

Notting Hill Gate Draft SPD – consultation comments [3- Streets and Places]

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
3.1	J Andrew		Further to point 3.17 regarding the exploration of closing Pembridge Road on Saturdays between Portobello Road and Kensington Park Road. As a resident within the proposed area, I am not against the closure, per se, so long as residents have access for loading/unloading outside their own houses.	Support but concern that if Pembridge Road is closed on Saturdays residents must have access for loading/unloading outside their own houses, noted. Any proposals would be subjected to careful investigation and further consultation before they were implemented.	Noted
3.2	Graham		<p>I realise there must be change but re STREETS AND SPACES I don't think you should reduce the amount of lanes at the top end of Ken. Park Rd or in Ken Church St. You have bus stops there and surely fewer lanes would really delay the traffic appallingly. With bus stops and traffic lights in both places there will be a huge build up of traffic reREFURBISH OR RE-BUILD</p> <p>4.13 Is this not a residential area? Do we need more offices?</p> <p>4.15. No no no please do not build another ghastly tower block. We want to see the sky - that is what need. More sky over head -</p> <p>6.29. How could you think of making Campden Hill Tower taller?? It is probably</p>	<p>The scheme as described has been subject to initial testing by consultants, on behalf the Council. It would not proceed without additional design refinement, testing, and the Council and TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable.</p> <p>The proposal is to maintain, not increase, the amount of offices in the area.</p> <p>The suggestion is that to address the eyesore two additional storeys might be permitted on top of</p>	Noted. Reference to adding height to Campden Hill Towers removed

			nice to live in, but for who have to look at it, it has been an eyesore the past 40 plus years. 6.26 I suppose you could add another floor or two over Marks and Spencer but no more	Campden Hill Towers to fund re-cladding to make the building more attractive. This is unlikely to proceed because the flats are in multiple ownership with long leases and has been removed from the SPD.	
3.3	Laure Ghouila-Houri		I agree with the comments but would like to add that the traffic on Kensington Church Street in the direction to High Street Kensington should be addressed. It is currently a bottleneck and it takes forever to drive down that road.	This is beyond the remit of this SPD as the traffic is most likely caused by the junction with Kensington High Street.	No change
3.4	David Colver		What is distinctive about Notting Hill Gate is not the shopping, or the road, the like of which can all be found elsewhere in the borough. It is the presence of the underground station. The crowding in that station's ticket halls approaches intimidating levels at busy times. Since the existing layout and buildings date back to the 1950s and 1960s, any redevelopment of the area presents a once in fifty year chance of remedying this issue, which will reach impossible levels in another few decades. Extracting a meaningful reconstruction of this facility as a by-product of any redevelopment should be RBKC's dominant priority in this exercise.	Re-constructing Notting Hill Gate station is not currently high on London Underground's priorities. Opportunities to introduce step free access continue to be investigated with TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect this..	SPD amended for step free access
3.5	Kensington Heights Property Company Limited (Tim Tinker)	Kensington Heights Property Company Limited	* Effect of the proposals on traffic density along Campden Hill Road We note the draft SPD proposes reducing the number of traffic lanes along Notting Hill Gate, in order to widen the pavements. Traffic along Campden Hill Road has continued to increase in recent years, making it	The scheme as described has been subject to initial testing by consultants, on behalf the Council. It would not proceed without additional design refinement, testing, and the	SPD amended for step free access

			<p>unpleasant for local residents and hazardous for pedestrians. You will have the statistics as the Highways Department have been monitoring flows. Our concern is that the draft report does not in any way address how traffic, restricted in using Notting Hill Gate may well divert along Campden Hill Road and the feeder residential streets linking Campden Hill Road to Kensington Church Street. Our experience during the closure of Notting Hill Gate in the summer is that there could well be additional traffic pushed onto Campden Hill Road and the adjacent residential streets. We are very concerned about this.</p> <p>* Improvements to Notting Hill Gate Tube Station We consider the draft report is not tough enough about requiring improvements to disability access to the station concourse and to the District and Circle Line. There is an excellent escalator connection to the Central Line but this is two floors of steps down and to allow this situation to continue into the mid 21st century seems to us to be unacceptable, particularly bearing in mind the volume of passengers using this tube station... TFL must be pressed much harder on this one. We gather funds collected through parking fines may well be available to assist in the finance. Apart from the needs of local people, if you consider the volume of overseas tourists that use this tube station to get to Portobello Road, the present access/egress for the disabled and those with prams seems a poor advertisement for what is claimed to be and in many ways is a vibrant 21st century global city.</p>	<p>Council and TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable.</p> <p>Improvements to Notting Hill Gate Station are very low on TfL's priorities so they will not fund this work. The SPD has been amended to reflect the opportunity to deliver step free access as part of development proposals.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

3.6	Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Mark Mathews)	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	Paragraph 3.25 of the draft SPD relates to greening of the area through planting of street trees and greenery. Thames Water support the approach to increase planting, however, the location of new tree and shrub planting needs to be carefully considered so that it would not introduce damage below ground infrastructure both now and in the future as tree roots grow. Consideration should also be given to the potential to incorporate sustainable drainage techniques into any public realm improvements to minimise run-off into the drainage network. Any redevelopment proposals would be expected to comply with the requirements of Policy CE2 of the adopted Core Strategy to ensure that there is a reduction in the volume and speed of runoff into the drainage system.	Any planting proposals that emerge would be reviewed by the Borough's Arboriculturalists to ensure they would not result in the damage described.	Noted
3.7	Yashmin and Alex Jeffries	3 Streets and spaces	Section 3: Streets and Spaces The proposals (page 12 Sketch of public realm proposals) show a few new trees to be planted on Notting Hill Gate. In my view, this is not nearly enough greenery. Trees and shrubs in the central reservation are the main way in which this ugly street scene can be beautified, but it appears that only nine new trees are being proposed (though the drawing is not clear). I would support a significant replanting scheme of trees, shrubs and planters, both on the pavements and in the central 'islands'. In terms of transport, I have strongly supported elsewhere in this consultation the provision of 'step-free' access to the Underground at Notting Hill - essential for disabled people such as me. I do not support relocating the bus stop from Pembridge Road to Notting	At this stage the scheme has not been finalised so the trees and greenery illustrated is only indicative. The final scheme would be consulted upon separately. The SPD has been amended to make this clearer. Comment noted, the impact of the proposals on disabled access would be considered before a decision was taken.	Noted

			<p>Hill Gate itself. This means a long walk for disabled people from e.g. Tesco's to the Southbound bus routes and puts a new stop too close to the next stop at Palace Gardens Terrace. I have written elsewhere about the space in front of Newcombe House. Undesirable people (drunks, beggars, pickpockets) already congregate here and I am opposed to provision of "a public space to linger" for this reason. I wholeheartedly support the proposal to achieve 'step free access' to the District/Circle lines and - preferably - also to the Circle Line. I am a disabled local resident and am unable to use the underground at Notting Hill station as I cannot climb the many stairs from the District/Circle Lines to the ticket hall and again the stairs from the ticket hall to the street level. This would transform my life, but would also help disabled visitors coming to Notting Hill Gate for e.g. Portobello Road market</p>	<p>Comment noted, however, the space being proposed would be privately owned publicly accessible space so the owners could move on anyone they considered was behaving in an undesirable way.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to reflect the opportunity to introduce step free access as part of development proposals.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>SPD amended for step free access</p>
3.8	Irving		<p>I welcome the proposed public realm improvement scheme and believe the cost of this should be high on the priority for S106 items. 3.37 refers to sustainable travel and should be expanded to explain the Council's policy on permit free development and low levels of parking (as set out in Section 3 of the Borough's Transport SPD). I believe that given NHG's excellent public transport links and poor air quality there should be few parking spaces within new developments.</p>	<p>Noted. Since permit free development and parking provision are covered in a borough-wide SPD there is no need for this issue to be covered in this SPD.</p>	<p>No change</p>

