

# LDF

*Building on Success*

## **The Proposed Submission Core Strategy Consultation Report**

**October 2009**

**Development Plan Document  
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**



**THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF  
KENSINGTON  
AND CHELSEA**

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 The purpose of this document is to set out how the Council's Proposed Submission has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 25 on public participation of a development plan document and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
- 1.2 This document therefore sets out the following in line with Regulation 30(d):
  - which bodies and persons were invited to make representations under Regulation 25;
  - how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations;
  - a summary of the main issues raised by the representations; and
  - a summary of how the representations have been taken into account.

## **2.0 Who was consulted?**

- 2.1 The Council's Statement of Community Involvement sets out who the Council should consult when preparing Local Development Framework and in particular, Development Plan Documents, in accordance with Regulations and Government Guidance.
- 2.2 In addition, the Council maintains an LDF database, which contains over 700 stakeholders and local groups and is regularly updated. Anyone with an interest in the LDF can request to be included on the LDF database and are therefore contacted on a regular basis with LDF newsletters and are informed of any consultation relating to the LDF.
- 2.3 The LDF database list is included as Appendix A. This includes the statutory consultees.

## **3.0 Consultation Methods**

- 3.1 Throughout the Core Strategy Process 2005-2009 a variety of different consultation methods were used to ensure a wide range of stakeholders and local groups were involved. The

table below outlines the different methods and response numbers at each stage of the Core Strategy.

<b>Consultation Document</b>	<b>Date of Consultation</b>	<b>Consultation Methods used</b>	<b>Total Number of Responses</b>
Issues and Options Consultation	March 2005	Newsletter Workshops Public Consultation	244 responses to public consultation
Interim Issues and Options Core Strategy and North Kensington Area Action Plan (NKAAP)	February-April 2008	Newsletter Workshops On-line consultation Kensington and Social Council partnership event Residents' Panel Survey Public consultation	53 individuals or organisations responded to the Core Strategy consultation, and 42 to the NKAAP
Towards Preferred Options Core Strategy and North Kensington Plan	July-October 2008	Newletter Workshops Youth consultation On-line consultation Public consultation	123 attended workshops  95 representations received.
Places and Strategic Sites Consultation	May- June 2009	Newsletter workshops On-line consultation Public consultation	Places: 550 comments from over 80 respondents  Strategic sites: 125 comments from over 50 respondents  A total of 252 people attended 14 'Places' workshops
The Draft Core Strategy with a particular focus on North Kensington July- September 2009	July- September 2009	Newsletter On-line consultation Public consultation	A total of 942 comments were received from 85 respondents

- 3.2 The subsequent sections elaborate how each stage of consultation was carried out; the summary nature of the responses received; and a summary of how these responses were taken into account by the Council.

## **4.0 Issues and Options Core Strategy (March 2005)**

### ***Consultation Methods***

#### **Newsletter**

- 4.1 Preparations for the consultation exercise began in March 2005 with the publication of the first of two widely circulated LDF newsletters seeking views from stakeholders and local groups as to how the consultation should be conducted. The newsletter was over 600 groups, organisations, societies and individuals.
- 4.2 As a result of the feedback generated by the newsletters, an Issues and Options report was assembled and published. This report laid out and illustrated the substantive issues and optional responses across a range of themes.

#### **Workshops**

- 4.3 An informatory launch event in the Town Hall was held on November 14th, 2005, to which local stakeholders were invited. This was followed by a series of thematic workshops, which generally followed the themes that resulted from the newsletter feedback. The workshops were designed to inform and involve the public. The workshops focused on the following themes:
1. Town Centres and Shopping
  2. Housing
  3. Offices and Industry
  4. Conservation and Design
  5. Transportation
  6. Leisure and Recreation
- 4.4 Three outreach workshops were also held to ensure the inclusion of young people, people with disabilities and BME and Faith Groups in the consultation process. All workshops took place at a range of venues across the borough to ensure that everybody was given the opportunity to participate.

## **Formal Consultation**

- 4.5 The Issues and Option Core Strategy formulated from the initial newsletter feedback was formally consulted on for six weeks from on 14 November - 23 December 2005. A response form was provided in both hard copy and electronically through the Council's dedicated LDF website.

### **Summary of the main consultation issues raised and council response**

- 4.6 A total of 244 responses received. The main issues which were raised, and the Council's response, are summarised below.
- 4.7 **Portobello Road:** The main concern was to maintain the special character and status of the Portobello Road and was perceived to be an undervalued asset and its international dimension was pointed out. The 'function of town centres' was included as an issue in the following iteration of the Core Strategy which reflected the special character of both Portobello Road and Westbourne Grove.
- 4.8 **North/South divide:** Many considered the north/south divide in the borough to be a matter of great concern meriting special attention. The Council considered there was a need for a North Kensington Area Action Plan in light of the comments received. There was also recognition to investigate the public transport accessibility differences within the Borough and how to overcome these.
- 4.9 **Housing:** Responses showed that housing remains a sensitive issue in the borough, especially in consideration of its high housing density. There was a strong request for more affordable housing and in particular family housing within the Borough. The Council considered that achieving mixed and balanced community and providing a diversity of housing is the essential policy direction. A wide variety of housing issues were taken forward to the next of the Core Strategy and changes made to take the comments received into consideration.
- 4.10 **Conservation:** There was general favour for conservation over development. The conflict between conservation and development was pointed out on a number of occasions, referring also to the issue of density. There were concerns that land, which is outside the controls relating to conservation areas, may suffer intense development pressure. The policies taken forward in the following stage of Core Strategy focused on the principles of conservation and

good design and highlighted the great importance respondents placed on conservation within the Borough

- 4.11 **Offices:** There were suggestions that there is a low demand for large-scale office development whereas the protection and the encouragement of small business units were considered to be important. At the same time, mixed use development, creating a balance between housing and employment uses, was considered to be essential in order to maintain the quality of life within the Borough. The Council considered that the protection of all light industrial use across the borough was important given the comments received and this was followed through into the next stage of the Core Strategy.
- 4.12 **Bus routes:** Many respondents highlighted their wish to improve the north-south bus routes. There was also a demand to limit on-street parking through permit restrictions and zoning. The issue of permit free parking was taken forward by the Council for further investigation. Directing development to areas where accessibility is better was also taken into consideration.

## **5.0 Interim Issues and Options Core Strategy and North Kensington Area Action Plan (NKAAP) February-April 2008**

- 5.1 As NKAAP has not previously been consulted on, it was felt necessary to prepare an interim Core Strategy document and consult on it alongside the NKAAP to ensure that the Council was still on the right track due to the time lapse from the last consultation in 2005.

