

**Notting Hill Gate Draft SPD – consultation comments
[Site 5 - Ivy Lodge to United House]**

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Site 5. 1: Ivy Lodge to United House	Yashmin and Alex Jeffries		Site 5: Ivy Lodge to United House I am vehemently opposed to any proposal to increase the height of Campden Hill Towers or United House. These buildings are real eyesores and in an ideal world, they would be demolished and replaced by new buildings sympathetic to the environment. Their existing height is part of the reason they are such eyesores.	Opposition to increasing the height of Campden Hill Towers noted. Ownership constraints mean a redevelopment option at this site is unlikely to come forward. Without additional floorspace it is unlikely that refurbishment options would be viable.	No change
Site 5. 2: Ivy Lodge to United House	laure ghouila-Houri		agree	Noted.	No change
Site 5. 3: Ivy Lodge to United House	Irving		Ivy Lodge is already 6 stories high. Any additional stories are unacceptable as they would result in a building out of scale with the period buildings on the other side of NHG. Note that the buildings on the other side of Pembridge Road are only 4 stories high so it is unacceptable for additional stories to be added to United House which is already 4 stories and significantly higher than the period buildings opposite. Any	The Council's townscape analysis suggests that one additional storey on top of Ivy Lodge would be acceptable if this results in significant improvements to the external appearance of the building. Concern over additional storeys on the west side of Pembridge Road noted. However, the Council's townscape analysis suggests this would not be out of scale	No change

			extra height on United House would result in a building out of scale with surrounding buildings and a loss of sky/light in the views along NHG and Pembridge Road.	for the location.	
Site 5. 4: Ivy Lodge to United House	G. Keating		This block is already very high by the standards of the overall surrounding streets and so I strongly disagree with the proposal to add further height.	Concern over additional storeys noted. However, the Council's townscape analysis suggests this would not be out of scale for the location.	No change
Site 5. 5: Ivy Lodge to United House	Dickson		6.29 The overhang provides great shelter against the weather, please don't remove.	Support for the overhang as it provides shelter against the weather noted.	
Site 5. 6: Ivy Lodge to United House	Estelle Beverley Hilton		Improve the overhang with better lighting, rather than removing. It rains often!	Support for the overhang as it provides shelter against the weather noted	No change
Site 5. 7: Ivy Lodge to United House	Bulmer Mews Management Limited (J Gardner)	Bulmer Mews Management Limited	<p>The proposal to permit additional height on Camden Hill Towers - is completely unacceptable. The area already suffers terribly from the wind the building creates and the long shadows it casts over the area.</p> <p>To add to this height will only make this worse. I believe this provision should be deleted entirely. I live in a small mews at the rear of Camden Hill Towers and we suffer an endless collection of waste being blown into our small gardens due to the wind effect this tower has.</p> <p>There have been times when the wind is so extreme we can't go out into the garden or have</p>	Any proposal for additional height would be supported with wind, sunlight and daylight testing to ensure the situation was not worsened.	No change

			<p>our windows open because of the wind tunnel effect around CHT. The thought of additional wind and less light - we already have massive shadows over our garden for large chunks of the day - makes this proposal a nightmare for us.</p> <p>There is no "significant improvement to the external appearance of the building" that would be worth any increase in the wind, the rubbish and the loss of light caused by more height on the building. We also feel that the proposal to add extra storeys to all the buildings along this aspect of Notting Hill Gate is ill-thought out.</p> <p>Each of these sites has air conditioning and other mechanical units which sit on top of them, so by adding an extra storey you are in effect raising them much higher than you intend as the kit will merely go on top. The impact of these the day and sunlight of the houses in Bulmer Mews will be severe.</p> <p>I strongly urge that no additional height is permitted to this row of shops/units given the impact on residents.</p> <p>In addition, no mention is made of the servicing of any larger</p>	<p>Paragraphs 4.4 of the revised SPD sets out the Council's policies and requirements for</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<p>shops. We noticed a significant increase in lorry trips and size of lorries servicing Tesco, when it took over the Nisa site. It is key to any future plans for the area that the hours for servicing them are limited to the existing service road hours of 7.30-8.30pm during weeknights, 7.30am-6pm on Saturdays and 10am-12pm on Sunday if at the rear or they are serviced from the front if outside these hours.</p> <p>There seems to be no justification for increasing United House by 2 storeys and this will merely add to a canyoning effect on Pembridge Road and yet more wind issues. By my assessment United House is only 4 storeys at the moment. It is essential that all current heights are included v proposed heights.</p>	<p>off-street servicing and managing servicing.</p> <p>Council's townscape analysis suggests that additional storeys on top of United House would be acceptable if this results in significant improvements to the external appearance of the building. As above any proposal would be supported with wind, sunlight and daylight testing if it were necessary.</p>	
Site 5. 8: Ivy Lodge to United House	Shala Kaussari-Dick		I strongly oppose any proposal to increase the height of Campden Hill Towers or United House. These buildings are real eyesores (because of their height) and in an ideal world, they would be demolished and replaced by new buildings sympathetic to the environment.	The buildings are unlikely to be redeveloped but the Council's townscape analysis suggests that the additional storeys identified would be acceptable if this results in significant improvements to the external appearance of the building.	No change
Site 5. 10: Ivy Lodge to United House	Everett		I support the comments already made on behalf of Bulmer Mews Management Limited, repeated below. The wind tunnel effect is already so strong as to blow	Any proposal for additional height would be supported with wind, sunlight and daylight testing to ensure the situation was not worsened.	No change

