

## Summary of Representations

### Norland Neighbourhood Plan Examination

---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Summary of Representation</b>
<b>Natural England</b>	The letter refers to guidance on dealing with the natural environment in neighbourhood plans, but does not make any specific comment on the Neighbourhood Plan.
<b>Transport for London</b>	<p>The letter refers to section 3.4 of the plan – street assessments for Royal Crescent and St Ann’s Villas. The plan refers to adverse impacts around increase of traffic flow, which affects the safety and amenity of the plan area, including from buses, though this is not supported with evidence.</p> <p>The letter goes on to say that TfL reviews have demonstrated that there is sufficient demand within the plan area to warrant the level and frequency of bus services.</p> <p>Comments are included on working with the council to promote alternative modes of transport to the car, reducing congestion and improving safety in Norland. TfL states that it is keen to ensure that the neighbourhood planning process is compliant with the London Plan. It would like to ensure that transport operations infrastructure and enhanced where possible. TfL has no plans to change bus services in the area and points out that any changes to the highway network would need to be tested fully in traffic terms.</p>
<b>Jon Bunker &amp; Ann Mollo</b>	The letter comments on the zoning of Darnley Terrace as an area where no changes at roof level are to be considered. It points out that 33% of houses already have changes at roof level and that the Norland Conservation Society and Kensington Society take a different view on the desirability of such changes.
<b>Georgiana Lebus</b>	The letter supports the Neighbourhood Plan and points out that the area has experienced overdevelopment and loss of local amenities. The plan will contribute towards preserving the environment and valued amenities that contribute to the special character of the conservation area and also provide for sustainable and appropriate development.
<b>David Lindsay, Ward Councillor for Norland</b>	This supports the Neighbourhood Plan and praises the Norland Conservation Society.
<b>Mort Mirghavameddin</b>	The letter questions the categorisation of Darnley Terrace as a street where “no change at the roof level should be allowed”. This is considered to be unnecessarily punitive and it should be re-categorised as “additional storey may be acceptable” or “on its merits”. The letter points out that previous letters from the Norland Conservation Society and Kensington Society supported the erection of a mansard storey to properties in Darnley Terrace.
<b>Richard Towner &amp; Mary Sheehan</b>	The letter questions the categorisation of Darnley Terrace as a street where “no change at the roof level should be allowed”. This is considered to be unnecessarily punitive and it should be re-categorised as “additional storey may be acceptable” or “on its merits”. The letter points out that previous letters from the Norland Conservation Society and Kensington Society supported the erection of a mansard storey to properties in Darnley Terrace.