### ***Consultation Methods***

#### **Newsletters and Consultation Letters to the LDF Database members**

- 5.2 705 Newsletters were posted and 589 letters were sent to consultees

#### **Workshops**

- 5.3 Eight LDF workshops were held between 19 February 2008 and 3 April 2008 at a number of locations throughout the borough. The purpose of the workshops was to provide

residents and stakeholders the opportunity to have their say in an informal atmosphere.

<b>Workshop Date</b>	<b>Workshop Location</b>	<b>No. attendees</b>
19 February 08	Philbeach Hall, SW5	9
21 February 08	David Game House, W11	20
26 February 08	Kensal Community Centre, W10	15
3 March 08	Kensington Town Hall, W8	22
4 March 08	Lighthouse West London, W11	46
6 March 08	St Columba's Church, SW1	9
17 March 08	Chelsea Old Town Hall, SW3	31
3 April 08	St Clements and St James Community Centre, W11	43
	<b>TOTAL PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>195</b>

### **On-line consultation system**

- 5.4 For this LDF consultation, the Council also introduced a new online system of consultation. This software allows residents and stakeholders to log on, view the document and make comment on specific sections of the document. The software also allows for the publication of surveys and questionnaires to gauge participants views on LDF documents.

### **My K and C My Say Consultation Event – 10 March 2008**

- 5.5 This consultation event was organised by the Kensington and Social Council in partnership with the Kensington and Chelsea Partnership. The objective of the event was primarily to engage the community and capture their opinions, thoughts and ideas, so that they could be reflected in the Community Strategy.

- 5.6 The LDF team had a stand at the event, providing another avenue to engage with the community. The attendance of policy staff provided an opportunity for attendees to ask questions and received information about the LDF and the consultation, received copies of the consultation documents and register for the remaining workshops.

### **Residents' Panel Survey – February 2008**

- 5.7 A questionnaire was put to all members of the Residents' Panel. At this time there were a total of 1,063 Panel members. A total of 511 completed questionnaires were received.
- 5.8 The questionnaire was designed to include questions on the Community Strategy with questions relating to:
- Environment and Transport
  - Homes and Housing
  - Arts, Culture, Leisure and Learning
  - Health Care
  - Work and Business
  - Equalities
  - Planning and Borough Development
- 5.9 Although the Residents' Panel survey was design specifically with the Community Strategy in mind, the overlap between this document and the LDF documents means that the data provides usual information. This section of the LDF Consultation report provides only a summary of relevant information coming from the survey analysis.

### **Formal Consultation**

- 5.10 The Interim Issues and Option Core Strategy document put out for publication consultation. The consultation period ran from 11 February to 7 April 2008.

### **Summary of the main consultation issues raised and council response**

- 5.11 53 individuals or organisations responded to the Core Strategy consultation, and 42 to the NKAAP.
- 5.12 **Transport:** Public transport connectivity and accessibility within the borough, in particular the lack of north/south public transport connections was the most frequent issue raised during this stage of consultation. The Council considered the need for a greater emphasis on Transport within the next iteration of the Core Strategy and therefore a dedicated

chapter was incorporated into the Core Strategy dealing with transport issues.

- 5.13 **Local Facilities and Services:** Respondents felt that there was a need for more sporting, leisure and recreational facilities. A range of GPs surgeries across the borough was seen, by most, as an essential element of the 'Keeping Life Local' Chapter. There was a considered need for section 106 funds to be spent towards facilities and services, provision and quality of libraries and creating walkable neighbourhoods. Whilst the upgrading of facilities was considered important, maintaining the borough's already excellent provision was considered the most appropriate policy direction.
- 5.14 **Retail:** The concern raised by a large number of participants related to maintaining a retail mix also encouraging ethnic diversity. There was not a consensus on whether residential amenity should be protected at all cost, both GOL and the GLA considered that mixed use development should be designed in such a way as to ensure that the development does not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity. Whilst the protection of residential amenity remains important the protection of residential amenity "at all costs" it was not considered to be a viable option, and therefore the Council supported a policy which provides for a range of uses across the borough.
- 5.15 **Portobello Road:** The protection of Portobello Road's identity, character and atmosphere was a highly priority amongst the participants of the workshops. The Council considered that special initiatives were needed, in light of comments raised, to support the special character of Portobello Road and to maintain the identity of the Borough's centres and to protect valued uses. The 'Fostering Vitality' chapter was amended in light of comments to reflect this
- 5.16 **Open Space:** The responses were mixed. Some felt we should be seeking new public open space in developments within the borough, and others recognised the tight constraints of the borough and agreed on taking a more flexible approach. There was suggestion that reordering the streets may offer new kinds of attractive public spaces. The 'Public Realm' issue was strengthened in light of the comments received. The Council recognised the need for more emphasis to be placed on protecting and enhancing biodiversity, ecological and landscape within the Borough.

## **6.0 Towards Preferred Options Core Strategy and North Kensington Plan July-October 2008**

- 6.1 The consultation period ran for 11 weeks from 29<sup>th</sup> July-10<sup>th</sup> October 2008. The consultation period was held over the summer, which was why the standard 6 weeks consultation period was extended to 11 weeks. This also allowed the LDF consultation to align with the Community Strategy consultation closing date.

### ***Consultation Methods***

- 6.2 The following measures were carried out to ensure that the consultation period was widely publicised:
- Article published in August edition of the 'The Royal Borough' magazine
  - Published on the Council's website and consultation portal
  - Posters were displayed at all libraries, council offices and various community facilities.
  - Letters sent to over 700 people on the LDF database
  - Monthly newsletters sent to over 700 people on the LDF database
  - Borough-wide workshop – 11<sup>th</sup> September 2008, held at the Town Hall 7.00pm-9.00pm
- 6.3 The following workshops were held in relation to specific spatial areas outlined in the Core Strategy and North Kensington Plan:
- Notting Hill Gate Advisory Group Meeting – 9<sup>th</sup> September 2008, held at the Town Hall 5.30pm-8.30pm.
  - Kensal Project – 10<sup>th</sup> September 2008, held at the Lighthouse 7.00pm-9.00pm.
  - Earl's Court Workshop – 15<sup>th</sup> September 2008, held at Philbeach Hall 7.00pm-9.00pm

- Notting Barns West Workshop – 17<sup>th</sup> September 2008, held at the Lighthouse 7.00pm-9.00pm
- Portobello/Golborne Drop-in Session – 8<sup>th</sup> October 2008, held at the Portobello Market Offices 12.00pm-4.00pm.

- 6.4 Posters were displayed advertising the Towards Preferred Options document and the consultation events. The posters were displayed at all libraries, council offices and various community facilities.
- 6.5 On request, members of the Policy team also attended meetings with a number of local organisations. These included the Golborne Forum, Portobello Court and Longlands Court Residents Association.