3 .9	Roger Laschelles		<p>Escalators I am of the view that it is time for London Underground people to change their attitude from sluggish creaking lifts, to wide tread, all weather, short escalators. You have to WAIT for lifts and that puts a lot of people off. I guess we need to know who MAKES short-haul escalators and what the COST!!! LU can probably use of them and should qualify for a quantity discount!! Then if LU puts up thin excuses for NOT putting them in, we need people like the RBK&C to lean on them, to force their hand. It is ridiculous in a city the size of London to talk about the prohibitive cost of escalators. The passenger throughput at Notting Hill Station would almost justify gold-plated escalators!! TENS OF THOUSANDS of passengers surge in and out of that station every day. It is time we dragged L kicking and screaming into the 21st century!!! The proposed development of NHG gives the RBK&C a perfect excuse for raising absolute hell!!!! I might add 'en passant' that the Holland Park Station simply cries to heaven for (rather longer) escalator access to its platforms. This is dreadful, draft, cold station and maybe the first stage should be a visit from the Luftwaffe, followed by a total re-build of the whole shooting-box to modern standards?? I hope your Director of Planning could deliver a well-earned kick about this station as well.</p>	<p>Escalator provision would be a matter for TfL not the Council. The downside of escalators is that they are less sustainable because they move continuously, lifts only move when people are there to use them. Unfortunately Notting Hill Gate is not high on London Underground's priorities for station improvement, and this is beyond the influence of the Director of Planning.</p>	No change
------	------------------	--	---	---	-----------

3.10	Donald Cameron		(iv) The suggested "open spaces" needs a dose of reality. Because of the high buildings the wind whistles around and open spaces will not work as a recreational area.	Wind modelling will be required as part of the assessment of the acceptability of any proposed building.	Noted
3.11	Elizabeth Shaw		Pedestrian and Vehicular traffic increase and housing increase I do not think that sufficient cognisance has been taken that, in the future, both pedestrian and vehicular traffic and housing need is going to increase substantially due to the anticipated increase in London's population. Even if private car numbers can be reduced there will still be an increase in vehicular traffic due to public buses, service and emergency vehicles. Oxford Street is an example of this. Private vehicles have been banned but there is often a 'bus jam' Therefore to accommodate this. I think that ground level open space should be increased substantially	London's population is increasing and this is likely to continue. For London to continue to grow and remain a 'liveable' city the emphasis must switch from the private car to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, and streets cannot be used to store buses as currently in Oxford Street. It is not possible to increase the space at ground level because this is occupied by very valuable buildings, what can be done is to make better use of the existing space.	No change
3.12	Elizabeth Shaw		3. Bus stops should be on roads with lesser traffic. I think there should be no increase in buses stopping in Notting Hill Gate unless very significant increase in carriageway and pavement width can be obtained as described above. This would not be obtained at peak hours by just removing the parking bays, as parking bays are currently only for off peak hours. 4. Section 5.50 I strongly support restaurant and cafe WCs being freely available to non-customers.	Unfortunately bus routes are on major roads so it is not possible to relocate bus stops to roads with less traffic. The scheme proposed will not proceed unless TfL are satisfied that it will not have an unacceptable effect on traffic.	Noted

3.14	Charlotte Pennington		<p>Point 3.12 I believe too much attention is being given to pedestrians in this proposal Notting Hill Gate needs to flow properly with adequate roads and parking General pedestrians walk across the roads in random places and ignore the multiple crossings Cyclists are not a priority - they are often rude, aggressive and ignore lights Attractive public areas would be welcomed without fountains which fill up with rubbish and elephants this time please Definitely the way to Portobello Road needs to be clearly marked - I spend hours giving tourists directions Public lavatories are required for the general public and tourists - as one of the most eminent areas for tourists it is embarrassing that we do not have appropriate public facilities - to date men walk round into Uxbridge St and Jameson St and urinate up any walls available - particularly during the Carnival</p>	<p>London's population is increasing and this is likely to continue. For London to continue to grow and remain a 'liveable' city the emphasis must switch from the private car to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport. The behaviour of cyclists is not a planning matter but this is a matter of concern to a lot of people that can only be tackled by police enforcement and cycle training initiatives. Requirement for public lavatories, signage to Portobello Road but not fountains and Elephants noted.</p>	
3.15	Michael St. J. Wright		<p>A) You may say that some of the present arrangements are "pedestrian unfriendly", but surely charges such as reducing some lanes to two would be very bad for the considerable use that Notting Hill Gate has consisting for Ambulances, Police Cars and Fire Engines. As it is, I rarely walk half the length of NHG without hearing or seeing one of these! I noticed last week that, even with three lanes, traffic had come to a complete halt the whole length from the Russian Embassy to the beginning of Holland Avenue. Similarly stopping all traffic movement simultaneously in favour of pedestrians would increase their failure to reach their destinations in good time. B) Signs to Portobello Road. Surely the</p>	<p>The scheme as described has been subject to initial testing by consultants, on behalf the Council. It would not proceed without additional design refinement, testing, and the Council and TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable.</p> <p>Suggestions noted and will</p>	Noted

			<p>problem could be alleviated by the following:</p> <p>1) For pedestrians on the pavements, add immediately beneath the existing signs "Pembridge Road" the words "Leading to Portobello Road" with arrows pointing north.</p> <p>2) For people coming out of the tube, direct them to the exit no.3 before they get far beyond the escalators. There is already a sign, but only if they have turned right rather than left in the first place.</p> <p>3) When they come near to the left turn into Portobello Road from Pembridge Rd, have large signs on both sides of the road facing them with "Portobello Road" and large arrows.</p> <p>C) Shoppers would be helped if all shops were made to put (preferably prominently and in the same type face, at the same height) their street number! They are virtually all lacking between Linden Gardens and Pembridge Gardens. This would cost virtually nothing!</p>	be investigated.	
3.16	Michael St. J. Wright		<p>F) It is a great pity that when there was a six months blockage near the tube entrances, that a underground link from the N-S subway to the relatively wide pavement westwards by Boots.</p>	<p>Unfortunately we are unable to take opportunities of this kind because creating a new underground access requires considerable planning, consultation and funding.</p>	No change
3.17	Washbourne Field Planning (C Griffin)		<p>The Museum is supportive of aims to enhance the local environment in Notting Hill Gate. Initiatives to strengthen 'connectivity' to and through the area, and the ease of movement for pedestrians and improvements to the public realm should be actively pursued. A lateral minded and creative approach ought to be embraced.</p>	Support noted.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Comprehensive redevelopment removed from SPD</p>

3.18	Peter Thompson		<p>Section 3.8: The cycle stands outside Crispin's and Frae on Notting Hill Gate are poorly located; they seem to be used infrequently and should be removed. This would be a very cheap way of improving pedestrian circulation. Section 3.9: Agree the street furniture (= clutter) is poor and much of it could be removed. Section 3.10: Congestion around the bus stops at the north end of Ken Ch St is not evident to me. Widening the walkway at this point would be fine, but not necessary as a result of the bus stops. Section 3.11: Don't agree that creating pedestrian access direct to Jameson Street would be good. It would increase noise from the busy thoroughfare of NHG into Hillgate Village, and increase foot traffic down Jameson St itself which as you say is currently a quiet street. Many families with children live in Hillgate Village and are presently able to play on the sidewalks; if this became a throughway they might lose that freedom. This change would create another problem area just like the point throughway at Farmers Street is. It would be better to simply solve that issue and not create another one. I object to the increased noise and access to Jameson Street this would create. Section 3.12 I do not believe that reducing the lanes of traffic on Kensington Church Street would be a good thing. The only time I perceive pedestrian traffic in this location to be a problem is the carnival and it does not seem sensible to exacerbate the already very congested traffic on this street for a two day a year event. I have not experienced any problem in passing the bus stop. This area is in no way comparable to Oxford Street in</p>	<p>Comment noted, it may be possible to relocate these cycle stands as part of redevelopment.</p> <p>This was something that the Council had identified as a problem, particularly at peak times</p> <p>Newcombe House Option 2: Comprehensive approach has been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>The reference to Oxford Street only related to the innovative crossing installed at Oxford Circus that allows diagonal pedestrian crossing.</p>	
------	----------------	--	--	---	--

