

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON
& CHELSEA'S CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**AGENDA FOR THE SECOND DAY HEARINGS
(Revised version)
10am Wednesday 21 July 2010****Matters and Issues for Discussion**Matter 3 – Policies for Places: General

- 1 *Chapter 4 advises that place shaping requires that different plans and programmes from across the Council and its partners are integrated. Do the policies for places give a clear framework on which to base future actions?*
- 2 *Each chapter in the 'Places' section considers the area against the strategic objectives but offers a single policy which is not separately monitored (North Kensington, CP3, being the exception). Rather each Place has a monitoring section, and policies involved in delivering the Vision are highlighted in footnotes. Is the Plan sufficiently clear on how the policy for each Place will realise the Vision?*
- 3 *Infrastructure that would help to deliver the Vision is identified for each Place within the Place Chapter and output indicators are provided in the monitoring section. Is the relationship between infrastructure needs, output indicators and monitoring actions necessary, clearly explained?*
- 4 *Some Places also have a Strategic Site Allocation. Is the relationship between the Vision for the Place and the Strategic Site Allocation always clearly articulated?*
- 5 *The vision for Earl's Court includes returning the one-way system to two-way working, but the Chapter advises that no funding is at present allocated. Should the Vision allow flexibility for an alternative scenario?*
- 6 *The Thames Policy Area is a strategic policy area in the London Plan and is subject to development pressures and policy constraints. Should there be a separate 'Place' for the Thames area?*

Matter 3 – Policies for Places: Specific7 *Earl's Court:*

Has consideration been given to the sustainability of the local residential community?

Should there be a reference to the importance of the Warwick Road Corridor?

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON
& CHELSEA'S CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT
Latimer and North Kensington Sports Centre:

Does the Vision ignore affordable housing and associated infrastructure?

Is the proposal for a new shopping centre at Latimer Road Station unsound?

Should there be reference to improved transport and community safety?

8 Any other relevant issues.

Matter 4 – Keeping Life Local

- 1 *The emphasis in Chapter 30 appears to be on protecting and enhancing the present social and community facilities with the key role of the planning system identified as protecting uses that have lower land values, but high values to the community. Should more account be taken of the need for social and community infrastructure to meet the needs of increased population?*
- 2 *Policy CK1 protects social and community land and buildings for re-use for the same, similar or related uses. Should the Policy provide flexibility for the relocation of uses through 'use swaps'?*
- 3 *Policy CK1(c) applies a sequential approach to the protection of land or buildings currently or last used for a social or community use. It is proposed as a pragmatic approach to allowing necessary changes whilst maintaining the overall stock of such uses. Is the sequential approach too restrictive, hindering redevelopment proposals?*
- 4 *The Council is concerned with retaining local shopping facilities and enabling better access to them and Policy CK2 seeks to ensure that opportunities exist for convenience shopping throughout the Borough. At the same time Policy CF1 seeks to control the location of new shop uses on a 'town centre first' basis. Is this a source of potential policy conflict and is Policy CK2 strong enough to provide adequate protection for local facilities?*
- 5 *Having local neighbourhood facilities within a short walking distance is seen as an essential characteristic of local life and it is suggested that existing facilities need protecting. Policy CK3 indicates that policies CK1 and C1 provide the policy mechanisms for delivery. Should CK3 be more explicit in the actions required to give support to walkable neighbourhoods?*
- 6 Any other relevant matters.