### **Youth Consultation**

- 6.6 Active youth consultation was a key aim for this consultation to take advantage of the consultation period being held over the summer school holidays.
- 6.7 A voluntary team of three school students and one university student devised a unique consultation activity, asking what facilities and services youth considered important to have close to their home, throughout the different stages of their life. The students visited 11 locations throughout the Borough, such as youth and leisure centres over a two week period in August.
- 6.8 A total of 61 responses were collected during this consultation exercise.

### **Online Consultation**

- 6.9 All aspects of the Towards Preferred Options consultation were available on the Council's website ([www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning](http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning)) and the consultation portal (<http://ldf-consult.rbkc.gov.uk/portal>)
- 6.10 A letter was sent to all people registered on the Council's LDF database to inform them of the new online consultation system and encourage them to register and comment online.

### **Summary of the main consultation issues raised and council response**

- 6.11 There were a total of 123 people who attended the workshops and drop-in session. A total of 95 representations

were received from the public consultation by 10th October 2008.

- 6.12 Whilst comments were made on most of the proposed policies, the principal issues raised were:
- 6.13 ***The structure of the document.*** Whilst GOL were generally supportive of the document which they considered provides a good spatial portrait of the borough and which gives it a locally distinctive dimension, they considered that final core strategy needs to contain more detail, firming up the Council's ambitions and setting out the nature of the development that the Council wishes to see spatial area by spatial area. The Council added more detail with regard the quantum of development expected in different parts of the Borough and across the Borough as a whole.
- 6.14 ***Spatial vision and objectives for the Borough*** There is overwhelming support for the vision of "Improving and Excellent Borough". Our residents, land owners and businesses owners recognise the strengths of the Royal Borough but do not wish to merely maintain the status quo. There is almost universal support for the regeneration of parts of the north of the borough, the protection of existing, and encouragement of new business and social and community uses. The Council, therefore, took the general direction of the vision into the next stage of the document.
- 6.15 ***The spatial areas:*** There was widespread support from those who commented for the Council taking a more proactive approach to the planning of the borough's newly identified spatial areas. In particular, support was noted for developing a vision for Kensington High Street, to compete with Westfield London; for an integrated approach to support the cultural draw of the South Kensington Area; maintaining Knightsbridge as an International Town Centre, but also as a centre serving local residents; building upon the King's Road's as a 'vital' town centre which still retains some of its iconic character; and promoting Earl's Court as a major opportunity to create a high quality mixed use development.
- 6.16 There was also general concern that the ambitions for each of the areas should not be at the expense of the amenity of nearby residents, and that the existing character of the areas should not be diluted.
- 6.17 Therefore, the Council has taken the general direction of each of the vision into the next stage of the document, with particular mention of the need to recognise the importance of maintaining residential amenity being added. These visions

note the importance of building upon the existing character of each of the areas.

- 6.18 **Waste Sites:** The ability Council to meet the meet waste apportionment set out within the Mayor of London's Waste Apportionment Study was questioned. Following discussions with the GLA the Council has agreed to prepare a waste DPD at later date.
- 6.19 **Keeping Life Local Chapter:** There was widespread support for the Council's ambition to maintain a mix of social and community and local shopping uses within the borough, and to provide for the communities needs locally. Council's support for the ambitions of the Police and for the PCT was noted and agreed, with particular value was placed, by some, upon medical uses and upon the provision of local shops. This is articulated by the principal of the walkable neighbourhood – a concept which received support. Support for the provision of social and community buses when beyond that of the PCT, and in the case of education, Council provided schools.
- 6.20 The Council therefore took the general direction of the proposed policy into the next stage of the document, supporting the provision of new services, and shops as well as the protection of the existing, particularly where this supports the 5 and 10 minute walking distance of the walkable neighbourhood. It also recognises the value a wide range of social and community uses.
- 6.21 The GLA was concerned about the current wording of the policy in relation to relaxing the affordable housing requirement. It suggests that the onus should be placed on the developer to prove why the maximum affordable housing is not viable if social infrastructure is to be provided. The Council therefore, increased the housing target to ensure that the provision of new social and community uses it not at the expense of the housing in the Borough.
- 6.22 **Fostering Vitality:** The consultation showed widespread support for a core strategy which encourages the maintenance, or the creation of, a diverse borough which contains a mix of residential, commercial and local need uses. The Council, therefore, took the general direction of the proposed policy into the next stage of the document.
- 6.23 Many respondents stated that the LDF should continue to protect and focus employment in existing employment zones and not impose a blanket protection on all other existing employment in the borough. Some respondents also raised

concern over the 'Affordable business space' policy direction and that could prove to be counter productive if the cumulative impacts of planning requirements and Section 106 obligations stifle innovation and make development unviable. The Council, therefore, took the general direction of the proposed policy into the next stage of the document, as the protection of existing business space, and the provision of new, in appropriate locations was supported by a Employment Land Study. Reference to the provision of affordable units was however removed as was considered to undermine the existing business stock – many of which was already 'affordable'

- 6.24 There was general support for the proposed hierarchy of town centres, and the creation of two new town centres in the north of the borough, where, in the case of the latter, the Council could demonstrate that there was 'need'.
- 6.25 There was strong support for initiatives that support the diversity of the borough's town centres, although a number of consultees reminded the Council that the success of a centre does not rely solely on the presence of small independent retailers but that multiple retailers have an important role to play. The artificial skewing of the market could harm, rather assist in the maintaining of diverse and successful centres. Whilst, the majority of consultees, including the GLA, support the provision of affordable shops some consultees are concerned about this initiative. They stress that the provision of affordable units must be carefully managed if the vitality of our centres is to be maintained. Affordable units should only be sought from schemes which include a substantial retail element.
- 6.26 The Council, therefore, took the general direction of the proposed policy into the next stage of the document. The Council does realise that the provision of affordable retail units will not always be appropriate in large retail proposals, and that such proposals will be assessed on their merits.
- 6.27 There is support for a policy which seeks to improve opportunities in sport health and physical activity with the Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU) being concerned that specific actions to attempt to address the deficiency on open space (and the associated sports facilities) being are required. The GLA reiterated their view that a full Open Space Strategy, more comprehensive than the PPG17 assessment, is required. The Council, therefore, took the general direction of the proposed policy into the next stage of the document, supporting the provision of additional facilities where possible. The Council has also been in discussions

with the GLA regarding the completion of a full Open Space Strategy, and has concluded that this is not necessary given the circumstances of the Borough.

