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1. Introduction

Tokara Property Holdings is proposing to redevelop Glen House, 125 Old Brompton Road, in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

As part of the pre-application process, Tokara Property Holdings conducted a thorough stakeholder and public consultation programme to engage local residents, businesses and key stakeholders on the emerging proposals. This document provides an overview of the consultation, engagement and communications undertaken by Tokara Property Holdings.
2. Executive Summary

The public consultation was effective in raising awareness of Tokara Property Holdings’ plans to redevelop Glen House, 125 Old Brompton Road. This was achieved by engaging local residents, businesses and stakeholders and identifying key issues surrounding the potential development.

During the consultation the following activities were undertaken:

- Stakeholder letters were sent to residents and key stakeholders to publicise the redevelopment plans and the public exhibition. An invitation to meet the development team to discuss the proposals was also extended.

- A leaflet was distributed to publicise the proposals and invited locals to a public exhibition on 10 July 2012.

- A follow-up letter was sent to encourage local residents to feedback on the proposals, which included two further drop-in sessions to view the proposals.

- The Leader of the Council requested a briefing document, which was also sent to other councillors.

- Ongoing dialogue with residents.

A public exhibition was held on Tuesday 10 July 2012 from 3pm to 8pm, which included exhibition boards outlining the proposals and a scale model of the site and surrounding area. The proposals received constructive feedback from the event, with 15 people attending the exhibition and five feedback forms returned. Further drop-in sessions were held in July and four individual meetings were held in September for stakeholders to discuss the proposals with the development team.

Local residents were supportive of the improvements proposed for the building and the provision of residential apartments. There were, however, concerns about access to the site, overlooking from the balconies and a potential increase in illegally parked cars.
3. About Local Dialogue

Local Dialogue LLP was commissioned by Tokara Property Holdings to assist with the pre-application public consultation around the proposals for the redevelopment of Glen House, Old Brompton Road.

Local Dialogue is a specialist public consultation agency with broad expertise in advising on and implementing consultation programmes for both private and public sector clients. Its extensive experience includes working with local authorities, housing associations and other public sector bodies as well as private sector organisations on consultation, facilitation and communications for master planning, regeneration and development proposals.
4. Why Consult?

Consultation can help the planning process by addressing issues and explaining proposals before applications are submitted; this often leads to significant support for developments among those communities and stakeholders involved. Tokara Property Holdings has committed to a thorough pre-application consultation in recognition of the importance of these proposals to the local community and the role stakeholders can have in influencing the proposals.

This policy and advice supports ‘front-loading’ public engagement as the proposals are developed before the submission of planning applications to the relevant local authorities. It also recognises all parties will benefit from a programme of communications ensuring all those with an interest are fully informed of the proposals.

The basic need for consultation in planning has been reiterated recently through the Planning Act 2008, the 2008 Killian Pretty Review, the April 2009 ‘Duty to Involve’, the Localism Act, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and current best practice guidance.

The Localism Act 2011 includes three key duties to consult for developers of large projects. These reflect the Coalition Government’s localism agenda and its commitment to devolving decision-making to a neighbourhood and local authority level. These are:

- **Genuine consultation.** Developers must consult in a meaningful and open way with stakeholders and the community around proposals for development.

- **Responsive consultation.** Developers must give real consideration to a consultation’s feedback and use it to influence the development of designs, or be able to explain why it has not been incorporated into designs.

- **Demonstrable consultation.** The Act supports the submission of a Statement of Consultation, which documents and demonstrates the consultation process and its influence on design.
In recognition of this legislation and of the community-focused agenda it codifies, Tokara Property Holdings has conducted a thorough and open consultation for the redevelopment proposals.

In recognition of this legislation and the consultation strategies outlined in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea’s Statement of Community Involvement the applicant has conducted a thorough and open consultation for the Old Brompton Road proposals.

5. Proposals Overview

Tokara Property Holdings’ proposals are to redevelop Glen House, 125 Old Brompton Road. The existing building is outdated when compared to its surroundings. It was constructed in the 1930s as a car showroom and ancillary offices above, which would now greatly benefit from modernisation. The need for offices of this type has diminished and demand is for smaller, flexible and modern space with good access and facilities.

The redevelopment plans will extend forward the upper floors of the existing building, bringing it in-line with neighbouring buildings. This will accommodate new, modern office space and include high quality residential apartments.

A new fifth floor will replace the existing plant and machinery, which is unsightly, with a contemporary extension of similar massing to the Institute of Cancer Research office building next to Glen House.

The outdated elevations will be replaced with a more efficient and attractive façade, which ties into the surrounding buildings and architectural style of the area.

HR Owen, who currently occupies the ground floor, will continue to trade on site undisturbed.
6. Consultation Activity

This section sets out the pre-application consultation undertaken by the project team to engage the local community and stakeholders.

Consultation aims

The aims of the consultation were:

- To raise awareness within the local community of the proposals to redevelop Glen House
- To gain a firm understanding of key issues affecting the site and the surrounding area, such as the concerns and priorities of the local community
- To engage residents, businesses and other stakeholders in the site’s vicinity and to ensure they have the opportunity to give feedback on the proposals.

Consultation methodology

This subsection sets out the methodology and rationale behind Tokara Property Holdings’ approach to the pre-application consultation process for the proposed redevelopment of Glen House. The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea’s Statement of Community Involvement was reviewed to ensure the methodology was appropriate.

Stakeholder engagement

On 19 and 21 June 2012, local residents and political and community stakeholders were contacted by letter to introduce the redevelopment proposals and invite people to the public exhibition (see Appendix 1 for the letter to residents and Appendix 2 for the letter to community and political stakeholders).
This handshake letter was sent to:

- Residents of Eagle Place and Roland Way
- 58 local councillors, including site and neighbouring ward councillors, key Cabinet and Planning Committee members
- 49 local community groups, residents’ associations and businesses.

The handshake letters were followed by a publicity leaflet (see Appendix 3), which was hand delivered on 4 July, to invite local residents to view the proposals at a public exhibition on 10 July. The leaflet was hand distributed to 1,000 residents and businesses (see Appendix 4 for a distribution map).

Public exhibition

A public exhibition was held at Glen House on Tuesday 10 July from 3pm to 8pm, which gave local residents and stakeholders the opportunity to view the proposals and provide feedback. This included exhibition boards outlining the proposals, a scale model of the site and supporting documents such as floor plans and side elevations of the balconies and feedback forms (please see Appendix 5 for copies of the boards).

At the exhibition, the development team was on hand to answer questions and explain the finer details of the plans. The team included:

- John Hunter, Barnaby Joy and Richard Scott from Tenhurst
- Nigel Perryer, architect
- Nick de Lotbiniere and Katie Hale, planners
- Jessica Stewart and Benedict McAleenan, Local Dialogue.

Residents who attended the public exhibition on 10 July suggested that further events be held to fully engage with the local community. It was agreed that two more drop in sessions be held for residents to view the proposals and give feedback. These were held on 24 and 26 July.
Semi-permanent display

A room within Glen House was used to display the redevelopment plans on a semi-permanent basis, from after the exhibition on 10 July until the submission of a planning application. This featured the same exhibition materials as at the public exhibition and members of the public could call to arrange a viewing and meet members of the team.

A total of eight people signed the sign-in sheet.

Further public drop in sessions

Further to the semi-permanent display and the public exhibition, the development team hosted two drop in sessions on Tuesday 24 July from 8.30am to 10.00am and Thursday 26 July from 5.00pm to 7.30pm. Members of the public could also call to arrange a viewing and meet members of the team. 10 people, primarily residents, arranged viewing.

Written briefings

At the request of the Leader of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, written briefings summarising the proposals, were sent to him and the ward councillors on Monday 13 August. (See Appendix 6)

Written responses to stakeholders

Four stakeholder wrote to the development team with a number of questions and concerns surrounding the proposals and affect on the surrounding area. Detailed responses were sent to each stakeholder.
covering in-depth the issues raised. (See Appendix 7 for comments received and the responses).

Changes to an exhibition board

It was noted by two local residents that the information in one board, outlining the experience of the developer, was not accurate. The board discussed the previous work carried out by Tenhurst, which was pointed out that the projects were completed by John Hunter at Northacre, a company he founded before Tenhurst. A notification letter was sent to a number of interested stakeholders and the board in question was changed. (please see Appendix 8 for a copy of the letter).
7. Consultation Feedback

Summary of feedback

In total, 18 people attended the public exhibition and subsequent meetings and four feedback forms were received. Copies of the forms are given in Appendix 9.

The feedback forms contained six statements, which respondents could ‘agree’ or ‘disagree’ with. It also included a ‘further comments’ box to allow respondents to provide further detail.

Table 1, below, shows the responses to the question asked in the feedback form. The majority of attendees ‘agreed’ they were happy for the proposals to go ahead as they were in-keeping with what they would expect for the locality and would make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

**Table 1: Feedback form questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals are very much in keeping with the quality of what we would like to see for this unattractive building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals are broadly in line with our expectations for improving this building in the context of the local surrounding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals require further analysis for which we continue to have concerns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will certainly enhance the appearance of the local surroundings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are happy for these proposals to go ahead</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further comments
The ‘further comment’ box enabled attendees to fully set out any concerns or messages of support. Three attendees gave comments, which are detailed in Table 2 below.

