

**Notting Hill Gate Draft SPD – consultation comments
[Site 2 - Astley House]**

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Site 2. 1: Astley House	Yashmin and Alex Jeffries		Site 2: Astley House I do not support any increase in height of Astley House for any reason. The buildings are already too high. Instead, the focus should be on attempting to 'beautify' the building by refacing the exterior with some more attractive materials.	Preference for refurbishment of Astley House noted but it is unlikely that refurbishment would be viable without additional floorspace.	No change
Site 2. 2: Astley House	Irving		This building is already 4 stories high, with buildings on the opposite side of the road (the north side of NHG) only being 2 or 3 stories high. Additional stories on Astley House would therefore be out of scale with nearby buildings. Additional stories on Astley House would also adversely impact the views looking up Kensington Church Street and along NHG, resulting in a loss of sky in the view. A higher building would also	Concern about additional height on Astley House noted but it is unlikely that refurbishment would be viable without additional floorspace. The architectural style and quality of individual developments would be the subject of planning applications and any developer will have to address issues of townscape impact through the submission of a visual townscape analysis.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>shade the opposite pavement in the middle of the day making it darker. I therefore reject the proposal.</p> <p>Redevelopment of Astley House should only be permitted if the new building is no higher than the existing building.</p>		
Site 2. 3: Astley House	G. Keating		The buildings on Astley House site are already high by the standards of the surrounding area and I object strongly to any increase from the present height which will alter the character of the area in an undesirable way	Concern about additional height on Astley House noted but it is unlikely that refurbishment would be viable without additional floorspace	No change
Site 2. 4: Astley House	Estelle Beverley Hilton		If two storeys are added, these should be set back as a mansard or modern equivalent to let light into NHG and reduce apparent mass. Keep the overhang, but make sure it is well designed and well lit. Remove all the air-con units. The Czech embassy should not be used as a precedent for the height and mass of the rest of NHG.	Detailed design issues and the quality of individual developments would be the subject of planning applications and any developer will have to address issues of townscape impact through the submission of a visual townscape analysis.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Site 2. 5: Astley House	Bulmer Mews Management Limited (J Gardner)	Bulmer Mews Management Limited	p44 plan - it would be useful to show the current height against the proposed heights.	These maps are designed to show future principles on various sites across Notting Hill Gate. The additional of current building heights has the potentially add unnecessary confusion.	No change
Site 2. 6: Astley House	Shala Kaussari-Dick		I do not support any increase in height of Astley House for any reason. The buildings are already too high. Instead, the focus should be on trying to improve the appearance of the building by using more attractive materials on the exterior.	Concern about additional height on Astley House noted but it is unlikely that refurbishment would be viable without additional floorspace	No change
Site 2. 7: Astley House	Shala Kaussari-Dick		I do not support any increase in height of Astley House for any reason. The buildings are already too high. Instead, the focus should be on attempting to 'beautify' the building by using more attractive materials on the exterior.	Concern about additional height on Astley House noted but it is unlikely that refurbishment would be viable without additional floorspace	No change
Site 2. 8: Astley House	Forsters LLP, on behalf of the Notting Hill Arts Club.		1. Notting Hill Arts Club "the Club" is located within Astley House, a property identified as Site 2 in the draft SPD. 2. The Club is a long-	The Council recognises the contribution the Notting Hill Gate Arts Club has on the character and vitality of Notting Hill Gate and has amended the text	Text change to state that the design should ensure that existing uses and activities are not compromised

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>established and important part of the cultural mix in this part of the Royal Borough. Since its opening in 1997, it has been the focal point for established bands, as well as a supportive and influential launching pad for new bands seeking to make their way into this competitive industry. Its success has been based on effective, hands on management a willingness to embrace new talent and its geographic location at the heart of music led environment.</p>	<p>of the SPD to state that the design should ensure that existing uses and activities are not compromised.</p>	
Site 2. 9: Astley House	Forsters LLP, on behalf of the Notting Hill Arts Club.		<p>3. The benefits brought by the Club are not limited to its impact on the music industry. As an important local employer and popular visitor attraction, it contributes significantly in socio-economic terms, providing real jobs, opportunities and spend. Moreover, whilst music is at its heart, it is much more than merely a venue for live music,</p>	As above.	Text change to state that the design should ensure that existing uses and activities are not compromised

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>contributing to the local community through local initiatives. 4. The Club is an intrinsic part of both the Royal Borough and of the Notting Hill area. As such, it seeks as much protection as possible from the planning system in order to ensure that any redevelopment of the area fully protects the business as a going concern. Whilst the principle of regeneration of the area within the draft SPD is supported by the Club, the specific policies and guidance in the draft SPD are currently not sufficient to protect the Club's future in the event that Astley House was to be redeveloped.</p>		
Site 2. 10: Astley House	Forsters LLP, on behalf of the Notting Hill Arts Club.		<p>8. Paragraphs 6.22 and 6.23 explain the possible ways in which the redevelopment of Astley House may come forward. The club is very concerned that there are no specific references in this section which deal specifically with the Club</p>	As above	Text change to state that the design should ensure that existing uses and activities are not compromised