- 6.28 There was support for the approach that the Council should be looking to improve the existing tourist experience rather than increasing tourist numbers, although hotels are not seen as appropriate uses across the Borough. The Council, therefore, took the general direction of the proposed policy into the next stage of the document, protecting hotels until 2012 when a review of the policy will be made.
- 6.29 **Better Travel Choices** :There was concern raised in relation to the policy direction for new stations on the Chelsea – Hackney line in Chelsea by a Residents Association in the area who believe that it is premature to support the line and new stations without more detailed feasibility work. They believe new stations could have serious impacts on the character of the area. The need and value of smaller scale local improvements to the bus network were highlighted.
- 6.30 The Council, therefore, took the general direction of the proposed policy into the next stage of the document, whilst specifically recognising that the impact of any future station need to be fully assessed before they are supported.
- 6.31 **Caring for the public realm**: There was widespread support of our commitment to the public realm and its important role in making the borough of attractive place with the public realm being managed in an integrated way, providing a more appropriate balance between cars and other users.
- 6.32 One consultee did however consider that the policy direction too restrictive where it requires new development to adopt or support the traditional urban pattern, believing it should only be encouraged and have regard to local circumstances.
- 6.33 The Council, took the general direction of the proposed policy into the next stage of the document, noting that local distinctiveness was an integral aspect of good design.
- 6.34 **Renewing the Legacy**: There was general support for the policy direction, and the promotion of both the preservation of the built environment and of High quality new design. However, the majority of respondents, including the GLA believed the approach that the Council had taken on the density of development to be too restrictive. A more flexible approach was preferred: one that is more closely aligned with the London Plan’s density matrix and sees density levels as guidelines rather than absolute limits. Similarly, the notion of

plot ratios came in for criticism, potentially stifling opportunities for new jobs and homes.

- 6.35 The Council general direction of the proposed policy into the next stage of the document, as still supports the principal that townscape should be the principal determinate of appropriate density of development.
- 6.36 There was some interest on the Council's policy on tall buildings, with English heritage offered strong support for the policy direction and local residents saw only dis-benefits of tall buildings in the borough. The GLA, and some local businesses requested wanted closer reflection of the London Plan's policy on tall buildings and their contribution as attractive landmarks and to regeneration
- 6.37 The Council continues its generally restrictive approach to tall buildings, and considers that there will be few circumstances where they will not harm the character of an area. Detailed criteria have been introduced.
- 6.38 ***Diversity of Housing:*** One of the main issues concerning housing relates to the priority that the Council should give over residential development. Some considered that housing should remain the top priority in order to ensure the London Plan 10 year target will be achieved. This approach was not take forward as the implementation of the Council's central vision, 'Improving and Excellent Borough' includes the promotion of a range of uses – and not to rank residential uses above all others. Variety of uses can be achieved which is not at the expense of the Council meeting its housing targets.
- 6.39 The Council's approach to Affordable housing (both the threshold and percentage) was also questioned with the Council's proposals for the affordable housing threshold received very little support, being seen to be inadequately justified, with the threshold being too low, and therefore likely to stifle housing development
- 6.40 The Council has therefore modified its approach raising the threshold where a contribution to affordable housing is required increasing from 500 sqm to 800 sqm. A greater understanding of the need for viability was also taken forward.
- 6.41 ***Respecting Environmental Limits:*** The protecting and enhancing biodiversity, mitigating and adapting to climate change and the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage were generally very well supported, however, it is considered that

any targets must be realistic, viable, technically feasible, in accordance with London plan policy and consider the impacts on listed buildings, conservations and the townscape. Some respondents also thought the new title is still too ambiguous.

- 6.42 ***Flooding:*** The precautionary approach to flood risk and impacts of climate change is welcomed. Thames Water do however, also require a specific policy on the Thames Tideway Tunnel. The Council has introduced a policy which concerns the Tideway Tunnel into the proposed submission core strategy document.
- 6.43 ***Drivers for Change (North Kensington):*** Many respondents were concerned that the proposals for new rail stations in the north of the Borough, particularly a new Crossrail station, were unrealistic and the need to increase densities, again particularly to feed a new Crossrail station, would have an unacceptable impact on the area. The Council fully endorses the creation of a new Crossrail station, a proposal which forms a central part of the to the Kensal Place, and to the regeneration of the north of the Borough.
- 6.44 ***Educating our Children*** There was support for the building of a new secondary school in the north of the Borough. This has been taken forward in later iterations of the plan, with a new school being allocated within the North Kensington Sports Centre site.
- 6.45 ***Notting Hill Gate:*** A number of the consultees were of the view that Notting Hill Gate should not be included as part of the North Kensington Plan, area but should be a separate spatial area. The combining of the North Kensington Plan into the main core strategy ensures that all parts of the Borough are considered in the same way.

## **7.0 Places and Strategic Sites Consultation May-June 2009**

- 7.1 Both the Places and Strategic Sites sections of the Core Strategy have been available for public consultation for six weeks. The six week consultation started on 5<sup>th</sup> May and finished on 16<sup>th</sup> June.

### ***Consultation Methods***

- 7.2 The documents were available on-line, at Council offices and local libraries and available on request. Responses were

able to be made via the consultation portal, by email and by post.

## **Workshops**

7.3 Workshops were held on each of the 14 'Places', before the formal six week consultation period.

- **Knightsbridge Workshop:** Kensington Town Hall, 9th March
- **King's Road/Sloane Square Workshop:** Chelsea Old Town Hall, 10th March
- **Portobello Road/Westbourne Grove Workshop:** Lighthouse West London (4pm to 6pm) 23rd March
- **Kensington High Street Workshop:** Kensington Town Hall (1:30pm to 3:30pm) 24th March
- **Lots Road/Worlds End Workshop:** Chelsea Old Town Hall, 30th March
- **South Kensington Museums Workshop:** V&A Museum, Sackler Centre, 31st March
- **Earl's Court Workshop:** Brompton Library Meeting Room, 1st April
- **Notting Hill Gate Workshop:** Kensington Town Hall, 1st April (as part of the Notting Hill Gate Advisory Group) (4pm to 6pm)
- **Fulham Road Workshop:** Chelsea Old Town Hall, 2nd April
- **Westway Workshop:** Isaac Newton Centre, 3rd April
- **Notting Barns West Workshop:** Lighthouse West London, 6th April (6pm to 8pm)
- **Kensal Workshop:** Lighthouse West London, 8th April (3pm to 5pm)
- **Golborne/Trellick Workshop:** Venture Centre, 16th April (6pm to 8pm)

## **Newsletters and Consultation Letters to the LDF Database members**

7.4 724 newsletters and 738 letters posted. Letters and posters were sent to 'Consultation Champions' asking them to act as Council ambassadors and inform their peers that the consultation was underway.

## **Summary of the main consultation issues raised and council response**

7.5 A total of 252 attended the 14 different 'Places' workshops. For the Places consultation, we received over 550 comments

from just over 80 respondents. For the Strategic sites the numbers were lower; 125 comments from just over 50 respondents.

