

# **New Homes Delivery Programme: Barlby Road**

**Analysis of round two stakeholder consultation**

**July 2021**

**Putting Communities First Team  
The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea  
[consult@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:consult@rbkc.gov.uk)**



**THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF  
KENSINGTON  
AND CHELSEA**

# Introduction

## Background

The New Homes Delivery Programme (NHDP) has identified a site by Barlby Road as a potential area to help deliver new homes for the borough. This site, currently called Barlby Road, will form part of 'Stage 2' of the New Homes Programme.

## Consultation methodology

Following a first round of consultation, which took place in December 2020, the Council launched a second round of consultation on 9 June 2021, running to 21 July 2021, to gather stakeholders' views on the emerging proposals. A dedicated page was set up on the Council's website with details of the proposals and consultation, this included presentation material and a video presentation. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback via an online survey, as well as one in person session and one online session organised for stakeholders to ask questions about the proposals and provide feedback. To ensure those without access to the internet were able to participate, paper copies of consultation material was available on request, as was support in alternative formats (e.g. support for those whose first language is not English).

The consultation was promoted via a variety of channels, including; leaflet drops, social media, the Council's website, newsletters, posters and via local voluntary and community groups.

## Report

A total of six surveys were returned by the deadline and a total of 21 stakeholders attended across the two discussion sessions. This report contains an analysis of survey responses and a summary of feedback from the discussion sessions. Due to the small number of returns to the survey, graphs and percentage figures have not been included in the survey analysis.

## Acknowledgements

The Council would like to thank all residents and stakeholders that took the time to feedback their views.



# **Section 1:**

# **Stakeholder survey**



# Survey findings

There were six responses to the online survey. The below is a high level analysis of the responses submitted via the survey and includes all comments made by respondents

## Principle of the scheme

Respondents were asked if they supported the principle of a scheme on the site providing new homes and an indoor sports facility. All six respondents either **'strongly supported'** or **'supported'** this principle.

## Site layout

Five of the six respondents **'strongly supported'** or **'supported'** the proposed site layout which provides four new residential blocks surrounding a central garden space. One respondent responded neutrally.

## Sports facilities

Five of the six respondents **'strongly supported'** or **'supported'** provision of new sports facilities for the community in this location. However, one respondent **'objected'** and went on to comment:

- *"Sports Facilities are kind of a waste of space. We have sports facilities in the Aldridge Academy School. In this area focus should be on more homes, homes, homes! Local parks are many in the borough and I really don't see the need to spend on indoor sporting venues."*

Four of the six respondents indicated that they, or their family, would make use of the new indoor sports hall. Two indicated that they would not.

Respondents were asked to comment on the activities and facilities they would like to see included within the new indoor sports hall. All comments can be seen below:

- *"Emphasis on inclusion of girls in sports, particularly football."*
- *"Adult fitness sessions."*
- *"Free for people who live in the area."*
- *"None."*
- *"Playground, sport field."*



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF  
KENSINGTON  
AND CHELSEA

# Survey findings

## Height of the scheme

Four respondents either **‘strongly supported’** or **‘supported’** the proposed approach of a mix of heights across the site. However, one respondent responded neutrally and another **‘objected’**. Respondents were asked about the heights of individual blocks and whether they felt these were appropriate for the site.

### Block A – lower ground, ground and six upper floors.

Four respondents felt that the height was appropriate. However, one did not and another selected don’t know.

### Block B – lower ground, ground and seven upper floors, including a mezzanine floor

Two respondents felt that the height was appropriate. However, two did not and another two selected don’t know.

### Block C – ground and five upper floors

Five respondents felt that the height was appropriate. However, one selected don’t know.

### Block D – ground and four upper floors

Five respondents felt that the height was appropriate. However, one selected don’t know.

Four respondents went on to comment on the heights:

- *“We don’t want more tower blocks.”*
- *“These should be maximum heights.”*
- *“Blocks shouldn’t overlook the school.”*
- *“None.”*

## Residential mix

Five respondents either **‘strongly supported’** or **‘supported’** the proposed residential mix providing a blend of smaller (one and two bedroom) and larger (three bedroom) homes. One respondent responded neutrally. One respondent went on to comment:

- *“We need more bigger homes here.”*



# Survey findings

## Materials

Five respondents either **‘strongly supported’** or **‘supported’** the proposed approach of brick materials for the external elevations to fit in with the surrounding area. One respondent responded neutrally and one respondent went on to comment:

- *“But can you avoid the horrible mix of brick colours in the flats on the opposite side of Barlby Road. Traditional London brick or match the new schools.”*

## Site improvements

Five respondents either **‘strongly supported’** or **‘supported’** the proposed pedestrian route from Barlby Road to Treverton Street. One respondent responded neutrally and one respondent went on to comment:

Two respondents would like to see the central courtyard space gated to prevent anti-social behaviour or dog fouling. However, the majority (four) would not.