			<p>pedestrian congestion. Section 3.18: The current design of the service area at the end of Uxbridge St mean that it is used by homeless people as a shelter and a communal toilet. Any design for the future should actively discourage or not enable this use. Section 3.21: In general our preference is for public green space rather than expensive public art in paved spaces</p> <p>Section 3.32: This could be achieved in part by banning parking along Notting Hill Gate, allowing the road to be used as a through-route whilst also providing for wider pavements. The pavements will only be useful where street clutter is also removed.</p> <p>Section 3.42: This could be achieved by placing width restrictions at the entrance to Hillgate Village in a way that still allows emergency services to access the area.</p>	<p>The space that could be created in Notting Hill Gate behind Newcombe House could not be a green space because it would be too shaded and too intensively used to suit grass.</p> <p>Banning parking on Notting Hill Gate would be resisted by businesses and people who find it convenient to stop and shop, and would increase parking pressure in the side streets.</p> <p>Width restrictions in Hillgate village would be a matter for our Transport Department but this would not be appropriate to include in an SPD.</p>	
3.19	Mark Treasure		<p>The Notting Hill Gate Strategic Planning Document refers to a need to reduce traffic domination at Notting Hill Gate, and also to increase 'sustainability'. However, the indicative design presented in the document (Figure 3) suggests that little thought has been given to making cycling - a mode of transport that could significantly reduce the impact of motor traffic in the area, and improve sustainability - a pleasant and viable option for everyone. We feel that that the proposed design will do very little to increase the numbers of people cycling in the area. It therefore represents a major missed opportunity. Indeed, the only</p>	<p>Cyclists have been considered in this scheme. The plan, as you say, would be to provide a wider inside lane and Advanced Stop Lines at traffic lights to accommodate cyclists. A more ambitious scheme might include a separate cycle lane but this would be at the expense of additional space for pedestrians so a trade off has to be made. It may be more appropriate to investigate how to achieve</p>	<p>SPD amended to reflect cyclists needs</p>

			<p>proposals for cycling in the plan are 'wider nearside lanes' and Advanced Stop Lines. In the context of the width of this road - and the suggested intention to reduce the number of vehicle lanes in parts of the area covered by the plan - this is woefully inadequate. DfT figures suggest this stretch of road carries around 28,000 motor vehicles per day. Very few people are willing to share road space while cycling, when motor traffic volume is this high. This means that cycling will, to all intents and purposes, remain designed out of the area covered by the SPD. Physical measures are required to separate cycling from these levels of motor traffic, to make it an attractive and safe mode of transport, for people of all ages and abilities. The proposals fail to deliver this. Consequently substantial benefits to the area will be lost - benefits from reduced motor traffic, lower air and noise pollution, more people stopping and shopping in the area, and public health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>a cycling network in the wider area. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.</p>	
3 .20	Michele Hillgarth		<p>Transport is excellent and the Underground is outstanding. The pavements could be altered to make easier pedestrian traffic flow, and more space provided for pedestrians as there are certain spots with frequent congestion and lack of room for movement. Cycle lanes should certainly be a priority. There are far too many railings and poles on the pavements. The rear of David Game House is a disgrace to the expensive part of London we live in and should definitely be improved. The move of the farmers market is certainly positive, as it is not currently in a suitable area. There is a huge lack of greenery to complement the</p>	<p>Support for pavement widening, cycle lanes and the Farmers' Market and concern about railings, poles on the pavements, the rear of David Game House and lack of greenery noted. These issues are all tackled in this SPD: public realm improvements will include removing street clutter where possible and widening pavements; the inside lane will be widened to accommodate cyclists</p>	<p>Public realm improvements included in SPD</p>

			ghastly architecture of the high street, and the neighbouring roads (mainly Notting Hill Gate, the top of Kensington Church Street and the top of Pembridge Road, and also Bayswater Road).	and cycle lanes could be provided as part of a more ambitious scheme, if this does not adversely affect pedestrians.	
3.21	Dickson		3.12 The section between NHG and Pembridge Road is often blocked by stopped buses (which arrive in 3s). Moving the zebra crossing In PR nearer the mini roundabout would have a negative impact (even with more pedestrian area) as buses cross the mini roundabout and stop, so traffic backs up into the roundabout as cars turn into PR from KPR. Has any consideration been given to more buses stopping at the first stop in Kensington Park Road? I would support closing the first small stretch of Pembridge Road to traffic on Saturdays only, even though it would be personally inconvenient. 3.24 The space in front of Newcombe House gives a real feeling of space - it would be detrimental to lose it. 3.35 I don't understand the rationale for making the link between Victoria Gardens to NHG wider. Its fine as it is and I've never seen it busy.	The scheme as described has been subject to initial testing by consultants, on behalf the Council. It would not proceed without additional design refinement, testing, and the Council and TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable. Concern about loss of space in front of Newcombe House noted. The Council is keen to see this link improved and made more attractive.	Noted
3.22	Bulmer Mews Management Limited (J Gardner)	Bulmer Mews Management Limited	3.10 It is important to stress that the crowds are predominantly a Saturday issue as the root of the overcrowding is the additional tourist trade to Portobello Market on Sats. 3.10 You need to clarify where the "congestion around bus stops in Kensington Church St" occurs - is this Waterstones or in the Mall near the Czech Embassy. KCSt is a long road and this lack of clarity is unhelpful.	The congestion identified was around the bus stops by Waterstones, this is where pavement widening is suggested. The congestion identified was around the bus stops outside the shops along Kensington Church Street that include Waterstones. The SPD has been amended as requested.	SPD amended to reflect pavement widening

3.23	Hollick		<p>The intention to make NHG more pedestrian friendly is most welcome. Pavements in Pembridge Road (PR) from NHG to Portobello Road are too narrow and in many cases dangerous. The re-sitting of the bus stop from PR to NHG is a good start but unless the pavements are widened on the eastern side of PR between NHG and Portobello Road the overcrowding will not be materially improved. The suggestion that PR from the mini roundabout to Portobello Road be closed to all traffic on Saturday is an excellent one. Making PR from NHG to Portobello Road for public transport (Buses and taxis) only is well worth investigating not least because it would dramatically reduce the traffic, noise and pollution along PR and make PR from HNG to the mini roundabout a public space similar to the successful transformation of Exhibition Road.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>This is an interesting idea but this is a major north south route in the borough so it may not be feasible.</p>	Noted
3.24	'Commuter cyclist from Milton Keynes' (Andrew Lockley)	'Commuter cyclist from Milton Keynes'	<p>Please can you explain how you will safely accommodate mass cycling in this plan? In East and Central London, more journeys are made by bike than by car at peak times. I am not aware of any evidence that suggests cycling at this level has been given any serious consideration in the plan.</p>	<p>This plan has considered how Notting Hill Gate can better address the needs of cyclists and pedestrians. The Council is also investigating how a cycle network can be established in the wider area. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.</p>	Cyclists needs taken into account in SPD
3.25	hfcyclists, cycle campaign in Hammersmith and Fulham (Ingram)		<p>We are disappointed by your proposals for cycling. The memorial bike you have pictured reminds us clearly of Elidh Cairns death in this area almost five years ago. No measures appear to have been taken to reduce the danger of this area for cyclists. Not do we feel your proposals Armstrong enough. As with Kensington High Street</p>	<p>This photo was included specifically to highlight concerns about cyclists' safety. If a more ambitious scheme is developed this may include more radical interventions to promote</p>	Cyclists needs taken into account in SPD. Key has been amended

			<p>which is paralleled by the A4, the nearby A40 provides clear relief to through traffic on this road. However, levels remain high and far in excess of those we'd expect to see significant measures to physically increase the separation of cyclists from traffic. Given the increasing proportion of KSIs which are cyclists in yours and neighbouring boroughs we expect to see action to bring about casualty reduction. Cyclists heading from central London to Hammersmith, Shepherd's Bush, Fulham and beyond pass through your major roads such as Notting Hill Gate in large numbers. Cycle Crossrail can only cater for some of these journeys and will do nothing for those working in RBKC at the many shops and offices. Their safety matters. Additionally without clear changes on the roads we know many feel unsafe cycling into town. Even on our led ride for Ride London we had adults who refused to ride along your major roads due to past experiences. You need to review the constraint you are setting yourselves against segregation at the earliest opportunity. It is blocking routes into the rest of West London and has a significant safety impact. Wider near side lanes and ASLs are very weak measures. Finally, during construction of any major buildings large volumes of dangerous vehicles will be involved. We expect proper consideration leading to training for drivers, standards on trucks and arrangement of routes to avoid conflict, especially on Holland Park Avenue.</p>	<p>cycling but space is limited so there will need to be a trade off between the needs of cyclists and pedestrians. The Council is also investigating how a cycle network can be established in the wider area. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Any significant planning permissions granted in this area would include a construction management statement setting out how these issues would be addressed.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