- 7.6 Whilst comments were made on many of the proposed policies, the principal issues raised were:
- 7.7 **Golborne/Trellick:** comments sought for the references to the canal to reflect it as a 'positive' aspect of the area, rather than just a barrier to movement as in the consultation draft. The vision and text has been amended accordingly. Questions were raised regarding the feasibility of a new footbridge. The need for further investigation into the footbridges location was strengthened within the text. The provision of an 'art wall' helping draw people north up the Portobello Road to Golborne was also made. This has been incorporated. The text relating to Meanwhile Gardens has been strengthened to illustrate that the Council supports its maintenance and improvement.
- 7.8 **Portobello:** The majority of consultees were generally supportive of the vision that the Council has for the Portobello/ Notting Hill area. There was however some concern that the vital role that the antiques trade has in contributing to the character and to the vitality of the centre had been underplayed. There was also some concern that the Council was looking to rundown the Portobello Market, managing its decline. The other main issue concerned the relationship that Portobello has with the centres neighbouring it. Many thought that it enjoyed much stronger links with Golborne to the North than Westbourne Grove to the East. These links were strongly supported and the Council was encouraged to increase these further.
- 7.9 The vision and supporting text has been amended to make more explicit that the Council sees the antiques trade as being a central aspect of the character of the Portobello Road.
- 7.10 **Latimer:** A main theme was the potential relocation of the Sports Centre and the potential loss of the swimming pool – residents wish to retain the swimming pool in the area. Questions were raised as to whether this is the best location for the new school and concerns over security implications, one respondent has even requested more gated communities to protect themselves from the new pupils. Responses both in favour of protecting and in favour of relaxing our approach to employment zones were made. The text was amended to make it explicit that the Council expected the provision/

replacement of all sports facilities, including the swimming pool in the vicinity.

- 7.11 **Kings Road/Sloane Square:** the comments were disparate in nature. The special character of the King's Road was endorsed. It was seen as a successful centre which retains much of its character despite the large number of multiple retailers that it contains. Some of this character was seen to relate to the built form of the area - the juxtaposition between the bustling shopping street and the quiet garden squares and open spaces which opened up one side of the street or the other. The Council was urged to maintain this balance, and to ensure that the commercial uses do not harm the residential amenity of the neighbouring residential properties.
- 7.12 The text has been amended to reflect the contribution that the built form of the area (and the proximity of garden squares) has in the special character of the King's Road.
- 7.13 **Earl's Court Place:** Most of the comments were in support to the document. Some residents were not happy with the unravelling of the One-Way System as they saw the problem as being the large amounts of traffic and were not sure if the unravelling of the OWS would reduce traffic. Others supported the unravelling of the OWS and wanted us to seek highways improvements through section 106. There were also responses acknowledging the difficulty of unravelling the system and the need for a full transport study. GLA supported the work in partnership with LBHF but also wanted reference to partnership working with the GLA/LBHF and TfL as strategic partners and the potential for an opportunity area designation covering the site within the new LP. The Council still supports the future unravelling of the one way system as this is considered critical to increasing the permeability of the area. The future iteration of the plan (in the Earl's Court Site) also recognises Earl's Court as a future opportunity area.
- 7.14 **Notting Hill Gate:** This place was generally well supported,. The Metro Shopping Fund (landowners of a large portion of the centre) suggest a number of amendments, such as raising the importance of strengthening the retail function of the centre acknowledging that it's not the existence of coffee shops and restaurants that contribute to the poor quality of the centre, but the 'down market' quality of some of the operators, such as fast food outlets, which do not cater for the local community; and encouraging urban living within the centre, with which we agree. We did not support the suggestions regarding downplaying the role of the centre for offices and the potential to relocate the tube entrances, and

that the built environment issues could be resolved by 'uplifting' rather than redevelopment.

- 7.15 **Brompton Cross:** The Kensington Society questioned why Brompton Cross is designated as a 'Place' and should be deleted. However, officers are of the view that Brompton Cross should remain as a 'place' as it is a District Shopping Centre and in accordance with PPS6, all town centres should have a vision. We are using our Core Strategy places to deliver this requirement.

### **Strategic sites**

- 7.16 **Kensal:** Broadly, comments supported the Council's ambitions to regenerate this part of North Kensington, including the main land owners. National Grid have confirmed that they will continue to require the far western 'point' of their site for electricity infrastructure. This has been noted in future iterations as results of this comment.
- 7.17 **Land Adjoining Trellick:** several respondees questioned if this site was really of strategic significance to the borough to warrant inclusion in the core strategy. The view of officers is that the primary reason for the site's designation is to fund the restoration of Trellick Tower, a grade II\* listed building, that has significance in terms of the borough's commitment to renewing the legacy.
- 7.18 **North Kensington Sports Centre:** Significant concern was raised regarding any loss of existing sports facilities, especially the loss of the swimming facilities. Concern was also raised regarding the impacts of a new school and the new road layout to existing residential amenity. The timescales for delivery needed to be more specific, and clarification was needed regarding the loss of open space. Clarification has been added and the Council has explicitly noted that the swimming pool must be provided/ re-provided in the vicinity.
- 7.19 **Earl's Court:** the comments were generally supportive. Further discussions on the practicality of unravelling this have been requested from TfL.. Some respondents were concerned due to the allocation of the site to meet the waste apportionment – this has now been changed accordingly. The GLA wanted further consideration of the residential-led mixed use capacity, were a large exhibition based use not to proceed and the recognition of the transport constraints on development and the need to safeguard operational railway for both the place and the strategic sites. A number of respondents commented on the need to make greater

reference to the Hammersmith and Fulham part of the site. Now that Hammersmith and Fulham have published a discussion draft of their plan, this information can be included in future editions of our plan.

## **8.0 The Draft Core Strategy with a particular focus on North Kensington July- September 2009**

8.1 Public consultation for this document ran for six weeks from 24<sup>th</sup> July-4<sup>th</sup> September 2009.

### ***Consultation Methods***

8.2 The documents were available on-line, at Council offices and local libraries and available on request. Responses were able to be made via the consultation portal, by email and by post.

### **Newsletters and Consultation Letters to the LDF Database members**

8.3 768 newsletters and 759 letters were posted.

### **Summary of the main consultation issues raised and council response**

8.4 942 comments were received from 85 consultees.

8.5 Whilst comments were made on many of the proposed policies, the principal issues raised were:

8.6 ***Deliverability:*** In general, there was a concern that the places do not sufficiently demonstrate deliverability – ie they may fail the soundness test of effectiveness. All Places chapters have been altered to include a place-shaping policy. This is included within a sub-section for deliver located at the end of every place. This also includes the quantum of development, infrastructure needs and place specific monitoring indicators.

8.7 ***Earl's Court:*** Concerns were raised that the proposed allocation of the site might preclude the proper spatial planning of the whole Earl's Court site and the adjoining land. It was pointed out that the Council had not demonstrated that this quantum and mix of development can be readily

achieved in a manner consistent with the relevant design policies or that the Council had taken account of the constraints arising from construction over operational railway and the potential impact on the railway. Changes were made to reflect the concerns. This entails showing a more flexible mixed-use allocation on the site.