As the table shows respondents brought up a number of points of concern, in particular, access to the site, overlooking and parking.

**Table 2: Feedback form further comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern over being overlooked and the chance of use of the emergency exit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only major concern is using Roland Way / Eagle Place (i.e. builders) from the back of the building. Legally you should not have access as it is a private road - all deliveries should occur from the front of the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to consider a little more the plans before commenting on the development. I do like the idea that there will be provision for residential apartments however how this will impact on local parking does concern me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Responses**

A number of local residents wrote to the development team with specific concerns, which were addressed in detail via email. There is currently ongoing liaison with these stakeholders from Roland Way and Eagle Place to keep them informed of the plans for 125 Old Brompton Road.
8. Conclusion

The public consultation helped the development team gain an understanding of the issues local people had concerning the site and redevelopment.

18 people attended the public exhibition, 10 people arranged individual meetings and four feedback forms were received. The majority of verbal and written responses show the redevelopment and the proposed improvement to the building would be welcomed, as long as it related to the overall feel of the surrounding area.

Supportive comments related to ‘liking the idea’ of residential apartments and improving the ‘old building’. Overall, the attitude towards the proposals was positive.

Concerns raised by attendees were in regard to the possibility of overlooking neighbouring residents, the increase of parking on the streets and site works using Roland Way / Eagle Place. It was noted by a number of respondents that the plans should be developed further to take into account the issues raised and a more sympathetic architectural style. In sum, most of the 28 people who viewed the exhibition were very happy.
9. Next Steps

After submission of the planning application for Old Brompton Road the development team will update the exhibition with changes to the scheme and allow the local community to view on an appointment basis.

The development team will notify local residents and other interested parties of the updated exhibition and keep them informed of any changed to the proposals.
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APPENDIX 1

LETTER TO LOCAL RESIDENTS

10 June 2012

Dear Neighbour,

REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL:
GLEN HOUSE, 105 OLD BROMPTON ROAD SW7

We are writing on behalf of Tokara Property Holdings to inform you of our emerging plans in respect of the redevelopment of Glen House.

The existing building was constructed in the 1950s, is outdated, relates poorly to its surroundings and is in need of modernisation.

The proposals therefore comprise the following highlights:

- To extend toward the upper floors of the existing building to accommodate modern office space together with some high quality residential apartments above.
- To set back a new fifth floor, replacing the existing unsightly plant and machinery with a contemporary extension with a similar massing to that of the adjoining Institute of Cancer Research office building.
- To replace the existing outdated elevations with a more efficient and attractive contemporary facade that responds sympathetically to the local vernacular.
- For H & R Owen to continue trading from its newly refurbished showroom on the ground floor.

Local Dialogue has been appointed to oversee a comprehensive consultation programme. To this end, we will be setting up an exhibition room in Glen House with Local Dialogue, so that you can review the proposal plans as well as a scale model of the redeveloped building. This exhibition is an opportunity to read and discuss the display of our proposals, ask any questions you may have and hopefully also provide us with your feedback.

Following this early period of local consultation, the project team aims to submit a planning application to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea during the month of July.

Local Dialogue will be publicising the exhibition details over the coming weeks. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact Jessica Stewart at Local Dialogue on 020 3552 6908 or jessica.stewart@localdialogue.co.uk.

We look forward to meeting you at the exhibition.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN HUNTER
APPENDIX 2

LETTER TO POLITICAL AND COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS

Cllr Louis Moxley
c/o Kensington Town Hall
Hornton Street
London
W8 7NX

Dear Cllr Moxley

21 June 2012

REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL:
GLEN HOUSE 125 OLD BROMPTON ROAD SW7

We are writing to all local residents on behalf of Tokara Property Holdings to inform you first of our emerging plans in respect of the redevelopment of Glen House.

The existing building was constructed in the 1930s, is outdated, relates poorly to its surroundings and is in need of modernisation.

The proposals therefore comprise the following highlights:

- To extend forward the upper floors of the existing building to accommodate modern office space together with some high quality residential apartments above.
- To set back a new fifth floor, replacing the existing unsightly plant and machinery with a contemporary extension with a similar massing to that of the adjoining Institute of Cancer Research office building.
- To replace the existing unsightly elevations with a more efficient and attractive contextual façade that responds sympathetically to the local vernacular.
- For H R Owen to continue trading from its newly refurbished showroom on the ground floor.

Local Dialogue has been appointed to oversee a comprehensive consultation programme. To this end, we will be setting up an exhibition room in Glen House, with Local Dialogue, so that you can review the proposal plans as well as a scale model of the redeveloped building. With this in mind, we would like to offer you the opportunity to meet and discuss the display of our proposals; ask any questions you may have and hopefully also provide us with your feedback.

Following this early period of local consultation, the project team aims to submit a planning application to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea during the month of July.

Local Dialogue will be in contact to see if you would be interested in attending a meeting at a time of your convenience. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact Jessica Stewart at Local Dialogue on 07917 131575 or jessica.stewart@localedge.com.

We look forward to meeting you shortly.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN HUNTER
APPENDIX 3

PUBLICITY LEAFLET

We are proposing to redevelop Glen House into a highly desirable mixed-use business and residential property.

Please come along to our public viewing to discuss the emerging proposals for Glen House and to let us know your views on our plans (details on back page).

AN UNREMARKABLE BUILDING WITH A REMARKABLE ADDRESS

Glen House is located on the southern side of Old Brompton Road, opposite the famous Glen Head Hotel. It is currently home to the KPMG office building and is used by the Institute of Cancer Research, which is a residential and office building.

The proposed redevelopment of the site would create a new, high-quality building with a remarkable address. The new building would provide a high-quality public space, enhancing the area for both residents and visitors.

Features:
- Large, open-plan offices that can be adapted to suit various needs
- High-quality apartments, varying from one to four bedrooms, to suit a broad market
- A new, attractive, residential character
- Enhanced landscaping and improved access to the riverfront
- Enhanced landscaping, including planting on the rear land

PUBLIC VIEWING

Tuesday 10th July 2012
3pm-8pm
Location: Glen House,
125 Old Brompton Road,
London SW7 3HP

INFORMATION TO PUBLIC VIEWING

The project is to be shown at the viewing on Tuesday, 10th July 2012. If you have any questions or comments about the proposal, please contact:

Jessica Stewart
020 7377 4699
jessica.stewart@localdialogue.com

Contact: Lend Lease
Local Dialogues LLP
30th Floor, 30 St Mary Axe
London EC3A 8EP

Design
TOKARA TENHURST

20
APPENDIX 4

LEAFLET DISTRIBUTION MAP

The distribution area is outlined in blue.
APPENDIX 5

EXHIBITION BORADS

125 OLD BROMPTON ROAD

WELCOME TO OUR PUBLIC VIEWING

We are proposing to redevelop Glen House, located at 125 Old Brompton Road.

Following early discussions with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC), our proposals have been carefully designed to create a high-quality property, more inkeeping with the local character of the area.

H R Owen's showroom will remain unchanged throughout the development.

Please view our emerging plans for Glen House and ask any questions you may have.

We would very much like to hear your thoughts on our proposals and feedback forms are available for your comments.
AN UNREMARKABLE BUILDING WITH A REMARKABLE ADDRESS

Glen House is located on the southern side of Old Brompton Road, opposite the junction with Fossezy Gardens. It is currently H R Owen’s Feneri showroom and is also next to the Institute of Cancer Research, which is a residential and office building.

Glen House was built in the 1930s as a garage and car showroom with offices above. The building does not complement nearby architecture and the character of the area.

Glen House is currently an unremarkable building with a remarkable address. There is great potential to create a higher quality property, more in-keeping with the local area.
OUR PROPOSALS

Our proposals are to redevelop this 1930s office block into a desirable, high-quality and contemporary property. Our plans are to bring the height and façade of Glen House into line with neighbouring properties.

- Flexible, small offices - The new offices can be subdivided according to demand.
- Fine high-quality apartments - Ranging from one to four bedrooms to respond to the local market.
- A new, set-back rooftop apartment with garden - Replacing unsightly plant and machinery on the roof.
- A new attractive, environmentally-friendly façade - Replacing the outdated elevations to create an attractive property.
- Extensive Landscaping - Cascading planting on the rear façade.
- Private outdoor space for all apartments.
- Excellent sustainability - Significantly exceeding renewable energy and CO₂ reduction targets.
HIGH QUALITY NEW APARTMENTS AND MODERN OFFICES

Apartments
Five new, high-quality apartments of a range of sizes to reflect local needs and demands.

This scale of residential development does not require the provision of on-site affordable housing.

Offices
Existing open plan offices will be replaced by flexible floor space that can be subdivided to also cater for local demand from small companies and start-ups.
TRANSPORT AND ACCESS

Existing access for nearby residents will be maintained, during and after construction, and improved once the work is complete.