3.26	hfcyclists, cycle campaign in Hammersmith and Fulham		<p>p12 drawing - I suggest that a new bus stop is added in Kensington Park Road for the 452 and 52 opposite the northbound one. This will alleviate the weight of buses stopping and people all getting off in Pembridge Rd to only the 27, 28 and 328. The 31 already misses that stop as it turns right into Notting Hill Gate for its stop. The proposal to move the current bus stop to Notting Hill Gate is merely moving the crowds to create an even worse bottle neck at the tube entrances. It is better where it is; with I propose a split of buses - 52/452. I do not understand the proposed new build out near Bulmer Mews/zebra crossing in Kensington Park Rd. This is already a large pavement and tourists don't tend to use this to Portobello. The crossing across Ladbrooke Rd to Kensington Temple needs to be nearer the corner, as people tend to walk from corner to corner and ignore the crossing which is dangerous. Why move the crossing in Pembridge Rd nearer to the roundabout, as this means cars will just sit on it as they wait to enter the roundabout. This is impractical. Seem an excessive number of crossings: 5 in total - why do we need a new crossing near the corner of Pembridge Rd and Notting Hill Gate or two as you turn from Kensington Church St. So many crossings will lead to a lot of stationery traffic and therefore emissions. Why is Kensington Church St losing a lane, given the 390 bus uses the right hand lane as a bus stand, so we already are a lane down. The key is inadequate - what are the red and purple boxes? 3.26 Loss of P&D bays on Notting Hill Gate is bad for local businesses as people do use these bays for</p>	<p>The scheme as described has been subject to initial testing by consultants, on behalf the Council. It would not proceed without additional design refinement, testing, and the Council and TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable.</p> <p>The boxes are bus stops the key has been amended.</p> <p>P&D spaces would be replaced in nearby side streets. However recent</p>	SPD amended as per Council response
------	--	--	---	---	-------------------------------------

		<p>quick shopping. As a Council we need to encourage our businesses and trade - this is retrograde to move these round the block or two. It is not the same as outside shops. The traders found life v difficult when the main road was cut off recently by the months of roadworks - they need this passing trade and parking on their doorsteps is key to this. 3.19/20 The signage is poor - please no more of the monoliths, as they are too small to read and once you have a few people in front of them, no one else can see. Signs on lampposts pointing to key attractions which are clear to see when in a crowd are key to the area and currently missing. Larger and more prominent signage, whilst tasteful. 3.14 - I find it hard to believe the modelling has ensured it does not have "any" unacceptable impact on traffic flows. It is very easy to see if you go to Holland Park Ave the impact of two lanes of traffic and the bottle neck this causes. In Notting Hill Gate you are now proposing two lanes and a bus stop where all the buses will need to move across two lanes of traffic to get into the right-hand lane to turn right. It is nonsense. 3.25 - greening: the SPD cannot seek wider pavements and then add trees, as this defeats the very purpose widening the pavements by taking away footpath for pedestrians. 3.29 - air pollution: the proposals seem to encourage more stationery traffic (e.g. 5 crossings in NHG itself) and stationery traffic is what emits more of the harmful fumes. 3.31 - the first bullet needs to include mention of "without increasing stationery traffic and emissions" and on the last bullet regarding off street</p>	<p>research from the LGA has shown that shopkeepers consistently overestimate the amount of trade they get from car borne shoppers and underestimate the amount from pedestrians. Pedestrians visit more often and as a result spend more. Obviously the disruption caused by the recent roadworks was a quite different scale.</p> <p>The Legible London monoliths are a London-wide scheme.</p> <p>This clearly has to be a compromise, there are street trees in Notting Hill Gate that help soften the area's appearance and improve air quality. There may be some opportunities to increase the number of trees.</p> <p>The objective must be to increase air quality. 3.41 The permitted hours for street servicing are a matter for our Transport Department and should not be addressed in an SPD.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>servicing should add that this is "not beyond 9pm and nor anti-social hours". 3.36 - it is important that the places to sit do not become havens for street drinkers or people to congregate for anti social purposes, as has been the experience in some areas. 3.38 - if people are waiting at bus stops, overcrowding isn't necessarily reduced particularly if the road set up reduces traffic capacity and buses become less frequent as a consequence. 3.41 - off-street servicing: it is important that conditions are set on the hours of use for such off-street servicing, so that residents and businesses can co-exist. Whilst people put up with 2am or 4am deliveries for the Olympics it was on the basis that this was a 2 week period. Off street servicing cannot be at the expense of the peaceful enjoyment and sleep of residents and this Para needs to add a caveat to protect residents.</p>	<p>Similarly street drinking is a matter for the Police, and, in the case of private space, the landowners.</p> <p>3.38 This would need to be a compromise that achieves both aims. Initial work suggests this can be achieved.</p>	
3.28	Christiania Bikes UK (Andrea Casalotti)	Christiania Bikes UK	<p>I am dismayed to see that you are not providing any facilities for safe cycling. This is a difficult junction to avoid for people living in and visiting the area. Anyone cycling with children is being put off cycling. I really don't understand why you cannot put proper segregated lanes so that children can cycle to the parks safely. There is certainly plenty of space.</p>	<p>Cyclists have been considered in this scheme. The plan would be to provide a wider inside lane and Advanced Stop Lines at traffic lights to accommodate cyclists. A more ambitious scheme might include a separate cycle lane but this would be at the expense of additional space for pedestrians so a trade off has to be made. The Council is also investigating the opportunity to create a cycle network in the wider</p>	<p>Cyclists needs taken into account in SPD</p>

				area and the SPD has been amended to reflect this.	
3.29	Roxylight (Roxylight)	Roxylight	Our clients support 're think' in terms of pedestrian accessibility and the public environment. Traffic currently dominates this part of Notting Hill Gate making it an unpleasant and threatening environment for residents and visitors. We would support large scale pedestrianisation and our clients wish to see more ambitious proposals for the improvement of the pedestrian environment in this location. Any pedestrian and public environment scheme should be comprehensive and consider the how the various development sites would contribute positively to this new environment. A set of public realm design codes could be considered.	Support for more ambitious improvements for pedestrians noted. The intention is that the public realm improvements would be funded by developer contributions but implemented by the Council so a public realm design code is not considered appropriate.	Noted
3.30	Diana Williams		I have lived here since 1965 and thanks are due to Joanna Hammond for sending me a large print copy. I would like to comment as follows:-1. Notting Hill Gate is a notorious wind tunnel and indeed three of us were blown over when waiting for a bus outside Waterstones in January. I trust any change in structures will help solve this problem. 2. I am disabled and the document appears to disregard our needs! 3. The doctors surgery (Dr. Richard Hooker) used to be sited at the north end Palace Gardens Terrace but had to move to 73 Holland Park to gain additional space. Could they be considered for the proposed new Primary Care Centre	<p>The Council is aware of the wind tunnel issue, although not to the extent that people had actually been blown over. Providing step-free access to the tube station is being investigated with TfL.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended reflect opportunities to provide step free access that may come forward as a result of development.</p>	SPD revised to include step free access

			as they are an excellent and very popular practice ?		
3.31	Jeremy Amos		<p>1. A solution to accessibility to Notting Hill Gate underground station might be the introduction of high quality pavement-located lifts with access to the current ticket hall & to the Circle/District line platforms, with separate ticketing control at the latter.</p> <p>2. The Metasequoia Glyptostroboides planted in the central reservations in NHG have not been a success. They are ugly in winter & inappropriate in summer. They should be replaced with more suitable trees with a softer profile and greater winter attraction.</p>	<p>The reason proposals have concentrated on putting lifts into buildings is that the pavements are overcrowded and lifts require substantial housing above the actual lift cage so they are bulky bits of equipment to put onto a pavement.</p> <p>It is likely that the planting scheme would be reconsidered as part of this proposal.</p>	Noted
3.32	Shala Kaussari-Dick		<p>Section 3: Streets and Spaces: The proposals (page 12 Sketch of public realm proposals) show a few new trees to be planted on Notting Hill Gate. In my view, this is not adequate greenery. What is needed is a significant replanting scheme of trees, shrubs and planters, both on the pavements and in the central 'islands'. I am relatively new in this neighbourhood and find this area very intimidating especially when I come home on my own at night. There are usually undesirable people (drunks, beggars, pickpockets) congregating and the proposed scheme will provide a larger space for lingering.</p>	<p>At this stage the scheme has not been finalised so the trees and greenery is only indicative. The final scheme would include more detail on planting plans. Opportunities to design out crime would be considered as part of developing the final scheme. If an open space was provided as part of redevelopment of Newcombe House this would be privately owned and managed.</p>	Noted