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>or the need to ensure that is future is accommodated within any redevelopment scheme. 9. The Club would propose that in order to ensure that its future at this location is sufficiently protected, the following paragraph is added as a new paragraph 6.24: "Any redevelopment of Astley House will need to pay special regard to the importance of retaining the Notting Hill Arts Club within any redevelopment scheme. If necessary, this will need to include acoustic protection and legal measures which, when combined, will ensure that the Club is able to continue to function in its current manner without risk that its ongoing use may be threatened by the occupiers of the redevelopment scheme. The Council is aware of the measures required in relation to the redevelopment of Eileen House in Southwark (in relation to its proximity</p>		

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			the Ministry of Sound) and would require any application for the redevelopment of Astley House to demonstrate that it has had regard to these measures when submitting any application for redevelopment of Astley House".		
Site 2. 11: Astley House	Estelle Beverley Hilton		Site 2. Astley House If two storeys are added for residential use, these should be set back as a mansard or modern equivalent to let light into NHG and reduce apparent mass. Keep the overhang, but make sure it is well designed and well lit. Remove all air-con units! The Czech embassy should not be used a precedent for the height and mass of the rest of NHG.	Detailed design issues and the quality of individual developments would be the subject of planning applications and any developer will have to address issues of townscape impact through the submission of a visual townscape analysis.	No change
Site 2. 12: Astley House	N. Lindsay-Fynn		Site 2: Astley House We do not support any increase in height of Astley House for any reason. The buildings are already too high. Instead, the focus should be on attempting to	Concern about additional height on Astley House noted but it is unlikely that refurbishment would be viable without additional floorspace	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			improve the look of the building by refacing the exterior with more attractive materials.		
Site 2. 13: Astley House	Roger Hudson		6.22 6.23 Astley House. Trading an extra two storeys of residential in return for improving the external appearance back and front seems a sensible way forward. The back at the moment is deplorable and the front deeply depressing.	Support for the refurbishment paid for through additional floorspace noted.	No change
Site 2. 14: Astley House	Gerald Eve LLP (Samuel Palmer)	Gerald Eve LLP	Site 2: Astley House Paragraph 6.23 states that the Council will seek the retention of office floor space and permit two additional storeys for residential use only if, inter alia, public realm enhancements are carried out to the rear, office space is refurbished and the external appearance is improved. The principal of whether additional storeys are acceptable in townscape terms should not be dependent on the extent to which other aspirations of the Council, which are not	The text has been amended as requested.	The text has been amended to remove linked requirements.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>directly related, are achieved. It is therefore suggested that this paragraph should be reworded as follows: "To achieve this, the Council will seek the retention of office space and permit two additional storeys for residential use. As part of any application submission the Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Require public realm enhancements to be carried out to the rear; · Encourage office space to be refurbished, which may include the insertion of different cores and entrances; · Encourage the external appearance of the building to be significantly improved, including the corner on to Kensington Church Street; · Permit the loss of retail units in order to provide a ground floor entrance for a business hub." 		
Site 2. 15: Astley House	Way West Press (Tim Burke)	NHIG	5.2. Ashley, David Game House. Properties owned by The Pears Group seem to have much less of a	The SPD has been substantially amended in relation to Newcombe House so this conclusion no longer holds.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>redevelopment role in SPD, why? Ashley House: The Group supports only „Office? use and only additional „Office height redevelopment on this site. David Game House: The Group wishes to recognise the need to protect David Game College as an „educational facility? we highlight that large numbers of overseas students have greatly added to the vitality of the area, and should continue to do so. The Group is confused by plans for a new Underground Station entrance; we ask can R.B.K.C lend much more clarity than as drafted? Clarity of direction, the potential options, is of utmost importance as this element is critical to any spatial development.</p>	<p>David Game College occupy the building as a personal permission, if the college were to leave the planning use would revert to office. Planning policies would protect office use.</p> <p>The SPD has been re-written and many options that were considered have now been removed.</p>	
Site 2. 16: Astley House	C Pinder		<p>I do not support any increase in height of Astley House for any reason. The buildings are already too high. Instead, the focus should</p>	<p>Concern about additional height on Astley House noted but it is unlikely that refurbishment would be viable without additional floorspace</p>	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			be on attempting to 'beautify' the building by refacing the exterior with some more attractive materials.	Support for refurbishment option noted.	
Site 2. 17: Astley House	Knox-Peebles		6.22 & 23 Yes	Support noted.	No change