The five new residential apartments will not have any allocated parking at Glen House.

Secure and disburse cycle parking and refuse storage for both the apartments and offices will be available on site.

Glen House is located within a PTAL (public transport accessibility level) rating area of 4. This means that the property is well served by public transport and is well suited for this type of residential and office redevelopment.

The nearest tube stations to Glen House are Gloucester Road and South Kensington, both a short walk away.
125 OLD BROMPTON ROAD

KEY BENEFITS

- Redevelopment of an outdated, ageing building that currently relates poorly to its surroundings.
- High quality and contemporary design, responding to the local character and context.
- Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4.
- Extensive and attractive landscaping around and on the façade of the property.
- Excellent environmental credentials, achieving BREEAM good rating and with renewable energy and CO₂ reduction technology that will exceed targets.
CONSIDERATE CONSTRUCTION

We are committed to being good neighbours during the construction work, which will take 12 to 18 months to complete, and will endeavor to cause as little disruption as possible. This will include noise reduction technology.

As well as being part of the national Considerate Constructors Scheme, we will work with the RIBO to agree working hours and practices, such as site and traffic management plans.

Uninterrupted access will be maintained for all residents living behind Glen House and H R Owen throughout construction.

We will scaffold from the first floor up so that access will not be affected and H R Owen will remain fully visible at ground floor level.

We will need to bring in materials and scaffolding during construction and this may cause temporary disruption. We will work with residents to find the least disruptive way of doing this.

We will have a 24-hour hotline number for the local community to call if they have a query or concern about any aspect of the work.
EXAMPLE PREVIOUS WORK

Each of the above previous schemes by Tenhurst has been awarded RBKC’s blue plaque for the development’s excellent contribution to the local environment.

TENHURST

The Tenhurst Hallmark represents the company’s reputation and high values.

- Maker’s Mark – Hallmark of distinction.
- Significant – A proud 23-year track record.
- Purity – Quality of design and detail.
- Landmark – Creating London’s finest new addresses.
Thank you for taking the time to view the redevelopment proposals for Glen House.

Please let us know what you think by completing our feedback form.

All feedback received during the consultation will be collated and reviewed by the development team. It will form part of our discussions with the RBKC Planning Department to inform the scheme.

Following a period of pre-application consultation with local residents, we anticipate submitting a planning application this summer.

We will continue to engage with members of the community after we have submitted our application. RBKC will also undertake a formal consultation on the development proposals before making its decision.

If you have any questions or would like any further information, please do not hesitate to contact us:

Jessica Stewart
Tel: 020 7357 6606
E: jessica.stewart@localdialogue.com

Glen House Consultation
Local Dialogue LLP
FREEPOST NA3717
London SE1 2BR
APPENDIX 6

COVER LETTER AND WRITTEN BRIEFINGS

26 July 2012

Dear XXXXX

BRIEFING AROUND REDEVELOPMENT OF GLEN HOUSE, 125 OLD BROMPTON ROAD

Please find enclosed a briefing document designed to give you an outline of our proposals for Glen House, 125 Old Brompton Road, in the Brompton ward. Tenhurst plans to submit these proposals to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in the coming weeks.

Having personally led a number of successful projects within RBKC, such as The Bromptons, The Phillimores and Observatory Gardens, I am very pleased to be bringing forward this project. I believe it will be a great improvement on the existing building, to the benefit of the neighbourhood and the Royal Borough.

We propose to redevelop Glen House into a five-storey, highly desirable, mixed-use property, featuring modern offices and high-end residential units. The key elements include:

- Replacing an outdated and difficult-to-manage 1930s building from the first floor upwards and creating a new top floor to bring it in line with the adjoining building.
- Flexible and smaller office units on the first and second floors, to meet local demand from small and start-up companies.
- Five high-quality apartments, ranging from one to four-bedrooms to respond to the local market and high demand for new homes.
- A new, attractive, environmentally-friendly façade, replacing the outdated elevations to create an attractive modern property.
- Extensive landscaping, including cascading planting on the rear façade.

The H R Owen Ferrari showroom on the ground floor would remain in operation throughout building works and thereafter.

The development team has already consulted extensively with local residents, especially those on Eagle Place and Roland Way, for whom the building is a significant feature. Residents have been invited to four events to view details and a model of the proposals. Several have taken us up on the invitation and we will feed their comments into the developing proposals ahead of submission.
We would appreciate the chance to explain the proposals further. Please contact Jessica Stewart at Local Dialogue if you have any questions or would like to meet to see the proposals in more detail. She can be contacted on 0207 357 6606 or at jessica.stewart@localdialogue.com.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

JOHN HUNTER

WRITTEN BRIEFING
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## 125 OLD BROMPTON ROAD

**Exterior Impression of the front entrance (Glasshouse)**

We are proposing to replace the Glasshouse, located at 125 Old Brompton Road.

Following early discussions with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC), our proposals have been carefully designed to create a high-quality property, in keeping with the local character of the area.

**Exterior of local character and context**

**Examples of local character and context**

**HR Officers' showing will remain unchanged throughout the development**
AN UNREMARKABLE BUILDING WITH A REMARKABLE ADDRESS

Glen II house is located on the southern side of Old Brompton Road, opposite the junction with Rosseau Gardens. It is currently an RFL owner's family residence and is also next to the head site of Science Research, which is a residential and office building.

Glen II house was built in the 1930s as a garage and car showroom with floors above. The building does not complement the character of its area.

Glen II house is currently an unremarkable building with a remarkable address. There is great potential to create a higher quality property, in keeping with the local area.

OUR PROPOSALS

Our proposals are to redevelop this dated office block into a desirable, high quality architecture property. Our plans are to bring the height and façade of Glen II house into line with the more contemporary properties.

- Flexible space: The new offices can be subdivided according to need.
- High quality apartments ranging from one to four bedrooms to respond to the local market.
- A new, six-bedroom apartment with gardens.
- Replacing unsightly plant and machinery on the roof.
- A new, contemporary, environmentally-friendly façade.
- Replacing the outdated elevation to create an attractive property.
- Extensive landscaping.
- Excellent sustainability - Significantly exceeding renewable energy and CO2 emission targets.

125 OLD BROMPTON ROAD STAKEHOLDER BRIEFING
HIGH QUALITY NEW APARTMENTS AND MODERN OFFICES

Apartments
The new high-quality apartments of a range of sizes to reflect local needs and demands.

Offices
Guiding plan of offices will be replaced by flexible floor space. Floor area can be subdivide to adapt to changing demand from small companies and start-ups.

TRANSPORT AND ACCESS

Existing access for nearby residents will be maintained. During and after construction, access will be improved.

The new residential apartments will not have any allocated parking at Glen House.

Secure and efficient cycle parking and safe storage for both the apartments and offices will be available on site.

Glen House is located within a PDL (public transport accessibility level) rating area of 6. This means that the property is well served by public transport and is well suited for the type of residential and office development.

The nearest tube stations to Glen House are Gloucester Road and South Kensington, both a short walk away.
KEY BENEFITS

- Redevelopment of an outdated, aging building that currently relates poorly to its surroundings.
- High-quality and contemporary design, responding to the local character and context.
- Cost: LEED Silver.
- Extensive and attractive landscaping around and on the facade of the property.
- Excellent environmental credentials, achieving BREEAM good rating and net zero carbon, with renewable energy and CO2 reduction targets.

CONSIDERATE CONSTRUCTION

We are committed to being good neighbours during the construction work, which will take 13 to 18 months to complete, and will endeavor to cause as little disruption as possible. This will include waste reduction technologies.

As well as being part of the national Considerate Constructors Scheme, we will work with RIBA to agree working hours and practices, such as site and traffic management plans.

Uninterrupted access will be minimized for all occupants living behind the new tower and HR Owen throughout construction.

We will consult from the first floor up so that access will not be affected and HR Owen will remain fully visible at ground floor level.

We will endeavor to bring in materials in a considerate manner, ‘just in time’ during construction and this may cause temporary disruption. We will work with residents to find the least disruptive way of doing this.

We will have a dedicated team on site and not be inbound during the consultation period. If you have any questions or concerns about any aspect of the work, please contact us.
EXAMPLES OF PREVIOUS WORK

Each of the schemes to the left were led by Tenhurst’s Planning Partner and each has been awarded RICS’s top plas as for excellent contribution to the local environment.

TENHURST

The Tenhurst tradition represents Tenhurst’s repute and high values.}

NEXT STEPS

Thank you for taking the time to visit the redevelopment proposals for Old Brompton Road.

The development team has already held a number of meetings with nearby residents, especially Fulham Wharf and Southwark. We continue to liaise with them regarding the proposals.

All feedback received during the consultation will be collated and reviewed by the development team. It will form part of our discussions with the RBKC Planning Department to refine the schemes.

Following a period of pre-application consultation with local residents, we anticipate submitting a planning application this summer.

We will continue to engage with members of the community after we have submitted our application. RBKC will also undertake a formal consultation on the development proposals before making a decision.