3.33	English Heritage (Richard Parish)	English Heritage	Sustainability 2.13 In addition to the two strands of sustainability mentioned in respect of new development the NHHP also makes the conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance a key principle of sustainability. You may therefore wish to add that the SPD identifies opportunities to enhance both designated heritage assets and their setting through public realm improvements.	The SPD has been amended as shown in the next column.	SPD revised to reflect importance of conservation and heritage assets
3.34	White		There must be some public space preferably on Newcombe House site.	The Council expects publicly accessible space to be provided as part of redevelopment of Newcombe House. This will be privately owned not true public space.	Open space included in SPD
3.35	Stephen Dunkin		It is rather ironic that the Station originally had step free access presumably by lift (like Holland Park) as pictures clearly show the above ground Station where the RBS Bank now stands on the corner of Pembridge Gardens before the 1960's development. The cost and feasibility of using the site again for its previous station use could be considered because the area is very congested at certain times. The northern end of Kensington Church Street should be reverted back to two way traffic with bus stops both sides of the road. The current situation where all southern traffic is channelled through the narrow Kensington Mall with its high concentration of residential flats is unreasonable for those residents. The bus stops are inconveniently located on the edge of Notting Hill Gate and many users have to cross a road to get there. The traffic lights on a motorway style arm at the	Originally there were separate two stations one for the Central and one for the District and Circle Lines. They were amalgamated and the station concourse was created under the road as part of the 50s road widening scheme. It is unlikely that there was step free access to the District and Circle Lines as this part of the station was not remodelled. The site of the original Central Line station was sold off and so is not available for re-use. Making the northern part of Kensington Church Street	Noted

			<p>junction with Campden Hill Road not only looks awful but gives the wrong message if traffic is to be discouraged. The motorway style of lighting that is regularly replaced with higher and more inappropriate lighting should be replaced with a more sensitive design which again can be seen in photos of the early 1950's (I do not mean the concrete lamps that blighted the Borough from the 1960's)</p>	<p>two-way would significantly increase congestion on this very busy bus route where buses turn north, south, east and west. Replacing these lights is something that can be considered in refining the public realm scheme.</p>	
3.36	Sebastian Millett		<p>Please do not move the zebra crossing in Pembridge Rd closer to the mini roundabout. At present it is already too close, as cars heading north block the mini roundabout junction whilst waiting for pedestrians to cross at the zebra crossing causing danger.</p>	<p>The scheme as described has been subject to initial testing by consultants, on behalf the Council. It would not proceed without additional design refinement, testing, and the Council and TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable.</p>	Noted
3.37	Alessandra Masoero		<p>I think we should have more green than planned. I support step free access to underground</p>	<p>At this stage the scheme has not been finalised so the amount of trees and greenery is only indicative. The final scheme would include more detail on planting plans.</p> <p>Ways of providing step free access to the underground are being investigated with TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Noted. Step free access included in SPD</p>

3.38	Fiona Lindblom		In my opinion there should be additional landscaping and tree planting. The area around Newcombe House is very unsightly and lack of trees and landscaping creates a wind tunnel effect with rubbish blown around.	At this stage the scheme has not been finalised so the amount of trees and greenery is only indicative. The final scheme would include more detail on planting plans. The back of Newcombe House is likely to be redeveloped.	Noted
3.39	St Helens Residents Association (Henry Peterson)	St Helens Residents Association	Streets and Spaces We support the section of the SPD on streetscape improvements, and the allocation of S106 funds to such works. There may still be scope for exploring changes to the Underground entrance on the south side of Notting Hill Gate, as part of the Newcombe House redevelopment, which would allow for step-free access to the platforms at a viable cost. We would see this as an important part of a long-term regeneration of the area.	Support noted. The SPD has been amended to identify opportunities to provide step free access that may come forward as a result of development.	Noted
3.40	Anon 24.01.14		1. No cultural centre needed complete waste of money and space. 2. Access to tube, provide lift from pavement to ticket hall for prams, luggage and disabled. Cheaper option and of some help. Glass structure at pavement level, both attractive and safe. Perhaps one set of steps south side could be converted. 3. A new surgery is required. 4. No buildings to be increased in height, except possible 1 more storey between Waterstones and Kensington Place, and as Camden Towers is unlikely to be demolished, an extra couple of floors would not notice but only if the owner agrees to improve the appearance of the existing structure. 5. Consideration for cycle lanes	The Coronet Cinema has recently been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor and this has been removed from the SPD. The SPD has been amended to reflect opportunities to provide step free access that may come forward as a result of redevelopment.	Cultural attraction removed from SPD Step free access included in SPD. Other changes as per

			would be an advantage. 6. As many trees and planting as is possible, preferable to 'doubtful' art work.	<p>The reason proposals have concentrated on putting lifts into buildings is that the pavements are overcrowded and lifts require substantial housing above the actual lift cage so they are bulky bits of equipment to put onto a pavement.</p> <p>The document explains that a new primary healthcare centre is required.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to remove reference to the opportunity for taller buildings.</p> <p>The opportunity to provide cycle lanes will be investigated.</p>	Council response
3.41	E M Pedraz-Estevez		3. Streets & Spaces: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6. I approve with the stated suggestions and the observation/s re pedestrians. The cyclists are a real "MENACE" to the "pedestrians" and MUST "NOT BE ALLOWED" AT ANY TIME, TO USE THE "PAVEMENT/S". Air Pollution: THIS ITEM, does require action as there is very narrow space/street/s. DOES REQUIRE TO BE OBSERVED AND TO TAKE ACTION. TOO CONGESTED AND CROWDED ALL THE WAY.	Support noted, cyclists are not permitted to use pavements.	Noted

3.42	Eileen Strathnaver		<p>Traffic is rightly identified as a serious problem, be it vehicular, cycle or pedestrian. I am not expert but I do have a couple of suggestions to make. The document identifies the east west route through Notting Hill Gate as six lane (Para 3.7). This is not strictly accurate. There are parking bays which reduce the width in places and the lanes narrow, ten wide, in a confusing pattern which has a significant impact on the free flow of traffic. Three lanes became two at points and are one serious cause of congestion already. To remove one lane in each direction permanently seems madness. This is, whether we like it or not, one of only two major east west routes out of London between the Cromwell Road and Westway. One idea however, might be to reinstate the old traffic flow pattern which did not allow vehicles to turn right out of Pembridge Road into Noting Hill Gate. This was a change introduced about ten years ago: possibly not for the better.</p>	<p>The scheme as described has been subject to initial testing by consultants, on behalf the Council. It would not proceed without additional design refinement, testing, and the Council and TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable.</p> <p>Suggestion noted, further testing would look at options like this.</p>	Noted
3.43	Eileen Strathnaver		<p>The suggestion of moving the south bound bus stop from the east side at the top of Pembridge Road into Notting Hill Gate itself seems ill considered. It would then mean that the nos. 27, 28, 52, 328 and 42 would all have to turn across two lanes of constant traffic in order to turn right and head for Kensington Church Street. As an alternative, why not consider re-locating the south-bound stop for the nos. 52 and 42 somewhere on Kensington Park Road opposite the existing north bound stop for those two routes (which is next to Kensington Temple Church)? Since both</p>	As above	Noted