- 8.8 **Social and Community Uses:** In Keeping Life Local, a representation was received that elderly people's homes and similar uses should not be regarded as social and community facilities, and that our definition of social and community uses is insufficiently justified. This was a direct result of the Vicarage Gate case. The argument was that in many facilities of this nature, the apartments are privately owned by the individual residents, they are not therefore social and community uses. Following a legal opinion from Counsel, the wording of policy was altered slightly to further strengthen the Council's position. Further to this, a short evidence paper has been produced which highlights why the Council believes elderly people's homes and other, less conventional Social and Community Uses have been designated as such.
- 8.9 **Amenity:** Concern was raised that only residential amenity is protected and should be applied to non-residential uses as well. New 'Amenity' policy has been added in response to comments. The majority of this policy had previously been located in the "Diversity of Housing" Chapter but by rewording and relocating, the policy can now effectively manage non residential amenity as well.
- 8.10 **Town Centre Uses:** The proposed approach to restricting the loss of any shops in the primary shopping frontages was considered by consultees to be too restrictive and without reasoned justification. The Council had previously argued that it was a justified response as PPS6 supports the designation of primary frontages which contain higher concentration of shop uses. The document has been amended to include a 'criteria based' approach by which a small number of non shop town centre uses will be permitted in primary frontages. This approach remains "tighter" than that in the existing UDP. Given the "relaxing" of the Council's approach, it has been necessary to add a policy which resists the loss of any shops within the primary shopping frontage of the Portobello Road shopping centre. A further policy was added to resist the creation of new estate agents, bureau de change and hot food takeaways within the Notting Hill Gate Town Centre.
- 8.11 **Housing Tenure:** A number of consultees felt that the emerging London Plan tenure split should be adopted (60% social rented housing and 40% intermediate housing). The

tenure split has not been modified because the cost to the developer in terms of providing a social rented unit or intermediate housing unit is very similar due to costs being capped. In addition, the GLA support the proposed tenure mix, recognising it reflects local needs.

- 8.12 **Climate Change:** Several respondents suggested that the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM requirements should be flexible to take account of viability and existing building constraints. Many of the comments, especially those from the GLA, have resulted in considerable changes to the climate change policies. A new policy has also been introduced requiring the energy, heating and cooling to be supplied in accordance with the hierarchy of energy efficiency, decentralised energy and renewable energy. Following internal consultation, a new policy has also been included to require development to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM credits from reducing pollution and emissions and requiring development to contribute to producing on-site sustainable food.

## **9.0 How any representations have been taken into account**

- 9.1 At each stage of the Core Strategy, the key issues raised from the public consultation were reported back to the Local Development Framework Advisory Group and changes were proposed to the documents in light of these responses.

## Appendix A: The Local Development Framework Database.

In addition to 178 interested parties who requested to be included on the Local Development Framework, the following consultees were consulted.

Consultee Organisation Name	
1-49 Burton Court Residents' Association	CALM (Confidential and Local Mediation)
21/23 Cadogan Gardens Tenants Ltd	Campaign for Fair Play
37-59 Wetherby Mansions Ltd	Campaign for Fair Play
50-85 Burton Court Residents' Committee	Campaign for Real Ale Limited
Abbey Place	Campaign to Protect Rural England
Abbots House Residents Association	Campden Hill Residents' Association
Abbotsbury Residents' Association	Campden Street Preservation Society
Abingdon Mansions Residents' Association	Catholic Children's Society
Action Disability Kensington and Chelsea	CB Richard Ellis (CBRE)
Addison Crescent South Residents Association	CB Richard Ellis (CBRE)
African Refugges Project	Cedar Estates Ltd
Age Concern Kensington and Chelsea	CELTFIELD Ltd
A-L Wetherby Mansions	Central and NW London Mental Health NHS Trust
Al-Hasanlya Moroccan Women's Centre	Central Gurdwara (Khalsa Jatha) London
Allen Mansions Limited	Central Gurdwara (Khalsh Jatha) London
Ancient Monuments Society	Central Planning Forum
Andrews Downie and Partners	Charles Church Developments Ltd
Angolan Community in London	Chelsea and Kensington Swimming Club
Arts Council England	Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Foundaion Trust
Arundel and Elgin Garden Committee	Chelsea Citizens Advice Bureau
Assael Architects	Chelsea Community Church
Association of London Government	Chelsea Methodist
Astell Street et al Residents Association	Chelsea Old Church
Avondale Park Gardens Residents' Association	Chelsea Physic Garden
Ballymore Group	Chelsea Square/Manresa Road Residents' Association
Bangladesh Centre	Chelsea Towers Residents' Association
Banner Homes Group Plc	Chelsea Youth Club
Barclays Bank Plc	Chelsfield and the Ilchester Estate
Barratt West London	Cheltenham Terrace Residents' Association
Barton Willmore	Cherry Tree Residents' Amenities Association
Barton Willmore Planning	Chesterton and Broadwood Residents' Association
Bell Cornwall LLP	Children and Parents Carnival Association
Bellway Homes North London	Chris Thomas Ltd
Berkeley Homes	Christ Church School
Berkeley House	Christchurch Residents' Association
Beverley Court Tenants Association	Christchurch Residents' Association
Blenheim and Elgin Garden Enclosure	Church Commissioners
Blenheim Crescent Residents' Association (96-98 inc)	Church of Our Most Holy Redeemer and St Thomas More
BME Health Forum	Churchill Retirement Living
Bovis House Group Plc	Civil Aviation Authority
Bramley House Residents' Association	Clarendon Group
Bramley's Big Adventure	Clareville Court Residents' Society Ltd
British Gas Plc	Cluttons
British Gas Plc	Colliers CRE
British Geological Survey	Colville Powis Tenants Action Group
British Telecommunications PLC	Combined Harvest
British Waterways	Commission for Architecuture and the Built Environment
Brompton Association	Community Accountancy Self Help