If you have any questions or would like any further information, please do not hesitate to contact us:

Jessica Steward
Tel 020 7303 9890
jessica.steward@carline.gov.com

TOKARA TENHURST SHARD
APPENDIX 7

RECEIVED EMAILS AND RESPONSES

RECEIVED EMAILS

Monday, 9 July 2012 11:59

Benedict,

During our meeting with John Hunter and Richard Scott they promised to provide me with a plan drawing of the development so I could better understand the proposals regarding the rear balconies and the roof terrace for the three large apartments. When responding I would also ask that they clarify the suggested future use of the current emergency exit which opens onto the small access road beside the car showrooms (to the rear of the entry barrier). At the time of our meeting there was some vagueness as to whom would use it - the tenants of the offices, the occupants of all the apartments or only certain of the apartments.

Thanks,

Thursday, 19 July 2012 17:09

Dear Benedict,

I refer to the conversations my husband and I had with you and Barney Joy yesterday afternoon relating to the exhibition board which specifies Tenhurst’s previous experience.

I would now like to record two concerns I have about the content of the above-referenced exhibition board. My first concern is that the four residential developments specified on this exhibition board were not previous projects of Tenhurst. Each of these projects were developed by a publicly listed company called Northacre PLC. It was Northacre PLC which received the blue plaque awards from the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea for these projects and not Tenhurst. The Northacre PLC website is very clear on this point. It is, therefore, misleading that the exhibition board refers to these projects as being previous schemes by Tenhurst in respect of which it received certain awards. Further, each of the above four residential developments were completed well before Tenhurst ever existed as a legal entity.

My second concern relates to the words on the exhibition board which say that Tenhurst has a proud 23 year track record. This statement is also misleading. I advise you that it is a matter of public record that...
Tenhurst was only incorporated in 2010. Tenhurst clearly does not have a 23 year track record. If since its incorporation, it has completed any development projects, only these projects should be attributed to Tenhurst.

I really do not think that it is appropriate that the residents who have been to the public viewing room should have been misled as described above. I also note that one of Local Dialogue’s principles is to communicate the right message and promote understanding. Therefore, could you please confirm to me by **Tuesday, 24th July** at the latest that:

1. The exhibition board has either been removed from the public viewing room or that it has been amended so that it contains accurate information.

2. You have sent a clarification e-mail or letter to those residents who have previously been to the public viewing room to the effect that the exhibition board relating to Tenhurst did not accurately reflect either Tenhurst’s experience or the fact that it was only incorporated in 2010.

I also await receipt of the copy of the text of the existing exhibition board which specifies Tenhurst’s previous experience which I requested yesterday.

Kind regards

---

**Thursday, 12 July 2012 10:47**

Jessica

I have received some rough plans showing some only of the measurements of the proposed terraces overlooking Eagle Place and Roland Way. Please would be provide me with a copy of the actual plans and full measurements.

In addition, I understand that, there are a number of other changes which have not been disclosed which include:

1. Proposed changes to the exit road to Old Brompton Road:
   1.1 As you are aware, this is an exit road only and there are specific legal rights of way granted over the whole of this exit road, as well as a public right of way. What are your specific proposals for this exit roadway as no changes were disclosed at my meeting?
   1.2 I understand that there may now be a proposal to remove or replace the exit barrier which was installed as an integral part of the approved development of Eagle Place. Is there any proposal to remove or replace this barrier and if so, what are your proposals?
   1.3 I also understand that you may be proposing to permit access to
some of the building from the exit roadway where the emergency stairwell is located. Is this correct and if so, what are your specific proposals in this regard as this was again not disclosed in our meeting?

2. Proposed changes to the garden area:
2.1 I was told that the garden area was not to be changed in any way. Please confirm if the representations made to me in this regard at my meeting were indeed correct?
2.2 I am now informed that the street light may be removed. Is this correct?
2.3 I am also informed that you may be proposing to place a bicycle rack at the rear of Glen House. Is this correct and if so where are you proposing to place it, how big will it be and for whom is it intended?

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Regards

Tuesday, 31 July 2012 13:33

Dear Benedict,

I have now had the opportunity to read your e-mail.

I reiterate that the original exhibition board specifying Tenhurst’s previous experience was misleading. It was wrong to assert that Tenhurst had been responsible for the redevelopment of four high quality residential schemes and had received awards for these schemes from the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. It was also wrong to assert that Tenhurst, which was only incorporated in 2010 and which has minimal assets, has a proud 23 year track record. These were not minor errors.

It is now absolutely appropriate that you inform those residents who saw the misleading exhibition board of the true extent of Tenhurst’s actual experience. This information is highly relevant to the residents as they review the proposed redevelopment plans.

I would also like to inform you that the revised exhibition board is still misleading and the following changes should be made to it:

1. It should be clarified that it was Northacre PLC and not Tenhurst which was responsible for the four specified schemes.

2. It appears that only one of the Tenhurst team has anything like a 23 year track record. The "Signature" reference should be amended accordingly.
3. The "Landmark" reference is misleading as only one of the Tenhurst team appears to have had any involvement in creating London's finest new addresses. This should be amended accordingly.

As I am sure that you are now aware from this, my second e-mail on this subject, that I am concerned about having been given misleading information regarding the experience of the property development company which has been engaged by Tokara to re-develop a large office building in front of my home. It was only through my own research into Tenhurst that I discovered that I had been misled.

Further, it is reasonable to expect that each resident in Eagle Place and Roland Way is given clear and accurate information about Tenhurst. Therefore, I am troubled that Local Dialogue does not appear to want to give the residents this information. For this reason, I have copied both Mark Brown from Local Dialogue and John Gripton from Tokara on this e-mail so that they are each aware of this issue.

I note that you have still not sent me a copy of the text of the original exhibition board which specified Tenhurst's previous experience which I requested on 24th July and which it was agreed that I would receive. Please now send this to me as soon as possible.

---

**Tuesday, 31 July 2012 22:11**

Dear Mr Mcaleenan

I understand from my neighbour Mrs Beck that she has discovered that Tenhurst did not in fact do the developments that it is claiming to have done in support of its project for Glen House.

Would you be so kind as to clarify exactly the relationship, if any, between the developments cited in the exhibition board in the room at Glen House made available for consultation with the public, and personnel at Tenhurst? As the four developments referred to were undertaken a long time ago, would you please let me know exactly the dates they were undertaken, and what any individual connected with them and with Tenhurst, has done in the meantime?

I am most concerned that there appears to have been a deliberate attempt to mislead members of the public into thinking that Tenhurst had a long track record of prestige developments. What is Local Dialogue’s role in this matter?

Regards
Thursday, 16 August 2012 15:43

Dear Benedict,

We have now had the opportunity to review your reply of 8th August to our e-mail of 15th July.

Unfortunately, our request for information and documentation has been answered by the Glen House development team in a wholly unsatisfactory way. Please find below an annotated version of the original e-mail of 15th July. This now includes your reply to each of our points. Underneath your reply, we have included our detailed response.

We now await receipt from you of the information we have requested.

Kind regards

15 July 2012 18:52 To: ‘jessica.stewart@localdialogue.com’ Subject: Proposed re-development of Glen House

Dear Jessica,

You may recall that I attended the public viewing of the proposed re-development of Glen House on 10th July.

During the public viewing, you agreed to send me a number of documents relating to the proposed re-development project. For ease of reference, these documents are specified below. I have also reviewed thoroughly the artist¹s impression of the rear of the building; a copy of which you gave to me on Tuesday. I have also considered further Tokara¹s proposal for two new lifts and two new stairwells at the rear of Glen House. This has caused me to ask you for further information and documentation and has raised additional concerns about the proposed re-development all of which are detailed below:

1 DOCUMENTS REQUESTED ON 10TH JULY 2012

(a) A copy of all the drawings, diagrams and plans (with actual measurements) in respect of the proposed re-development.

Glen House development team¹s reply of 8th August

Floor and site plans

The detail of these items will become readily available once the content of our planning application is formalised. When these details are defined, they will be made available.
Response from [姓名] and [姓名]

At the public viewing on 10th July and at our specific request, Jessica Stewart agreed to send to us a copy of the drawings, diagrams and plans (with actual measurements) in respect of the proposed re-development. Over a month later, you now inform us that at this pre-application consultation stage, we will not be receiving the information we requested. The only documents we have received from you are an artist’s impression of the front of the building, an incomplete artist’s impression of the rear of the building, a rather vague computer generated image of the side of Glen House a rather vague computer generated image of the rear of Glen House and a drawing of the side view of the balconies at the rear of Glen House. It is not helpful nor is in the spirit of consultation to agree to send information to us and then decide later that this is not what you want to do.

(b) A copy of the report prepared on behalf of Tokara regarding the effect that the proposed re-development at the rear would have on the light coming into my house. Nick de Lotbiniere referred to this report several times on Tuesday.

Glen House development team’s reply of 8th August

Rights of Light

We have carried out the usual test for rights of light, daylight and sunlight, and are satisfied with the contents of the same. Notwithstanding this, it is not a requirement or indeed appropriate for said reports to be made available for public circulation.