			routes come down Kensington Park Road anyway, there would be no impact on their routes and the congestion at the current bus stop would be reduced. I also welcome ANY reduction of "street furniture"!		
3.44	Eileen Strathnaver		The idea of making Pembridge Road pedestrian only maybe on Saturdays - is just plain ludicrous. What will become of the affected bus routes on probably the busiest day of the week in the area, not just for visitors but for residents as well, seeking to travel in and out of the area?	This is not a firm proposal but the bus route would need to be diverted down Westbourne Grove. The impact of this would be tested before any decision is taken.	Noted
3.45	Anna Orenstein-Cardona		I don't believe that moving the bus stop from Pembridge Road to Notting Hill Gate makes sense at all. It will only lead to further delays and traffic build up. I see already how congested the area is and can definitely tell you that if bus stops constantly at Notting Hill Gate, the flow of traffic will only worsen. Thank you kindly, Anna	The scheme as described has been subject to initial testing by consultants, on behalf the Council. It would not proceed without additional design refinement, testing, and the Council and TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable.	Noted
3.46	W. M. and D. L. Gabbitass		5. We support the Council's desire to improve the traffic system through the Gate and make it more pedestrian friendly. We certainly support making it safer and friendlier to cyclists, especially if it keeps them off the pavements, where they are a threat at almost any speed to the elderly, small children and disabled - whatever Ministers say. 6. We would much prefer the farmer's Market not be re-sited, but acknowledge the possibilities of making the space between Notting Hill Gate and Kensington Place under and behind	Support noted. Any development proposals will be assessed to ensure they would not have an	Noted

			<p>Newcombe House more attractive. However, we are opposed to any plan to for redevelopment of that space that attracts more vehicle traffic into it from Kensington Place. If the ideas in Para 6.8 are realised they should be on the basis of a pedestrian only precinct with delivery traffic only.</p>	<p>unacceptable impact of on local traffic conditions.</p>	
3.47	Estelle Beverley Hilton		<p>3. STREETS AND SPACES The masses of tourists who arrive on Saturdays need to be guided away from congesting NHG as quickly and efficiently as possible, not encouraged to mill around and linger. They need clear signs and a clear route to what they have actually come to see. Overhangs I gather RBKC are not in favour of overhangs, such as the one outside Calders and under Astley House. However if they are well designed and well lit, spacious arcades provide more pavement space, shelter from the rain, as well as giving visual pleasure and relieving the mass of a building facade - (think of beautiful European arcades!) By the way, the quirky mosaic pillars outside Calders are cheerful, and have survived well. . Pavement space Moving forward the replacement building for Newcombe House will make the corner outside Waterstones overbearingly dark and congested. It will also entail the loss of the only mature tree at the centre of NHG (it will be destroyed, whatever the 'hopes' are.) Even though this space is too windy to be a comfortable place to sit, it contributes enormously to the light, 'breathing space' and walking area at this junction.</p>	<p>3.19 makes it clear that signage is an acknowledged problem.</p> <p>The overhang that had been identified as presenting a problem is underneath David Game House where the pavement is congested. - ?</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to remove reference to taller buildings.</p> <p>The Council hopes that a new publicly accessible open space will be provided as part of redevelopment.</p>	<p>SPD includes reference to signage</p> <p>SPD amended to remove reference to taller buildings</p> <p>Open space included in SPD</p>

3.48	Savills Planning (Round)	Savills Planning	<p>3. Streets and Spaces Comments: Our clients support 're think' in terms of pedestrian accessibility and the public environment. Traffic currently dominates this part of Notting Hill Gate making it an unpleasant and threatening environment for residents and visitors. We would support large scale pedestrianisation and our clients wish to see more ambitious proposals for the improvement of the pedestrian environment and public realm in this location. This could include changes to the road surface and an 'oxford circus' style crossing. Any pedestrian and public realm scheme should be comprehensive and consider the how the various development sites would contribute positively to this new environment. A set of public realm design codes could be considered.</p>	<p>Support for re-think on Streets and spaces noted, but this is unlikely to include large scale pedestrianisation because of Notting Hill Gate's position in the road network. 3.17 specifically mentions the possibility of creating an 'Oxford Circus' style crossing.</p> <p>The intention is that the public realm improvements would be funded by developer contributions, and possibly other sources, but implemented by the Council so a public realm design code is not considered appropriate.</p>	Noted
3.49	Deborah Collinson and Associates (Deborah Collinson)		<p>There is a suggestion that the one way system in Jameson Street may be changed. This would be awful. We have enough problems already with huge lorries, skip lorries and delivery vehicles using it as a cut through trying to get down the street and having to reverse back with bleeps. This morning it took a skip lorry half an hour to negotiate back to Uxbridge Street with the result that pollution increases and residents are subjected to a lot of noise.</p>	<p>The SPD does not propose the one way system is changed, this was something that was discussed and dismissed at an earlier stage.</p>	No change

3.50	Deborah Collinson and Associates (Deborah Collinson)		The idea of spending such a huge amount of money on relocating the tube entrances is not a good one. It is a shocking waste of money.	There has been considerable support for providing step free access to the tube station and alternative solutions have emerged from discussions between developers and TfL, which would not be nearly as expensive as originally thought. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.	3.3 It is possible that step free access to the station concourse and lifts to the District and Circle Lines could come forward as part of proposals to redevelop Newcombe House and 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site). The only way that step free access to the Central Line could be provided would be through redevelopment of 78 Notting Hill Gate (the building currently occupied by RBS). Step free access included in SPD
3.51	N. Lindsay-Fynn		Section 3: Streets and Spaces The proposals (page 12 Sketch of public realm proposals) show a few new trees to be planted on Notting Hill Gate. There is not nearly enough greenery. The main street is very ugly, trees and shrubs in the central reservation would improve it tremendously, it appears that only nine new trees are being proposed. We would support a replanting scheme of trees, shrubs and planters, both on the pavements and in the central 'islands'. We do not support relocating the bus stop from Pembridge Road to Notting Hill Gate itself. It is a long walk from places like Tesco's to the Southbound bus routes and would put the new stop too close to the next stop at Palace Gardens Terrace. The space in front of Newcombe House is unsuitable as undesirable people loiter there,	At this stage the scheme has not been finalised so the amount of trees and greenery is only indicative. The final scheme would include more detail on planting plans. Concern about moving the bus stop noted. The space in front of Newcombe House would be completely redesigned if this site was redeveloped.	Noted Noted

			frightening at night.		
3.52	Marion Gettleson		<p>9. Sorting out the underground entrances by using the lobbies of office buildings is an excellent idea. 10. In a public transport hub, private parking should most definitely NOT be a priority. No more underground parking; no more digging out of basements. 11. Cyclists must be physically separated from the lethal traffic. 12. The appalling traffic jams already created by Westfield at Shepherd's Bush must be urgently addressed. Westfield is soon to be greatly enlarged, without provision for more road traffic. More flats; more retail. There will inevitably be gridlock for miles around - especially at Christmas. It's high time RBKC protested vigorously to its bi-Borough "partner" for further eroding the amenity of RBKC residents. I suggest RBKC seeks a judicial review over H&F's failure to consult over various issues related to Westfield. One remembers that the developers failed to conduct an environmental impact assessment for the original project. The sewers are already grossly inadequate. The current plan will make matters far worse. 13. It's time to be creative - to make a radical change - not for the sake of change, but to put Notting Hill Gate on the map as a desirable place to be, to work and to live. A new green piazza above the corner of Church Street would create a green space for real people. A 24/7 lift or escalator are necessary for family access, rather than creating another rest stop for alcoholics. Fountains, trees, green walls and small scale shops and catering establishments are to be encouraged.</p>	<p>Support for improving underground entrances and concern about private parking noted.</p> <p>Options to provide separate lanes for cyclists would be investigated as part of developing a more ambitious public realm scheme but this can present problems for pedestrians so there will need to be some form of compromise.</p> <p>This Council has no road traffic control powers in relation to Westfield.</p> <p>The Council hopes that a new open space will be provided as part of redevelopment of Newcombe House but believes such a space should be at ground level. This would be privately owned and managed space.</p>	<p>Needs of cyclists included in SPD</p> <p>Open space included in SPD</p>