Brompton Oratory	Confederation of British Industry
Buckingham Court Residents' Association	Cornwall Gardens Residents' Association
Bywater Residents' Association	Cornwall Gardens Residents' Association
c/o Chelsea Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses	Coromandel
Cable and Wireless	Council for British Archaeology
Cadogan Estates Ltd	Courtfield Gardens (West)
Cranleigh Residents' Association Ltd	Fairview New Homes Ltd
Cromwell Mansions Residents' Association	CPRE London
Cross London Rail Links Ltd	Family Housing Association
Crossrail	Family Support Group
Cunnane Town Planning	FARRAR
Dadihiye Somali Development Organisation	Fernshaw Road Residents' Association
Dalton Warner Davis	FFT Planning
Denbigh Under 5's	Fields in Trust
Department for Children, Schools and Families	Finborough and Tregunter Residents' Association
Department for Culture, Media and Sport	Firstplus Planning
Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills	Flood Street Terrace Residents' Environment Protection Association
Department for Transport	Freight Transport Association
Department of Constitutional Affairs	Friends of Holland Park
Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	Friends of the Earth (London Region)
Department of Health	Friends, Families and Travellers
Department of Trade and Industry	Fusion Online Limited
Department of Work and Pensions	Garden Square News
Derek Horne and Associates Limited	Gate Theatre
Development Planning Partners	Gerald Eve
Dominion Housing Group Limited	Girl Guides Association Kensington & Chelsea Division
Douglas Wallis Architects	Golborne Forum
Dovehouse Street Residents' Association	Goldcrest Homes Plc
DTZ	Governance Services
Duke of York's Residents Action Group	Government Office for London
Durward and Roxburghe RTMC Ltd	Government Office for London (GOL)
Eardley Crescent Residents' Association	Grandma's
Earls Court and Olympia Group	Greater London Authority (GLA)
Earls Court and Olympia Group	Grenville Housing Association Ltd
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Grove House Residents' Association
Earls Court Chapter	Guinness Trust
Earl's Court Gardens and Morton Mews Residents' Association	GVA Grimley
Earl's Court Society	Hammersmith and Fulham Historic Buildings Group and West London River Group
Earl's Court Village Residents Association	Health and Safety Executive
Eaves Women's Aid	Help the Aged
Ebony Steelband Trust	Henniker Mews Residents' Association Ltd
Edenham Way Residents' Association	Her Majesty's Courts Services
EDF Energy Networks	Heska - Housing and Support - Kensington
EDF Energy Plc	Highways Agency
EDF Energy Properties	Historytalk
Edwardes Square, Scarsdale & Abingdon Association (ESSA)	Holbein House Residents' Association
Egerton Gardens Mews Residents' Association	Holland and Elsham Neighbourhood Association
Egyptian Community Association in UK	Holland Park Avenue Residents Association
Elm Park and Chelsea Park Residents' Association	Holland Park Residents' Association
Empty Homes Agency Ltd	Holland Park West Residents' Association
Energis Communications Ltd	Holland Road Co-ordinator (South Bound)
English Heritage, London Region	Hollywood Road Residents' Association
English Partnerships	Hornton Court Services Ltd
Environment Agency	Hortensia House
Environment Agency	House Builders Federation

Environment Round Table	Housing Corporation London Region
Equal People (K&C)	Hutchinson 3G UK Ltd
Equality and Human Rights Commission	Hyde Park Appeal
Eritrean Elder Welfare Association (EEWA)	India Welfare Society
Eritrean Parents and Children Association	Inkerman Housing Association
Institute of Directors	Inland Waterways Association
Iverna Court Shareholders Liaison Committee	League of friends of St Charles and Princess Louise
John Laing Partnership	Learning and Skills Council
John Lyon's Charity	Leigh and Glennie Ltd
Jones Lang LaSalle	Lennon Planning
K&C Liberal Democrats	LETEC
KCP Community Sub-Group	LEVVEL
KCSC	Lexham Gardens Residents' Association
Kelfield Open Space Association	Liddiard House Residents Association
Kempsford Gardens Residents' Association	Linden Homes South East Ltd
Kensal Community Association	London Ambulance Service
Kensington and Chelsea Chamber of Commerce	London Borough of Brent
Kensington and Chelsea Chamber of Commerce	London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham
Kensington and Chelsea Chamber of Commerce	London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham
Kensington and Chelsea Chamber of Trade	London Borough of Wandsworth
Kensington and Chelsea Citizens Advice Bureau Service	London Borough of Westminster
Kensington and Chelsea College	London Care Connections and Homeshare
Kensington and Chelsea Liberal Democrats	London Cycling Campaign
Kensington and Chelsea Mental Health Association	London Cyrenians Housing
Kensington and Chelsea Social Council (KCSC)	London Cyrenians Housing
Kensington and Chelsea Social Council	London Development Agency
Kensington and Chelsea Social Council (KCSC)	London Dial a Ride
Kensington and Chelsea Social Council (KCSC)	London Diocesan Fund
Kensington and Chelsea Social Council (KCSC)	London Diocesan Fund
Kensington and Chelsea Social Council (KCSC)	London Energy Plc (EDF)
Kensington and Chelsea Social Council (KCSC)	London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
Kensington and Chelsea Social Council (KCSC)	London Fire Brigade
Kensington and Chelsea with Westminster Friends of the Earth	London First
Kensington and Chelsea Talking Newspaper	London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies
Kensington Court Residents' Association	London General Transport Services Limited
Kensington Emperors Swimming Club	London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust
Kensington Gate Residents' Association	London Housing Federation
Kensington Heights Association	London Parks and Gardens Trust
Kensington Housing Trust	London Port Health Authority
Kensington Housing Trust	London Transport Users Committee
Kensington Mansions Residents' Association	London Voluntary Service Council
Kensington Square Garden Committee	London Wildlife Trust
Kensington Square Residents' Association	Longlands Court Residents Association
Kensington Temple	Longlands Court Residents Association
Kensington United Reformed Church	Longlands Court Residents Association
Kenton Court Residents' Association	Longlands Court Residents Association
Kids London	Longlands Court Residents Association
King Sturge	Longlands Court Residents Association
King's Road Association of Chelsea Residents	Longlands Court Residents Association
King's Road Trade Association	Longlands Court Residents Association
Labour Party	Longlands Court Residents Association
Ladbroke Association	Lonsdale and Westbourne Grove Neighbourhood Association
Ladbroke Association	Look Ahead Housing and Care
Ladbroke Gardens Ltd	Lots Road Action Group (LRAG)
Lancaster West Residents' Association	LSM Partners