Response from Susan and Steve Beck

At the public viewing on 10th July, concerns were raised about the effect of the proposed re-development on the right to light to our property. Nick de Lotbiniere represented that our right to light would not be affected and that there was a report which confirmed this. It was agreed at this public viewing that we would receive a copy of this report. We now read with concern that this is another document which the Glen House development team has decided not to give to us. We again ask for a copy of this report so that we can allay our fears that our right to light will be affected by the proposed re-development.

(c) A schedule of work for the proposed development specifying in some detail the different phases of the proposed re-development with an estimate of the length of time for the completion of each phase.
Glen House development team’s reply of 8th August

Schedule of construction works

As regards the schedule of construction work, this is not yet prepared and will not be so for some time. The parameters of the works will be discussed in detail with officers at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and we will then be able to provide an outline of intended works. As discussed at our meetings, we are very aware of the understandable sensitivities regarding disruption and access to Roland Way and Eagle Place. We have committed to using cantilevered scaffolding around the full outline of the building to avoid ground-level disruption and will also undertake other measures to ensure minimal disruption during those works. However, construction itself is not a material planning consideration.

Response from [Name] and [Name]

We are extremely surprised that you are not able to give us any information in respect of the different phases of the proposed re-development and the length of time for the completion of each phase. Again, this was a document which was requested on 10th July and it was agreed that we would receive this ³schedule of work². This information is highly relevant to us and we find it very hard to believe that you cannot give us any information about the scheduling of the construction works. We again ask for a copy of your ³schedule of work².

2. FURTHER INFORMATION/DOCUMENTATION REQUESTED ON 15TH JULY 2012

(a) The artist¹s impression of the rear of the building is incomplete as it neither shows the whole width of the rear of Glen House nor the garden area adjacent to the three parking spaces. Could you please provide me with an artist¹s impression which shows the entire width of the rear of the building and which clearly shows all of the garden area and the proposed new lift shaft and the new stairwell which are proposed to be built adjacent to the exit road

Glen House development team¹s reply of 8th August

Rear elevation image

Please find attached a copy of the computer generated image of the proposed rear elevation.

Response from [Name] and [Name]
We have studied the computer generated image of the proposed rear elevation. This document is very vague and does not clearly show what you are proposing to do to the rear of the building. Further, it does not show all of the garden area near the three parking spaces. In fact, the three parking spaces appear to have been removed. Please provide us with a more detailed computer generated image of the rear elevation which should also show the three parking spaces, the whole of the garden area to the side and to the back of these parking spaces, the proposed cycle racks, the proposed storage area for refuse bins and any proposed new entrance into Glen House from Eagle Place.

We also have the following additional questions as a consequence of our review of the computer generated image:

1. It appears that the proposed new fifth floor penthouse apartment will also have a row of balconies as well as a roof terrace. Please confirm that this is the case. If it is, this further increases the intrusion into our privacy as well as creating more noise in Eagle Place and Roland Way.

2. It appears that in addition to the proposed roof terrace, the proposed new fifth floor penthouse apartment will also have another terrace (with a pergola) on the top of the new lift shaft in the west core of the building. Please confirm that this is the case. If it is, this further increases the intrusion into our privacy as well as creating more noise in Eagle Place and Roland Way.

(b) It appears from the artist’s impression of the rear of the building that the structure housing the new lift shaft and stairwell is wider than the structure which currently houses the existing stairwell. This would bring this part of the building closer to my house. Could you please confirm that this is the case?

Glen House development team’s reply of 8th August

West core measurements

You asked whether the new lift shaft is wider than the existing stairwell (of the west core). We can confirm that the west core on the south east corner of the building will extend approximately 4,600mm farther eastwards compared to its existing position. Its measurement from the south-west corner will be approximately 8,800mm.

Response from and

It is noted that you have confirmed that the proposed new lift
shaft will extend eastwards which means that this will be closer to our property than the existing stairwell. Please now clarify if the proposed new lift shaft will also be extended:

(i) southwards into Eagle Place and over our right of way over the land owned by Tokara in Eagle Place; and

(ii) westwards onto the small pavement and into the exit road at the side of Glen House.

(c) Could you please provide me with an artist’s impression of the side of Glen House to show the exit road, any new pavement to be built next to the exit road, the proposed new entrance to Glen House and the exit barrier or new retractable bollards.

Glen House development team’s reply of 8th August

Side elevation image

Please also find attached the side elevation image as requested, showing the access point. The barrier will be annotated on the drawings as it is on the ground prior to submission of our proposals.

Response from [Redacted] and [Redacted]

This computer generated image is rather vague and it does not clearly show what you are proposing to do with the side of the building. It also does not show the barrier at the end of the exit road nor any replacement retractable bollards. Please provide a better computer generated image of this side elevation so that we can clearly see the relationship between the side entrance of the building, the small pavement (which narrows towards the existing barrier) and the barrier or the replacement retractable bollards.

It also appears from the computer generated image that the proposed side door will not be in the same location as the existing side door. Please clarify where this will be situated as it appears that this it will be on the corner of the exit road and Eagle Place and, therefore, closer to our property.

(d) As the two new lift shafts and stairwells will need to be illuminated, how much artificial light will be seen from Eagle Place and Roland Way? Please send me a copy of any report which has been prepared for Tokara on this point.

Glen House development team’s reply of 8th August
Light pollution

You asked about the potential light pollution anticipated from the lift shafts and stairwells and requested sight of any reports conducted into this issue. We will take your points into consideration to ensure that any lighting arrangement is reasonable and sensitive to the residential nature of the mews. You will note that the proposal benefits from the removal of all windows to this staircase core.

Response from [Redacted] and [Redacted]

Please provide us with your proposal to reduce the light pollution in Eagle Place and Roland Way as a result of the introduction into Eagle Place of additional lighting from the following sources:

(i) The new lift shaft and stairwell (which will each be encased in large tinted glass panels) at the east of the rear of the building.

(ii) The new lift shaft and stairwell (which will each be encased in large tinted glass panels) at the west of the rear of the building.

(iii) The two floors of offices with floor to ceiling tinted glass panels.

(iv) The third, fourth and fifth floor apartments which will have floor to ceiling tinted glass panels.

(v) The external lighting for the balconies on the third, fourth and fifth floors.

(vi) The external lighting for the roof terrace on the new fifth floor penthouse apartment.

(vii) The external lighting for the roof terrace on the top of the new lift shaft on the west core.

(viii) The external lighting for the cycle racks.

(ix) The external lighting for the storage area for the refuse bins.

(x) The external lighting for the new side door next to the exit road.

We do not understand your comment that³ the proposal benefits from the removal of all windows to this staircase core². Your proposal is to remove five windows of modest
width and height in a stairwell which is infrequently used. You propose to replace this stairwell with a significantly larger lift shaft and stairwell which will be frequently used and which will be encased in large tinted glass panels all of which will be closer to our property. Your proposal is of no benefit to us. Your statement is a clear sign that the Glen House development team does not understand (or does not want to understand) the effect that the proposed re-development will have on the local residents.

(e) Nigel Perryer told me on Tuesday that cantilever scaffolding would be used at the rear of Glen House. Could you please ask him what type of scaffolding would be used for the proposed re-development work at the side of Glen House (including the construction of the new lift shaft and stairwell).

Glen House development team’s reply of 8th August

We have committed to using cantilevered scaffolding around the full outline of the building to avoid ground-level disruption and will also undertake other measures to ensure minimal disruption during those works. However, construction itself is not a material planning consideration.

Response from [redacted] and [redacted]

Please explain what other measures you are planning to take to ensure minimal disruption during those works.

(f) There is currently a small pavement to the side of the exit road. This narrows as it reaches the exit barrier forcing any pedestrian to walk on the exit road itself. I understand that Tokara is proposing to build a new entrance at the side of Glen House which would be used by office workers and the occupiers of a number of the proposed new apartments. The current exit door at the side of the building is an emergency exit only. There are clear rights of way over the exit road to ensure, primarily, that the Eagle Place residents can exit Eagle Place. This right of way should not be obstructed. Therefore, could you please provide me with the following information:

(i) It does not seem that the existing small pavement is suitable to be used by the increased number of people going in and out of the new entrance to Glen House. Are there any plans to replace the pavement? If so, please provide me with these details and, in particular, whether the new pavement will have the effect of reducing the width of the exit road.

Glen House development team’s reply of 8th August

Pavement on west end of Glen House
You asked about plans for the pavement next to the road to the west side of Glen House. We do not intend any changes to this.

Response from Susan and Steve Beck

We are very surprised that you are not proposing to make any changes to the small pavement next to the exit road. As you are fully aware, the door at the side of the exit road is an emergency door and is used infrequently. We believe that the pavement is too small and narrow to be used as the main entrance into Glen House. Its maximum width is approximately 1.2m and it narrows significantly to approximately 0.56m at the exit barrier. We recommend most strongly that you look again at this part of your proposal as it is fraught with health and safety concerns including the following:

1. Any pedestrian who uses the exit road is forced to walk onto the exit road itself where the small pavement narrows. Any increase in the pedestrian traffic using the exit road increases the risk of there being an accident involving vehicles using this exit road as a means to exit Eagle Place and Roland Way.

