

From: Wendy.Norman@cluttons.com [mailto:Wendy.Norman@cluttons.com]
Sent: 10 December 2009 09:19
To: Planning Policy
Cc: andrew.stanford@cluttons.com; Andrew.Forrester@cluttons.com; Diane.Rider@cluttons.com
Subject: Proposed Submission Core Strategy - October 2009
Importance: High

Dear Sir

We have the following comments to make on behalf of our client The Wellcome Trust, on the above document:

- We support policy CP12 to promote the retail nature of Brompton Cross and the pedestrian links to South Kensington Underground Station and the further residential use of the upper floors above Fulham Road West and East.
- We support the proposals to improve pedestrian movement between Knightsbridge and South Kensington
- Regarding Policy CF2 and affordable retail units we believe that this policy is unsound. If implemented this will create a two tier retail market which may lead to unwanted adverse effects on retail occupation, thus making the objective of the proposed policy ineffective and undeliverable. A major problem in implementing this policy would be the definition of which types of retailers could benefit from affordable shops. This threatens its deliverability.
- We suggest that Policy CF8a is amended to refer to protecting hotels "in all wards except Earl's Court **and Courtfield**" since concentrations of hotels are shown in Courtfield ward as well as Earl's Court ward on the Fostering Vitality Map and problems in relation to them being in conflict with the residential nature of the surrounding area were referred to in para 31.3.15 of the draft Core Strategy policy of 24th July 2009. Our proposed amendment to the draft policy would make it more sound by being justified by the evidence.
- We believe that Policy CF3a is too onerous and that the current UDP criteria regarding non shop uses in primary shopping frontages should remain. The Core Strategy does not appear to have maps defining the primary and secondary retail frontages to which Policy CF3a and b refer. The policy is therefore currently unsound because it will be ineffective.
- We support Policy CH2c "to encourage extra care housing provision particularly in the south of the Borough" because there is clear, justified evidence of the need and the policy is sound.
- We support Policy CH2d to allow the self containment of HMOs where self contained studio flats are to be created. However the way in which this policy is currently drafted is unclear as to how it would be implemented in practice. For example, would the Council's floorspace standards be imposed on the new studio units and does the policy allow for any reduction in the number of units in a building if the overall living accommodation is improved by providing selfcontained studios? Will there be any different approach towards these uses within historic buildings where alterations are more restricted but a current HMO use may not result in the optimum use of the building? We would welcome the chance for this policy to be discussed at the Examination in Public and wish to reserve the right to comment further on this policy. We also believe the policy should allow for the loss of HMO accommodation where other planning goals are met such as in the restoration of a listed building.
- We object to the use of s106 agreements to restrict future residential amalgamations under Policy CH2g on the basis that this is unnecessary (there is no justification for this in the text) it increases impact on the administrative and legal resources of RBKC and restricts flexibility by landowners and indeed RBKC over the use of property over time, thus making the policy ineffective. We therefore submit that this policy is unsound.

Please acknowledge receipt of these representations.

Yours faithfully

Wendy Norman
Partner
Cluttons LLP
Portman house
2 Portman Street
London W1H 6DU

tel 0207 647 7102