Landowner of 205 Holland Park Avenue	Malcom Judd and Partners
Lansdowne Gardens Committee	Markham Square Residents' Association
Latymer Christian Centre	Maxilla Nursery Centre
LCCI/CBI London Manufacturing Group	Nottingdale Ltd
McCarthy and Stone Ltd	NSPCC
McCarthy & Stone Plc	NTL
Meanwhile Gardens Community Association	O2 (UK) Ltd
Melbury Court Residents'	Oakley Street Residents' Association
Melbury Court Residents' Association	Octavia Housing and Care
Metropolitan Police Authority	Octavia West Residents' Association
Metropolitan Police Authority	Office of Government Commerce
Metropolitan Police Authority	Old Mill Limited
Metropolitan Police Service	Onslow Neighbourhood Association
Milner Street Residents' Association(MISARA)	Onslow Neighbourhood Association
Milner Street Residents' Association(MISARA)	Onslow Square Residents' Association
Ministry of Defence	Open Age Charity
Mitre House Residents' Association	Open Age Charity - South Office
Mobile Operators Association	Open Spaces Society
Montagu Evans LLP	Orpen House Tenants Association
Motorcycle Action Group	Ovington Square Garden Committee
Multiplex Developments (Uk) Ltd	PACE
Murray John Architects	Paddington Development Trust
Music Space UK Ltd t/as The Grove Music Studios	Palace Gate Residents' Association
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	Partnership for Supplementary Schools in Kensington and Chelsea
National Association of Gypsy and Travellers	Paultons Square Residents' Association
National Association of Health Workers with Travellers	Peabody Trust
National Grid	Pelham Court Residents' Association
National Grid Company	Pelham Residents' Association
National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE)	Penywern Residents' Association
National Offender Management Service (NOMS) and HM Prison Service	Persimmon Plc
Natural England	Philbeach Residents' Association
Natural History Museum	Photoshot
Natural History Museum	Physic Triangle Residents' Association
Naz Project London	Planning Aid for London
Network Rail	Planning and Local Authority Liaison
Nevern Square Conservation Area Residents' Association	Planning Potential
NGPH and NGG (Gas)	Pond House Residents' Association
NHIG and Notting Hill Arts Club	Popularchitecture
NHS K&C (was Primary Care Trust)	Port of London Authority
NHS K&C (was Primary Care Trust) (Well Being Board)	Portland Road, Penzance Place, Pottery Lane and Princesdale Road
NHS London Health Urban Development Unit (HUDU)	Portobello Court Residents' Association
NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit	Portobello Management Committee
Norland Conservation Society	Post Office Property Holdings
North Kensington Environmental Forum	Pre-School Learning Alliance
North Kensington Law Centre	Princes Gate Mews Association
Northacre Plc	Prospects Kensington Ltd
Northbeach Property Ltd	Punch and Judy Family Centre
Notting Dale Technology Centre	Quayside House Residents Association
Notting Hill Action Group	Queen's Gate Gardens Committee
Notting Hill Churches Homeless Concern	Race Equality Partnership (Kensington and Chelsea)
Notting Hill Counselling	Radnor Walk Residents' Association
Notting Hill Gate Improvements Group	Radnor Walk Residents' Association
Notting Hill Gate Traders Association	Rail Freight Group
Notting Hill Housing Group	Ramblers Inner London Area Access Officer

Notting Hill Housing Group	Rapleys LLP
Notting Hill Methodist Church	Redcliffe Square (Number Ten)
Notting Hill Police Station	St Mary Abbots School
Redcliffe Street Residents' Association	St Mungo's
Redrow Homes (Eastern) Ltd	St Stephen's Church
Richmond Mansions Residents' Association	Stanley Gardens North Garden Committee
Redrow Homes (Eastern) Ltd	Stanley Gardens Residents Association (11)
Richmond Mansions Residents' Association	Stewart Ross Associates/DevPlan
Road Haulage Association	Sunley Holdings Plc
Roger Tym and Partners	Support St Mary Abbots Community Care Association
Roland Way and Eagle Place Residents' Association	Sure Start
Rolfe Judd	Susan Walker Architects
Roman Catholic Church	Swinbrook Estate Residents' Association
Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Trust	Swinbrook Nursery Centre
Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Trust	Sydney Street and District Residents' Association
Royal Crescent Association	Tavistock Crescent Residents Association
Royal Crescent Garden Committee	Tavistock Crescent Residents' Association
Royal Mail Property Holdings	Tavistock Sheltered Scheme
Royal Mail Property Holdings	Taylor Woodrow
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	Telewest Communications
Sainsburys	TELS, RBK&C
Salvation Army	Ten Acres Residents' Association
Savills	Termhouse (13-35 Wetherby Mansions) Management Ltd
Savills	TfL Surface Transport
Scott Brownrigg	Thames Gateway London Partnership
Serbian Community Centre	Thames Strategy - Kew to Chelsea
Servite Houses	Thames Water Property Services
Seymour Walk Residents' Association	Thames Water Utilities Ltd
Shaftesbury Mews Company Ltd	The Anglican Parish of St Michael and All Angels
Shawfield Street Residents' Association	The Bell Cornwell Partnership
Shawfield Street Residents' Association	The Berkley House
Silchester Residents' Association	The Blenheim Project
Sir Thomas More Estate	The Campden Charities
Sixty Plus	The Campden Hill Lawn Tennis Club Ltd
Sloane Square House Residents Co. Ltd	The Chelsea Society
SMART	The Crown Estate
Society for Protection of Ancient Buildings	The Earl's Court Community Project
South Kensington Estates Group	The Gypsy Council
Southern Housing Group	The Hill Magazine
Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue	The Kensington and Chelsea Borough Team
Sport England	The Kensington Society
Sport England (London Region)	The Kensington Society
St Clement and St James Churches	The Kensington Society
St Clement and St James Churches	The Knightsbridge Association
St Cuthbert's Centre	The Labour Group
St Francis of Assisi RC Church	The Lawn Tennis Association
St George Central London	The London Planning Practice LLP
St Georges Church	The Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum
St Georges Church	The National Trust
St James Group Ltd	The Pembridge Association
St John's Notting Hill	The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
St Leonard's Terrace Residents' Association	The Royal Parks
St Loo Court Lessees Association	The Space KC
St Loo Court Lessees Association	The Swan Court Residents' Association
St Luke's Church	The Theatres Trust

St Luke's Church	The Troubadour
St Mark's Grove Tenant Association	The Trustees of the Phillimore Estate
The Unite Group	Wornington Green Residents' Association
The Wellcome Trust	Wynnstay Gardens Residents Management Ltd
The Youth Centre	Youth Culture Television (YCTV)
Threshold Support (Formely Opendoor)	Workspace Group Plc
Thurloe Court Residents' Association	World's End Neighbourhood Advice Centre
TMO	
T-Mobile UK Ltd	
Tollard House Residents' Association	
Transport for London	
Transport for London	
Transport for London	
Transportation Planning PB	
Transportation Planning PB	
Travellers (Westway site)	
Tribal MJP	
Troy Court Residents' Association	
Union Railways Property	
Venture Childrens Services	
Venture Community Association	
Victoria Road Area Residents' Association	
Virgin Mobile	
Visit London	
Vodafone	
Volunteer Centre Kensington and Chelsea	
W11 Opera for Young People	
Walpole Street Residents' Association	
Warwick Gardens Residents' Association	
Wates Construction	
Way West Press	
Weatheralls	
West London Architectural Society	
West London Buddhist Centre	
West London Line Group	
West London River Group	
West Moroccan Widadia	
West Properties	
Westminster Drug Project	
Westway Community Transport	
Westway Development Trust	
Westway Development Trust	
Westway Development Trust	
Westway Nursery Association	
Westway Project	
Westway Stables	
Wetherby Mews Residents Association	
Whitelands House Residents' Association	
Wimpey Homes	
Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	
Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	
Wm Morrisons Supermarkets Plc	
Women's National Commission	
Women's Pioneer Housing Ltd	
Woodsford Square Management Ltd	