2. The use of the side door as the new main entrance to and from Glen House increases the risk of there being an accident involving people using the side door and vehicles exiting Eagle Place and Roland Way by means of the exit road. You should be aware if you are not already that vehicles using this exit road have to drive through a blind and narrow corner just before the existing location of the side door. In addition, we have occasionally seen large vehicles actually mounting the small pavement as the road here is so narrow.

3. The main reason why the exit road exists (and why we have a right of way over it) is to provide a means for the Eagle Place residents to exit Eagle Place particularly in an emergency. This exit road should not be obstructed by a significant increase in pedestrians walking on the road. The Eagle Place residents should not have to share this exit road with office workers or residents of Glen House or with any vehicles or people making deliveries to Glen House.

(b) How would deliveries be made to those businesses and residents who use the new entrance?

Glen House development team’s reply of 8th August

Proposed use of new entrance

You asked about proposed deliveries to the offices and residents who use the new entrance. It is intended that deliveries will be received at both the front and side entrances.

Response from Susan and Steve Beck
Please clarify how deliveries will be made to the side entrance of Glen House. If the deliveries are to be made using delivery vehicles, how will this be done without interfering with our rights of way over the exit road? If the deliveries are to be made on foot, how will the items (particularly large items) be transported along the small pavement at the side of the exit road?

(ii) How will refuse be collected from this part of the building?

Glen House development team’s reply of 8th August

Storage and collection of refuse

Refuse will be stored beneath the pergola to the west of the existing planter, within the footprint of the building and collected from there, in line with the current service management arrangement in Roland Way and Eagle Place.

Response from Susan and Steve Beck

We do not understand your reply to our question. We have looked at the incomplete artist’s impression of the rear of the building and the rather vague computer generated image of the rear of the building and we have the following questions:

(i) Please clarify where the proposed pergola will be. We cannot see any sign of a pergola (which we are assuming means a frame in a garden over which climbing plants can grow).

(ii) We have measured the space from the end of the new lift shaft at the west of the rear of the building to the beginning of the garden area. This space is approximately 1.5 metres wide. It is also on our right of way and is not within the footprint of Glen House. Please clarify what you are proposing to do with this 1.5 metre space. If you are proposing to do something with this space, please explain and how this would not be interfering with our right of way over this part of the land in Eagle Place owned by Tokara.

(iii) Please clarify exactly where the refuse bins will be located within the footprint of Glen House. The refuse created by the occupiers of the high quality apartments should be stored within Glen House’s property line and collected from there. The refuse bins should not be located anywhere on the land owned by Tokara in Eagle Place. This land is not within the footprint of Glen House. We do not want to see or smell these refuse bins nor be disturbed when they are collected by the council. In addition, we do not want to see any of the occupiers of the apartments (or any of their staff) coming into Eagle Place to deposit
their refuse in the refuse bins.

(iv) Please clarify where any excess refuse created by the occupiers of the high quality apartments will be stored when the refuse bins are full.

(v) Please clarify exactly how the refuse bins will be collected. Please note that there is not a service management arrangement in Roland Way and Eagle Place for the collection of bins. The refuse bins are collected from each property by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea as part of the council tax charge.

We now inform you that if you are proposing to locate refuse bins in any part of the land owned by Tokara in Eagle Place, we will be objecting most strongly to this part of your proposal.

3. Unfortunately, it did not appear from last Tuesday¹s public viewing that either Tokara or any of its advisers had given any thought relating to how deliveries of plant, equipment and materials would be made to Glen House during the construction and fit-out phases or where the workmen would park their vehicles. This is of some concern to me as there are only three parking spaces at the front of Glen House. I advised you on Tuesday that the land in Eagle Place which is owned by Tokara cannot be used to deliver or store plant, equipment or materials and/or as a parking area for any entity or person involved in the re-development project at whatever contractual level. This is because there are clear rights of way over Tokara¹s land primarily for the benefit of the Eagle Place residents. Could you please now arrange for the preparation of a plan which should detail how this part of the proposed re-development project is to be managed. I would then like to see a copy of this plan.

Glen House development team¹s reply of 8th August

Construction and use of South Courtyard

You pointed out, in section 2(g) of your e-mail, that there should be no storage of plant or equipment on Eagle Place. We very much understand this and we will not impede rights of access to and from Eagle Place or Roland Way through the storage, delivery or other placement of plant, equipment or materials.

Response from [Redacted] and [Redacted]

Your reply has not addressed in any way our concerns over the very real possibility of your workmen (at whatever contractual level) trying to park their vehicles on our right of way over the land in Eagle Place which is owned by Tokara. As you are fully aware, there is very limited parking on Old Brompton Road and the easiest and cheapest solution for your workmen
would be to park in Eagle Place. For the second time we request that you send us a plan detailing how you are proposing to manage the deliveries of plant, equipment and materials to Glen House during the construction and fit-out phases and where your workmen will be parking their vehicles. We also request that you confirm that there will be no storage of plant, equipment or materials in Eagle Place. Please also advise where such plant, equipment and materials will be stored.

3. ADDITIONAL CONCERNS

You will recall that I raised serious concerns on Tuesday over the proposed plan to build balconies and a roof terrace at the rear of the building. Not only is this a clear intrusion into my privacy and that of my husband, the use of the balconies and the roof terrace will also significantly increase the noise levels in Eagle Place and Roland Way.

Glen House development team’s reply of 8th August

Balconies overlooking your property

We have consulted the local authority on the question of balconies. Planning policy requires that we provide amenity, in the manner as proposed.

Response from [Redacted] and [Redacted]

We do not accept that there is any planning policy which requires that you have to provide amenity space in the form of balconies (either to the rear or to the side of Glen House) for any of the five high quality apartments you are proposing to build. We also do not accept that there is any planning policy that provides that even where there is a requirement to provide amenity space (which is not the case in this instance), this overrides privacy intrusion concerns of local residents.

We now request that you send to us the name and telephone number of the person you spoke to at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea on this issue of balconies. Please also provide us with the references to the relevant planning policy on which you are relying to support your statement that you are required to build the balconies as proposed.

Noise levels from balconies

At our meeting you raised concerns over noise levels from the balconies. While these balconies may lead to a small increase in noise from time to time, we have no reason to believe this
would be at an unreasonable level.

Response from [redacted] and [redacted]

Your response is completely unsatisfactory. The proposed three rows of balconies, the proposed roof terrace, the proposed new terrace on top of the new lift shaft and the proposed small balconies next to the exit road will cause the noise levels in Eagle Place and Roland Way to be increased. You have no basis to say that this increased noise level will not be at an unreasonable level. The whole purpose of building the balconies and terraces is to provide leisure and recreational space and you will be able to charge a higher price for the apartments because of this. Your rather naive reply is yet another example of the Glen House development team not understanding (or not wanting to understand) the effect that the proposed re-development will have on the residents.

I am now also very concerned about the following aspects of the proposed re-development which also has the effect of intruding into our privacy:

(i) It is proposed that the first and second floors are to be extended at the rear of the building which will mean that these floors will be closer to my house. In addition, the current windows are to be replaced with floor-to-ceiling tinted glass panels. Each of these proposals will result in office workers having a better view than they currently have of the inside of my house and into my garden.

Glen House development team's reply of 8th August

Offices overlooking your property

You have raised several times your concerns over the provision of balconies at the third, fourth and fifth storeys and of your fears regarding overlooking from offices. We have stated our opinion that there will be little change compared to the current situation. Whether it be for commercial or residential purposes, the mixed use of the building is more likely to result in a reduction of overlooking.

Response from [redacted] and [redacted]

We will not stop raising our serious concerns regarding the intrusion into our privacy caused by your proposal to move the building forward so that it is closer to our property and to replace the modest size second and third floor windows with floor to ceiling tinted glass panels. It is both preposterous and
extremely thoughtless to state that there will be little change compared to the current situation or that there will be a reduction in overlooking. Each of the following aspects of your proposal will increase overlooking into our property (including our garden):

1. Your proposal to move the building forward so that it is closer to our property.

2. Your proposal to replace the modest size second and third floor windows with floor to ceiling tinted glass panels.

3. Your proposal to convert the third and fourth floors into apartments with floor to ceiling tinted glass panels rather than the existing modest size windows.

4. Your proposal to add balconies to the third and fourth floor apartments.

5. Your proposal to add a fifth floor to the building which will become a penthouse apartment with balconies, a roof terrace and an additional terrace.

6. The change of use of the third and fourth floors from offices which are currently used from approximately 9am to 5:30 pm Monday to Friday (excluding public holidays) to high quality apartments which could be occupied twenty four hours a day and seven days a week (including public holidays).

7. Your proposal to replace the existing stairwell at the east of the building with a new lift shaft and stairwell to be encased in large tinted glass panels.

8. Your proposal to replace the existing stairwell at the west of the building with a new lift shaft and stairwell which will be closer to our property than the existing stairwell and which will be encased in large tinted glass panels.