3.53	Elizabeth Clarke		<p>Public Space A pleasant idea. Must allow for one or more pavement cafés. A glazed-over arcade would be good - not one that is built over and artificially lit. (Horrors take place in built-over passages - that created under Newcombe House, for example...). Who would be responsible for maintenance of a Winter Garden - regular tending of planting, weekly glass cleaning? Not on the rates, I hope. Step-free Underground Entrances Pointless. There is only about one other step-free underground station in the whole of central London. What is the point of getting people easily down to the trains, if they cannot get themselves upstairs again the other end? Trees Yes please. We are all so grateful to the N.H.G. Improvements Group for the afforestation created so far. Street Crossings and Guard Rails Notting Hill Gate is not a motorway. It is not the business of the Council to impede elderly residents quietly going about their shopping. I am glad you will alter the present dam fool and dangerous traffic island in Pembridge Road, which causes traffic turning right to swing left, thereby catching hapless pedestrians off guard. Closure of Pembridge Road Please, please, no. This would be extremely tiresome, horrible for all the neighbouring streets, and unnecessary. Green Walls You are right to be leery of these - however fashionable. The weight, the water, the constant maintenance - they are "green" in colour only. The only true green wall is one covered in ivy. Now that would be nice. Crime</p>	<p>If a space was created as part of redevelopment of Newcombe House it would be publically accessible private space maintained by the owners of the building not the Council (or the rates).</p> <p>There has been a lot of support for provision of step free access to the tube station so the Council is continuing to investigate how this could be delivered with TfL.</p> <p>Removing guard rails has been identified as an issue in 3.12</p> <p>Concern about closure of Pembridge Road on Saturdays and green walls noted.</p>	<p>Step free access included in SPD</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
------	------------------	--	---	---	---

3.54	Elizabeth Clarke		Toilets Why were the ones in the underground station allowed to disappear? The ladies' (I cannot speak for the gents') was a small paradise of cleanliness and charm, and a splendid welcome to the area. Why not restore these?	Desire to see toilets reinstated noted.	Noted
3.55	J Loxton Peacock		I live now in Jameson Place and am concerned about the idea of introducing tube entrance so close. I would like to see some way of giving priority to residents parking in the area as we are hijacked by estate agents etc and parking by day is a nightmare until they all go home.	Option 2 Newcombe House: comprehensive approach is now considered unlikely to come forward and has been removed from the SPD. Residents' parking is a matter for our Transport Department not an SPD. Estate Agents should not be parking in residents' bays and there are no business parking permits.	
3.56	Transport for London (Beth Havelock)	Transport for London	Transport for London Group Planning Windsor House 42 – 50 Victoria Street London SW1H OTL Phone 020 7222 5600 Fax 020 7126 4275 www.TfL.gov.uk TfL's Issues TfL has reviewed the Supplementary Planning Document for the Notting Hill Gate area and is generally of the view that transport could be given greater prevalence in the document. Considering the scale of the proposals identified in the document and the potential number of development sites, TfL is concerned that insufficient emphasis has been given to significantly improving local transport infrastructure and enhancing overall capacity for future demand. Whilst the significance of the transport network is recognised at the start of the document in	Desire for transport issues to be given more prevalence particularly in terms of development proposals and contributions noted. The Council has continued to discuss options to provide step free access to the tube station with TfL and is hopeful that a cost effective solution can be found. The SPD has been amended to reflect the opportunity to deliver step free access as part of development proposals. The Council would expect	Noted. Step free access included in SPD

			<p>the ' current situation', TfL does not feel this is supported throughout the SPD especially in the development proposals and contributions sections. More information is provided below relating directly to each transport mode. Modelling and Trip Generation As already identified, Notting Hill Gate itself makes up part of the SRN and the existing network conditions around this area already show high levels of congestion on both weekdays and weekends. Whilst TfL does not object 'in principle' to the proposals to remove one lane of traffic in both directions on Notting Hill Gate between Kensington Church Street and Pembridge Road, the potential growth from other developments in the area along with the possible options discussed in the SPD causes concern for TfL. Therefore, it is vital for RBKC to work closely with TfL to discuss and agree all future proposals for the area in accordance with London Plan policy 6.11 and 6.12. The Roads Task Force also identifies a long-term strategy for roads throughout London and a commitment to investment in street management and urban design, TfL welcomes further discussions with the council about how the SPD can respond to the RTF work streams. London Underground Notting Hill Gate London Underground (LU) Station is a key interchange site providing access to the District, Circle and Central lines. Currently, there is no Step Free Access (SFA) available at the station. As previously stated, considering the scale of potential development and especially the close proximity of the station to many of the development sites, TfL is disappointed that</p>	<p>to work very closely with TfL to develop these proposals.</p> <p>The SPD did not include step free access as a priority because early work suggested this was unaffordable, however, since the draft SPD was published further proposals have emerged and the Council is hopeful that a cost effective solution will emerge. Responses to the consultation on the draft SPD indicate that this is a higher priority than originally considered. The SPD has been</p>	<p>Step free access included in SPD</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 have been removed and a new 3.3 added 3.3 It is possible that step free access to the station</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

		<p>the SPD does not include any plans to provide step free access or enhance the station within the regeneration plan for the area. Furthermore, TfL is concerned that the tube station in its current form may not have the capacity to deal with future demand. London Plan policies 6.2 and 6.3 state that development's transport requirements must be taken into account and if improvements to the tube station are not included within this policy document, potential capacity and accessibility issues could arise in the future. Section 3.3 states that the responses to the public consultation identified that improvement to the LU station entrances and SFA were not a high priority. However, after reading through the responses to the public consultation, TfL feels that there would be some merit in investigating this further. The feedback seems to show a significant desire to improve the station access especially for people with reduced mobility. Additionally, point 7.10, states that the ' Funding of step free access will not be given priority over the other items', however considering the above comments, TfL believes there is public demand for SFA at Notting Hill Gate Station which would justify such a prioritisation. Currently the SPD prioritises other public benefits over the delivery of access improvements and other station enhancements. Whilst TfL acknowledges RBKC's plans for the area, it is concerned about the lack of contributions allocated to the upgrade of the station and requests the rationale behind this. Sections 3.3, 3.39, 7.10 and table 7 all state that other public benefits will receive funding from section 106 agreements rather than</p>	<p>amended as shown in the next column.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.10 has been amended as shown in the next column.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.39 has been amended as shown in the next column</p> <p>Table 7 has been removed from the final document as it is considered too prescriptive, negotiations will be conducted with individual developers based on the viability of each scheme.</p>	<p>concourse and lifts to the District and Circle Lines could come forward as part of proposals to redevelop Newcombe House and 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site). The only way that step free access to the Central Line could be provided would be through redevelopment of 78 Notting Hill Gate (the building currently occupied by RBS).</p> <p>Revised text 7.10: Improvements to the entrance to the underground would be very beneficial. A new northern entrance, and step free access to the Circle and District lines, will be sought.</p> <p>3.39 Improvements are possible to the underground station. On-street cycle parking will be provided as part of the public realm improvements identified in 3.12 above.</p> <p>Table 7 removed.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>station improvements. Considering the forthcoming developments, TfL requests further discussions with RBKC on the possibility of funding towards SFA at the station either through section 106 contributions or RBKC's CIL. TfL note that the borough has recently consulted on its CIL charging schedule and TfL welcomes further discussions with the council about spending priorities for its CIL. Additionally, it is requested that Table 7 is amended to reference the Central line in the column title. Whilst the SPD does not discuss SFA to Central line, this is something that is possible, should be and considered and therefore represented in this document. TfL were initially asked to provide an estimate for works to provide SFA at Notting Hill Gate, this was provided and is stated in section 3.3 as £12-16million. However, this figure was based on station improvements being undertaken in isolation of any major redevelopment of sites in the vicinity of the station. If SFA works were to be undertaken alongside a major development the costs could be considerably reduced. TfL requests this is made clear in the document and that the 'Development Guidelines' sections of the document includes references to developers liaising with TfL to try and facilitate SFA. Section 3.3 also states that the quote would only achieve SFA to the ticket hall, this is again incorrect and there are options to enable SFA to both the concourse and platforms. TfL requests the SPD is amended to reflect both of the above. TfL has concerns relating to Figure 12, Newcombe House Development Principal Plan (Option 2). The location of the LU station entrance</p>	<p>Newcombe House Option 2: comprehensive approach is now thought to be unlikely to come forward and has been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to refer to a network of bus services as shown in the next column.</p> <p>This is an SPD so the Council would not expect to reiterate London Plan policies.</p> <p>Table 7 had been removed</p>	<p>Comprehensive approach removed in SPD</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to refer to a network of bus services</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>shown is unlikely to be feasible considering the location of the existing ticket hall. TfL welcome discussions with RBKC to discuss this option. TfL also requests that in section 3.4 'new station entrance' is replaced with 'upgraded station entrance'. Finally, sections 6.18 and 7.10 discuss the option of improving station access with the redevelopment of the substation, in particular the upgrading of entrances and SFA to District and Circle lines. TfL would request these comments are removed from the SPD as there are many other options available that would deliver improved entrances and access to all platforms, particularly given TfL's preferred locations for lift shafts etc.</p> <p>Buses The SPD does not acknowledge the importance of the bus network in the local area and its role in supporting the new development opportunities that are outlined in the document. London Plan policy 6.3 states that the effects the development has on the transport network needs to be considered. As such, TfL would expect each application in the Notting Hill Gate area to include an assessment of the impact on the bus network, and where issues are identified TfL will seek funding for mitigation. This should be borne in mind when setting out potential funding allocations, such as in Table 7. TfL understands RBKC has the aspiration to relocate the southbound bus stop on Pembridge Road to Notting Hill Gate, as shown in figure 3. Whilst the principle of the relocation is considered to be acceptable, TfL requests additional information is provided, including detailed drawings of the proposed relocation. All of</p>	<p>The public realm proposals outlined in this SPD are only at a very early stage of development, as detailed proposals are developed these will be discussed with TfL.</p> <p>The Council is discussing options to improve provision for cyclists with TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>6.15 relates to Newcombe House Option 2 : Comprehensive approach which has been removed from the SPD.</p>	<p>3.</p> <p>The SPD takes cyclists needs into account</p> <p>Comprehensive approach removed from SPD</p>
--	--	---	---	---