			<p>over metal tables in outside areas, and an increase in the height of the wind barrier can only be detrimental to our enjoyment of our outdoor space and the enjoyment of our neighbours of theirs: The proposal to permit additional height on Camden Hill Towers - is completely unacceptable. The area already suffers terribly from the wind the building creates and the long shadows it casts over the area. To add to this height will only make this worse. I believe this provision should be deleted entirely. I live in a small mews at the rear of Camden Hill Towers and we suffer an endless collection of waste being blown into our small gardens due to the wind effect this tower has. There have been times when the wind is so extreme we can't go out into the garden or have our windows open because of the wind tunnel effect around CHT. The thought of additional wind and less light - we already have massive shadows over our garden for large chunks of the day - makes this proposal a nightmare for us. There is no "significant improvement to the external appearance of the building" that would be worth any increase in the wind, the rubbish and the loss of light caused by more height on the building. We also</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>feel that the proposal to add extra storeys to all the buildings along this aspect of Notting Hill Gate is ill thought out. Each of these sites has air conditioning and other mechanical units which sit on top of them, so by adding an extra storey you are in effect raising them much higher than you intend as the kit will merely go on top. The impact of these the day and sunlight of the houses in Bulmer Mews will be severe. I strongly urge that no additional height is permitted to this row of shops/units given the impact on residents. In addition, no mention is made of the servicing of any larger shops. We noticed a significant increase in lorry trips and size of lorries servicing Tesco, when it took over the Nisa site. It is key to any future plans for the area that the hours for servicing them are limited to the existing service road hours of 7.30-8.30pm during weeknights, 7.30am-6pm on Saturdays and 10am-12pm on Sunday if at the rear or they are serviced from the front if outside these hours. There seems to be no justification for increasing United House by 2 storeys and this will merely add to a canyoning effect on Pembridge Road and yet more wind issues. By my assessment United House is only 4 storeys at the</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.4 of the revised SPD sets out the Council's policies and requirements for off-street servicing and managing servicing.</p> <p>Since unlikely that these</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

			moment. It is essential that all current heights are considered accurately.	buildings will be redeveloped it is clearer to show the additional storeys that are considered appropriate.	
Site 5. 11: Ivy Lodge to United House	Fiona lindblom		I do not support an increase in height for these buildings. They are already out of scale with the urban environment and the height of these buildings along with Newcombe House is a major contributory factor in the unattractive aspect that Notting Hill Gate suffers from.	The Council's townscape analysis suggests that the additional storeys identified would be acceptable if this results in significant improvements to the external appearance of the building.	No change
Site 5. 13: Ivy Lodge to United House	N. Lindsay-Fynn		Site 5: Ivy Lodge to United House We strongly oppose any proposal to increase the height of Campden Hill Towers or United House. These buildings are real eyesores and the best solution would be to demolish and replace with attractive new buildings sympathetic to the environment. Their existing height is part of the reason they are such eyesores.	It is unlikely that these buildings can be redeveloped. The Council's townscape analysis suggests that the additional storeys identified would be acceptable if this results in significant improvements to the external appearance of the building.	No change
Site 5. 14 Ivy Lodge to United House	Roger Hudson		6.29 Campden Hill Towers. I'd be doubtful about letting it go any higher in return for "improvements to the external appearance". It is an unimprovable lump.	The Council's townscape analysis suggests that the additional storeys identified would be acceptable if this results in significant improvements to the external appearance of the building.	No change
Site 5. 15: Ivy Lodge to United House	Gerald Eve LLP (Samuel Palmer)	Gerald Eve LLP	Site 5: Ivy Lodge to United House Paragraph 6.29 states that the Council will permit an additional storey for office use either side of Camden Hill	The additional storeys have been identified. The use of new floorspace will be subject to assessment in individual planning applications against	No change