This is an example of the Glen House development team not understanding (or not wanting to understand) the effect that the proposed development will have on the use and enjoyment of our property.

(ii) The new lift shafts and stairwells will have large tinted glass panels giving people who are using these parts of the building a clear view into my house and garden. This is particularly the case for the lift shaft and stairwell which is closest to the exit road and which appears to be closer to my house than the existing stairwell. The existing stairwell has five windows of modest width and height.
existing stairwell is also infrequently used which is very different from the proposal to use this part of the building as an entrance for a significant number of people.

Glen House development team's reply of 8th August

Stairwells overlooking your property

Regarding your concerns around glazing for the stairwells and lift-shafts, please refer to the above regarding planning requirements that relate to overlooking.

Response from [redacted] and [redacted]

We do not understand your response. Are you suggesting that it is a planning requirement that the stairwells and lifts should be encased in large tinted glass panels and that the consequent intrusion into our privacy is to be disregarded?

My husband and I are very concerned about the proposed re-development. We are also very concerned that since Tokara acquired Glen House last year, it has treated us with indifference at best and with a total lack of respect at worst. Neither my husband or I will be casual observers in this planning process. I expect that my requests for information and documentation be addressed by Tokara's advisers in a competent, clear and efficient way and I will not hesitate to ask for further information or documentation or raise additional questions.

Glen House development team's reply of 8th August

Previous communication with residents

We have also taken on board your comments regarding your frustrations over past communication with residents. We do hope the fact that we have committed to extensive pre-application consultation demonstrates that we are keen to engage with our neighbours in a constructive way.

Response from [redacted] and [redacted]

We do not feel that what you refer to as the ³ pre-application consultation² demonstrates that you are keen to engage with the neighbours in a constructive way. Further, we do not believe that anything we have said to you or sent to you in writing has caused you to change or even review your proposed plans. We also believe that the ¹pre-application consultation² has in practice been a vehicle for you to try to justify (and in some instances defend) what you want to do
with little regard for the views or concerns of the local residents. We are also most concerned that we have experienced great difficulty in obtaining any meaningful information from you about your proposed plans. This is extremely unhelpful.

**Cycle racks**

As regards cycle racks, there will be nine bicycle racks in a secure area within the footprint of the building beneath a pergola at the west end of the rear planter. They will be accessed via the South Courtyard, i.e. the area of land at the northernmost point of Eagle Place, which is owned by Tokara.

---

**Response from Susan and Steve Beck**

Please clarify exactly where you are proposing to locate the nine cycle racks. We reiterate that the land owned by Tokara in Eagle Place does not form part of the footprint of Glen House. Further, there is only a 1.5 metre space next to the garden planter towards the west of Glen House. This space is on our right of way and it should not be used to build cycle racks. We are also concerned about the increased level of noise in Eagle Place caused by people using cycle racks in Eagle Place no matter where they are located.

On a separate note, I will send you an e-mail early next week with a number of possible dates and times for my husband to see the public viewing room in Glen House. I will also be with him when he sees you in Glen House. We will also require access to the fourth and fifth floors of the building at that time as we discussed on Tuesday.

Kind regards

---

**Friday, 10 August 2012 22:48**

Dear Benedict,

Following our telephone conversation I have been trying to line up a suitable resident to talk through the concept of the gates at the three entrances but it would seem the same holiday problems are thwarting my efforts. If I do get someone before I leave first thing on Monday I will Email the contact details to you. However, in the meantime I would confirm the type of gates I had in mind were similar to those shown in the photos of the Phillimores and the Bromptons.

I know the residents association have been considering erecting them
but have the dilemma that they also want to carry out repairs to the cobbles in the Mews. I suspect we do not have sufficient funds to do both and I additionally think these gates would add value to your development both by their look and the security/privacy they would offer.

Let me know if I can be of any further help, regards,


Thursday, 30 August 2012 16:44

Dear Mr McAleenan

Further to your email response of 8 August (copied below) and our subsequent telephone conversation I confirm that I have a number serious concerns and some additional questions regarding some of the proposals for Glen House. These are as follows:

1. The exit roadway to Old Brompton Road from Eagle Place was always intended to be and is only used as an exit roadway. To permit inward traffic, as I understand is your proposal, would be extremely dangerous as the turn into the exit is a very sharp turn and one which provides no visibility at all as to any traffic coming in the opposite direction. Any such change is likely to be met with a number of objections.

2. Permitting access by office workers and residents to Glen House by the emergency exit only stairwell, adjacent to the exit roadway, is also objectionable for similar reasons as set out in 1. above. I mentioned in our telephone call that a similar change was rejected by the Council some time ago presumably on safety reasons.

3. You mentioned in our telephone conversation that your proposals included extending out the rear of Glen House, on the western edge (the area which incorporates the emergency exit stairwell) but it was not clear to me precisely how you intend to do this. Please would you provide me with a copy of the proposed plan showing how you propose making this extension. I mentioned over the telephone that there could be absolutely no encroachment into the existing roadway as, apart from our legal rights of access, access over all of that roadway is required for access into Eagle Place.

4. Please would you advise if you have any plans for placing any refuse at the rear of Glen House and, if so, please provide full details of your proposals, including a plan.

5. You mention that a “small section to the east end of the planter will be altered”. Please would you confirm that the alterations will not extend in any way outside the existing “footprint” of the existing planter/garden.

6. From a review of the relevant title plans it seems to us that our right
of way extends over the whole of the planted area at the rear of Glen House. Please confirm if you agree with this position.

7. Finally, please would you let me know when you are planning to submit your planning proposal.

Regards

RESPONSES

27 July 2012

RESPONSE TO [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for your e-mail of 12 July 2012. Please find below our responses:

In reference to section 1.1 of your e-mail, regarding changes to the road from Old Brompton Road towards the mews, we do not propose any structural changes to this roadway and the hard landscaping. In reference to section 1.2, regarding the barrier, we had originally considered replacing the swing arm¹ barrier with a telescopic bollard that would lower into the road to allow vehicle access. However, our intention is that the roadway, hard landscaping and barrier will remain as they are.

In reference to section 1.3, regarding access to the building via the aforementioned roadway: we do intend to allow pedestrian access for the offices and two smaller one-bedroom residential units from the existing doorway at the south-west corner of the building. The roadway would also be expected to provide pedestrian access to the bike store at the rear of the building and the rear entrance on the east end of the building.

It may be worth noting that the roadway access and a section of the South Courtyard that provides access to Eagle Place and Roland Way are in the ownership of Tokara, the owner of Glen House. As owner of the accessway, Tokara intends to grant entry and egress to residents and users of Glen House, but we are aware of our obligations to those with existing rights of way over the accessway and the intention is that said grant will not prevent the exercise of any of those existing rights.

Regarding 2.1 and the plans for the planter to the rear of the building: a small section to the east end of the planter will be altered to accommodate a bronze pergola, with climbing plants. You asked, in section 2.2, whether the streetlight located in the planter would be
removed. We do not currently have any plans to change this streetlight.

You enquired, in section 2.3, as to the proposals for a bicycle rack at the rear of the building. We are proposing to create a secure area within the planter to the rear of Glen House, within the overall outline of the building, to the west end and beneath a pergola covered by climbing plants. This is therefore not within the South Courtyard, but would be accessed from it. It would be used by residents of Glen House and would comprise a cycle rack for up to 9 bicycles.

We should reiterate at this point that our proposals are not final and we welcome your feedback to help us develop the proposals before submitting them to the Council.

We hope this answers your questions. Please let us know if you should have any further queries or comments regarding our proposals.

Yours sincerely,
Benedict McAleenan
On behalf of the Glen House Development Team.

RESPONSE TO

Dear [Name],

Thank you for your e-mails (notably that dated 15 July 2012) and for taking the time recently to meet with us and discuss our proposals for Glen House.

We have endeavoured to answer all of your questions as fully as possible. Please note that the proposals are at pre-application consultation stage. This process means that the proposals are subject to change and it is an opportunity for you to have some involvement in the process before our planning submission is formalised. In due course we will advise all residents of Roland Way and Eagle Place of our submission and how they will be able to access the detailed content of our application after it is submitted to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

Floor and site plans
The detail of these items will become readily available once the content of our planning application is formalised. When these details are defined, they will be made available.

Schedule of construction works
As regards the schedule of construction work, this is not yet prepared and will not be so for some time. The parameters of the works will be discussed in detail with officers at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and we will then be able to provide an outline of intended works. As discussed at our meetings, we are very aware of the understandable sensitivities regarding disruption and access to Roland Way and Eagle Place. We have committed to using cantilevered scaffolding around the full outline of the building to avoid ground-level disruption and will also undertake other measures to ensure minimal disruption during those works. However, construction itself is not a material planning consideration.
Rear elevation image
Please find attached a copy of the computer generated image of the proposed rear elevation.

Side elevation image
Please also find attached the side elevation image as requested, showing the access point. The barrier will be annotated on the drawings as it is on the ground prior to submission of our proposals.