All six respondents either **‘strongly supported’** or **‘supported’** the improvement of the refuse facilities for the adjacent estate and Ladbroke Grove properties.

Five respondents either **‘strongly supported’** or **‘supported’** the enhancement of the community garden as part of the proposal. One respondent responded neutrally. Respondents were asked to comment on how the courtyard garden could be utilised for community and wellbeing use, all comments can be seen below:

- *“It should be welcoming to all, with seating areas both dog friendly and dog-free and a small amount of play equipment suitable for younger children. Use by a mix of generations would discourage anti-social behaviour.”*
- *“Run gardening lessons.”*
- *“Perhaps a gated relaxation space.”*
- *“Green area and playground.”*



# Survey findings

## Comments on the proposed site improvements

The following comments were received in relation to site improvements.

- *"I notice there is no mention of transport infrastructure. Barlby Road and Ladbroke Grove already have high levels of air pollution and daily traffic jams. Restrictions on side roads are making this worse. What will be done to improve public transport and reduce cars and lorries?"*
- *"I strongly oppose gates and believe them to be divisive and anti-social. The planners should look at the pedestrian access available in the Brunel and Hallfield estates as a model that appears to work very well. The Brunel is temporarily closed off during the Carnival period with security guards allowing resident access."*
- *"Just make the most of light outside to inside the buildings."*

## Other comments on the presentation or scheme

The following additional comments were made in relation to the presentation or the scheme more generally.

- *"We need new homes but not like the ugly block of flats on the corner of Ladbroke and Barlby, most of which are unoccupied or on temporary lets, adding no community value."*
- *"With regard to refuse collection, the provision of bins for dog waste should be considered with frequent emptying."*
- *"Well presented and clear outline of planned works."*
- *"Thanks for consulting us."*

## Finding out about the consultation

Four respondents found out about the consultation via a **'leaflet/flyer'**, two via **'social media'**, and one via the **'Council website'**.

## Presentation

All six respondents felt that the presentation had informed them how they could provide their thoughts an input as part of the process.



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF  
KENSINGTON  
AND CHELSEA

# **Section 2:**

## **Virtual and in person meetings**





# Meetings

In addition to the feedback survey, the Council organised information sessions in order for residents and other interested stakeholders to ask questions and provide their feedback on the proposals. A total of 16 stakeholders attended the in person event on Saturday 19 June at the foot of Treverton Tower and five attended the online event on Monday 21 June held via Zoom. The below table summarises feedback from the sessions.

## In person event 19 June 2021 – 16 attendees

- There **was general support for the development**, feeling it would help to provide new homes and ease overcrowding. Attendees felt this was a positive thing for the community and that the Council had listened to feedback.
- There were a **number of positive comments about the design of the development and buildings**. There was support for the height, compared to what it is in the area currently. The matching of the brickwork was welcomed. There was support for the retention of the trees and tidying up of the bin stores. It was felt that walkways will encourage people into the estate.
- Attendees **felt security was important**, and cameras to prevent anti-social behaviour was supported. Gated access is important, but attendees did not want it locked at set times, preferring a fob system and/or access granted from inside.
- **Parking was a concern for some**. Attendees supported permit free parking and would like a 'drop off/pick up' point.
- The **addition of a sports facility was welcomed**, particularly for young people. Attendees wanted to see it balance the needs of young people, teens and adults. One attendee was keen to ensure that residents feel comfortable in using the space and not alienated by the public. The basketball court was also seen as an important part of the development.
- The **communal garden idea is appreciated** and the chance to feedback on and decide what the horticulture will be in the space was welcomed
- There were **some concerns expressed** about overcrowding and "encroachment". There were also some concerns about ongoing management, when the Council has moved on.



# Meetings

## Online event 21 June 2021 – five attendees

- Attendees thanked the Council for the presentation and one commented that the plans look exciting and indicated they were delighted to see investment in North Kensington.
- Another praised the design aspects of the slides shown at the session.
- There was excitement about the new school building too.
- Attendees were glad that none of the homes are to be sold off.
- Attendees were glad to see that several units were family sized and for social rent.
- A question was raised about the housing waiting list of 2,300, whether this was households or individuals.
- Attendees asked whether the market rent would be available to those on the housing waiting list.
- Attendees were keen to understand more about the extended and improved dental practice provision and the area this would occupy.
- The dedicated refuse service was welcomed.