			Towers. We request confirmation as to why this has been restricted to office use only.	Core Strategy Policies.	
Site 5. 16: Ivy Lodge to United House	David Marshall		You will see from the attached brochure the work I did in conjunction with Sauerbruch Hutton Architects and Land Securities in the late 1990s and early 2000. a - 'Sauerbruch Hutton Architects sketch proposals - LEB site. September 1998'. b - 'Newcombe place - a preliminary proposal. Sauerbruch Hutton Architects October 1997'. I believe you should return to these documents and look strongly, with the Pears group, to what can really be done on the North side of Notting Hill Gate. For example, it would be perfectly possible to develop the service road and at least two levels underground, including the old boiler house. It should be possible to provide for the expansion of commercial space that can be linked to ground floor frontages and to allow for potentially two more shops with an overall square footage approaching 20,000s.f., which can be linked with the ground floor shops and make much better use of the first floor dead shop areas above many of those shops on the North side.	The points made are noted but detailed design proposals would be brought forward by the landowners not the Council	No change
Site 5. 17: Ivy	David Marshall		The EDF building is in two parts	The Council has no power to	No change

Lodge to United House			as you know. The premises which I refurbished for Land Securities and currently occupied by the Language College. I believe a really masterful person could find ways and means, together, with your Council to make EDF cooperate in the redevelopment of their site. We know from earlier research that it is possible for them to move and it is even possible for them to go way underground at the back of Newcombe House. We also know from a local man, expert in these matters, on the Ladbroke Committee, who dealt in a prime way with the Leicester Square redevelopment of placing an EDF transformer underground and also with the arrangements for the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital in Fulham Road. Considerably less space is required to even upgrade the transformer to present day use, indeed something like 10% of the space is what is now needed for a transformer.	make any landowner bring forward a site for development. However market forces may make this an attractive proposition if the changes you describe are feasible and viable.	
Site 5. 18: Ivy Lodge to United House	Kennedy		I strongly object to the possible addition of extra storeys to Camden Hill Towers, a building which is already an eyesore and which seriously impacts on the conservation area to the rear.	The Council's townscape analysis suggests that the additional storeys identified would be acceptable if this results in significant improvements to the external appearance of the building.	No change
Site 5. 19: Ivy	C Pinder		I am vehemently opposed to any	These buildings are unlikely to	No change

Lodge to United House			proposal to increase the height of Campden Hill Towers or United House. These buildings are real eyesores and in an ideal world, they would be demolished and replaced by new buildings sympathetic to the environment. Their existing height is part of the reason they are such eyesores.	be redeveloped. The Council's townscape analysis suggests that the additional storeys identified would be acceptable if this results in significant improvements to the external appearance of the building.	
Site 5. 20: Ivy Lodge to United House	M Bayley		<p>As a Board member of the Gate Theatre, I agree fully with the comments in the draft SPD on the bohemian heritage of Notting Hill Gate in para 2.6. I believe this heritage should be preserved, celebrated and encouraged since it is what makes Notting Hill Gate a unique part of London. The Gate Theatre is at the heart of this heritage in view of the diversity of its programming, ranging across classic and contemporary drama from many different dramatic traditions and cultures.</p> <p>As the document says in para 5.16, the cultural activities in the area are a source of real strength and the Gate Theatre has been a mainstay of these activities for the past 35 years since it was founded in 1979.</p>	Support for the Gate Theatre and building upon the bohemian heritage of Notting Hill Gate noted.	No change
Site 5. 21: Ivy Lodge to United House	M Bayley		I also agree with the Council's policy stated in para 3.43 to support enhancement of the	Support enhancement of the cultural offer of Notting Hill Gate and using developer	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the

			<p>cultural offer in Notting Hill Gate and the proposal that a new arts venue should be provided to anchor Notting Hill Gate as a cultural hub, conserving the area's cultural heritage. I note that the proposal is that this should be provided as part of the redevelopment of Newcombe House through a section 106 agreement and that the venue should forge links with other arts venues in the vicinity and provide a 'shop window and marketing presence' (para 5.18). These are all excellent proposals.</p>	<p>contributions to provide an arts venue as part of the redevelopment of Newcombe House noted but this has not been the general response and so the idea will not be progressed.</p>	<p>SPD.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	-------------