West core measurements
You asked whether the new lift shaft is wider than the existing stairwell (‘the west core’). We can confirm that the west core on the south east corner of the building will extend approximately 4,600mm farther eastwards compared to its existing position. Its measurement from the south-west corner will be approximately 8,800mm.

Light pollution
You asked about the potential light pollution anticipated from the lift shafts and stairwells and requested sight of any reports conducted into this issue. We will take your points into consideration to ensure that any lighting arrangement is reasonable and sensitive to the residential nature of the mews. You will note that the proposal benefits from the removal of all windows to this staircase core.

Pavement on west end of Glen House
You asked about plans for the pavement next to the road to the west side of Glen House. We do not intend any changes to this.

Proposed use of new entrance
You asked about proposed deliveries to the offices and residents who use the new entrance. It is intended that deliveries will be received at both the front and side entrances.

Storage and collection of refuse
Refuse will be stored beneath the pergola to the west of the existing planter, within the footprint of the building and collected from there, in line with the current service management arrangement in Roland Way and Eagle Place.

Construction and use of South Courtyard
You pointed out, in section 2(g) of your e-mail, that there should be no storage of plant or equipment on Eagle Place. We very much understand this and we will not impede rights of access to and from Eagle Place or Roland Way through the storage, delivery or other placement of plant, equipment or materials.

Offices looking over your property
You have raised several times your concerns over the provision of balconies at the third, fourth and fifth storeys and of your fears regarding overlooking from offices. We have stated our opinion that there will be little change compared to the current situation. Whether it be for commercial or residential purposes, the mixed use of the building is more likely to result in a reduction of overlooking.

Balconies looking over your property
We have consulted the local authority on the question of balconies. Planning policy requires that we provide amenity, in the manner as proposed.

**Stairwells overlooking your property**
Regarding your concerns around glazing for the stairwells and lift-shafts, please refer to the above regarding planning requirements that relate to overlooking.

**Noise levels from balconies**
At our meeting you raised concerns over noise levels from the balconies. While these balconies may lead to a small increase in noise from time to time, we have no reason to believe this would be at an unreasonable level.

**Rights of Light**
We have carried out the usual test for rights of light, daylight and sunlight, and are satisfied with the contents of the same. Notwithstanding this, it is not a requirement or indeed appropriate for said reports to be made available for public circulation.

**Cycle racks**
As regards cycle racks, there will be nine bicycle racks in a secure area within the footprint of the building beneath a pergola at the west end of the rear planter. They will be accessed via the South Courtyard, i.e. the area of land at the northernmost point of Eagle Place, which is owned by Tokara.

**Previous communication with residents**
We have also taken on board your comments regarding your frustrations over past communication with residents. We do hope the fact that we have committed to extensive pre-application consultation demonstrates that we are keen to engage with our neighbours in a constructive way.

Please let us know if you have any further queries or comments regarding our proposals so that we might consider them in the further adjustments to be incorporated in our submission.

We look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely,
Benedict McAleenan
On behalf of the Glen House development team.
APPENDIX 8

REVISED BOARD LETTER

8 August 2012

Dear XXXXXXX

THE TENHURST TEAM AT GLEN HOUSE

As you know, we have recently been consulting local residents regarding our proposals for the redevelopment of Glen House, 126 Old Brompton Road. Thank you for taking the time to come and visit our information display and meet members of the team.

Thanks to the admirable attention to detail of one of your neighbours, Mrs Susan Beck, we have amended one of the display boards in order to clarify the team’s relationship with four successful local projects. We are grateful to Mrs Beck, who has also asked us to write to you directly and advise you of the change. I enclose the new display board for your information.

I’m incredibly proud to say that the four precedent development projects shown on one of our exhibition boards were completed by me while at Northace, a company I founded before going on to found Tenhurst.

Through Northace, I led the development of four of London’s finest new addresses, here in Kensington: The Bromptons, The Phillimore, Earl’s Terrace and Observatory Gardens (among others). Each won the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea’s Blue Plaque for excellent contribution to the local environment.

I fully intend for Glen House to become an equally high-end development, with all of the benefits for the immediate neighbourhood that this entails. We have updated the display board within Glen House to make it clearer, ensuring that this was my personal work rather than that of Tenhurst itself.

As well as my own background in high-end local development, I am pleased to say that my partners at Tenhurst also bring a wealth of experience. You can be assured that the Glen House redevelopment would be managed by one of the best teams available for this type of scheme. You can see more about us at www.tenhurst.com.

Throughout the process, we have sought to engage local residents as openly as possible and we have invited your feedback repeatedly. If you would like the opportunity to view our proposals again, please let me know. My direct line is 0203 405 2870 and my e-mail is johnhunter@tenhurst.com.

APENDIX 9

FEEDBACK FORMS

Re-development of Glen House
125 Old Brompton Road
Have your say

Personal Information
Name
Address
Tel
Email
Postcode

☐ The proposals are very much in keeping with the quality of what we would like to see for this unattractive building
☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

☐ The proposals are broadly in line with our expectations for improving this building in the context of the local surroundings
☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

☐ The proposals will make a positive contribution to the conservation area
☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

☐ The proposals require further analysis for which we continue to have concerns
☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

☐ The proposals will certainly enhance the appearance of the local surroundings
☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

☐ We are happy for these proposals to go ahead
☐ Agree ☐ Disagree STILL CONSIDERING

☐ Further comments

CONCERN OVER BEING OVERLOOKED & THE CHANGE OF USE OF THE EMERGENCY EXIT

Once completed, please post in this bullet box or return free of charge to:
Glen House Consultation, Local Dialogue Ltd, FREEPOST NM12517, London SE1 2BR.
Alternatively you can email your comments to Benedict McAlister or benedict.mcalister@localdialogue.com

The information you provide will only be used for the purposes of this consultation exercise. The data will be held securely in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 and will not be published on an individual basis.
Re development of Glen House
125 Old Brompton Road

Have your say

Personal Information
Name
Address
Tel
Email
Postcode

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: I would have preferred a classical architecture rather than modern.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: The proposals are broadly in line with our expectations for improving this building in the context of the local surroundings.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: Some as above.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: Anything that improves this old building is welcome.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: The proposals require further analysis for which we continue to have concerns.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: Need to remove balconies at the back.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: Need to improve the “accessory garden” they are disappointing.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: The proposals will certainly enhance the appearance of the local surroundings.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: Anything that improves this old building is welcome.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: We are happy for these proposals to go ahead.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: Curated as follows: need more a draft reduction plan to do explained. Better - more formalised approach with the back gardens, planting.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree: Further comments.

Once completed, please post in the ballot box or return free of charge to:
Glen House Consultation, Local Dialogue LLP FREEPPOST NA13717, London SW1 2SR.
Alternatively you can email your comments to Benedict McAleerian at bенедикт.mcaleerian@localdialogue.com

The information you provide will only be used for the purposes of this consultation exercise. The data will be held securely in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 and will not be published or in
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REDEVELOPMENT OF GLEN HOUSE
125 OLD BROMPTON ROAD

HAVE YOUR SAY

Personal Information
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Tel: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

- The proposals are very much in keeping with the quality of what we would like to see for this unattractive building
  □ Agree □ Disagree

- The proposals are broadly in line with our expectations for improving this building in the context of the local surroundings
  □ Agree □ Disagree

- The proposals will make a positive contribution to the conservation area
  □ Agree □ Disagree

- The proposals require further analysis for which we continue to have concerns
  □ Agree □ Disagree

- The proposals will certainly enhance the appearance of the local surroundings
  □ Agree □ Disagree

- We are happy for these proposals to go ahead
  □ Agree □ Disagree

- Further comments

Once completed, please post in the ballot box or return free of charge to:
Glen House Consultation, Local Dialogue LLP, FREEPST NAT217, London SE1 2BR.
Alternatively you can email your comments to Benedict McAleeman at benedict.mcaleeman@localdialogue.com

The information you provide will only be used for the purpose of this consultation exercise. The data will be held securely in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 and will not be published on an individual basis.
HAVE YOUR SAY

Personal Information
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Tel: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

- The proposals are very much in line with the quality of what we would like to see for this unattractive building
  - Agree □ Disagree □

- The proposals are broadly in line with our expectations for improving this building in the context of the local surroundings
  - Agree □ Disagree □

- The proposals will make a positive contribution to the conservation area
  - Agree □ Disagree □

- The proposals require further analysis for which we continue to have concerns
  - Agree □ Disagree □

- The proposals will certainly enhance the appearance of the local surroundings
  - Agree □ Disagree □

- We are happy for these proposals to go ahead
  - Agree □ Disagree □

- Further comments
  I would like to consider a little more the plans before commenting on the development. I do like the idea that there will be provision for residential apartments however how this will impact on local parking does concern me.

[Signature]

Once completed, please post in the ballot box or return free of charge to: Glen House Consultation, Local Dialogue LLP, FREEPOST NAT7717, London SE1 2BR.
Alternatively you can email your comments to Benedict McAleer at benedict.mcaleer@localdialogue.com

The information you provide will only be used for the purpose of this consultation exercise. The data will be held securely in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 and will not be published on an identifiable basis.