			<p>the issues and details will have to be discussed and agreed with TfL and further discussions are welcomed.</p> <p>Cycling TfL welcomes RBKC's commitment to improving cycle safety and cycling infrastructure in the area to provide cyclists with more space on the carriage way and introduce advanced stop lines at junctions. The planned streetscape improvements must provide adequate provision for cyclists, and other road users. Therefore, is crucial for RBKC liaise closely with TfL on the design to ensure the proposals are in accordance with London Plan policy 6.9 and the Mayor Cycling Vision for London. TfL welcomes further discussions with the council on cycling issues.</p> <p>Pedestrian Movement TfL recognises the need to improve the footways in the SPD boundary to reduce pedestrian congestion. The Council's plan to declutter the pavements to improve the pedestrian environment, encourage movement and endorse the active street frontages is all welcomed, and will support the future economic growth of the area. Section 6.15 (bullet point 4), states that the ' Council will seek significant improvements to the tube entrance on the south side of the street', TfL requests this is amended to reflect all entrances on both the north and south side of the street as these are all equally congested and lack step free access. TfL is disappointed the SPD does not mention inclusivity for all users and requests the document is amended to reflect this. Reference should be made to step free access and inclusive design as stated in London Plan policy 7.2. The new public</p>	<p>The location of Legible London signs would be matter for our Transport and Highways Department, it would not be appropriate to specify this in an SPD. Contributions for improved signage would be sought as part of an overall package of public realm improvements.</p> <p>The document refers to the Council's Transport SPD (3.32) which details TfL's Best Practice Guidance. The SPD does not refer to the Council's pre-application advice service so we do not think it would be appropriate to refer to TfL's service in this document.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---------------------------

			<p>realm areas should demonstrate high quality accessibility for all users and developments should be designed for any disabled users and assessed on the step free access at the planning stage. TfL welcomes Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea's (RBKC) commitment to improving the signage in the area, and especially the routes to Portobello Market. After reviewing the existing signs, TfL requests the number of Legible London way finding signs is significantly increased to the south west of Notting Hill Gate Underground Station and along Portobello Road to encourage pedestrian movement in accordance with Policy 6.10 of the London Plan. Contributions should be sought from forthcoming developments to introduce new signage and update the existing way finding. TfL can provide more information on suggested locations and number of signs required, it is recommended RBKC liaises with TfL to agree the implementation of Legible London in the area. The SPD should make reference to TfL's Transport Assessment Best Practice Guidance as well as TfL's pre application advice service as this may assist developers wishing to submit planning applications in the future. Summary Overall, TfL welcomes this SPD to regenerate the Notting Hill Gate area, however would like to see more emphasis placed on improvements to the transport network, especially at Notting Hill Gate LU Station. TfL's main concerns are covered above however it is considered further discussions are required in relation to the LU station, pedestrian improvements and bus stop relocation to generate a successful outcome considering the scale of the</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			developments involved and the potential of the area.		
3.57	Environment Agency (Wioleta Osior)	Environment Agency	Based on a review of environmental constraints for which we are a statutory consulter, there are no environmental constraints under our remit (such as fluvial/ tidal flood risk, watercourses) that could affect the proposed designated area. The Lead Local Flood Authority will be able to advise if there are areas at risk from surface water flood risk (including groundwater and sewerage flood risk) in the Notting Hill Gate Area. The Surface Water Management Plan will contain recommendations and actions about how surface water flooding can be reduced. This may be useful when developing guidance for particular areas. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), measures can be designed or retrofitted into streets as well as other public spaces. The Susdrain website will have examples of SuDs that are appropriate for these types of areas - for more information http://www.susdrain.org	No comment to make.	Noted
3.58	Norland Conservation Society (Georgiana Lebus)	Norland Conservation Society	* Streets and spaces Improvements to the public realm, including a new public space, new street furniture and (depending on budgetary consideration) some new public art would be welcomed. While I support some proposals for returning original links from Hillgate village streets to the main thoroughfare, the pressure on the streets behind in Hillgate Village must be	Support noted Newcombe House Option 2 : Comprehensive approach which includes re-creating a pedestrian link to Jameson Street is now considered unlikely to come forward and has been removed from the SPD.	Noted

			sustainable. * I support the emphasis on energy-efficiency and sustainability in every aspect of the development. * Traffic - I support in theory the idea of providing more pedestrian space. But I am concerned as to the impact on the surrounding area. If cars cannot pass through Notting Hill Gate in order to reach Holland Park Avenue, Shepherd's Bush, Westfield and the West, there is a strong likelihood that (with the active assistance of Sat Nav) they will turn the residential roads to the north and south of Notting Hill Gate into rat runs,	The scheme as described has been subject to initial testing by consultants, on behalf the Council. It would not proceed without additional design refinement, testing, and the Council and TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable.	Noted
3.59		Norland Conservation Society	* I support the proposal to restore some of the original links from Hillgate Village to NHG - but am concerned at the additional pressure (footfall, parking) this may put upon the residential streets. * I think the proposal to join NHG to Kensington Place with a mews, cutting off Kensington Church Street and all its marvellous and unusual retail offering from the rest of NHG would be a terrible shame .	Concern about mews noted but there is considerable public support for creating a new publicly accessible space in Notting Hill Gate and this is the only site where it may be feasible.	No change
3.60	Michael Noel-Clarke		The plans seem to me to be eminently sensible, and I have the following comments: 1. The plans for additional pavement space near the tube station are good news, but I wonder how you will be able to avoid simultaneously worsening traffic problems there. 2. The new entrance to the tube station should include a lift from pavement level to the station. Many tourists are carrying luggage and the older residents among us would appreciate not having to lug our luggage down the stairs	The scheme as described has been subject to initial testing by consultants, on behalf the Council. It would not proceed without additional design refinement, testing, and the Council and TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable. Opportunities for providing step free access are being actively investigated with developers and TfL. The	Noted SPD amended for step free access

				SPD has been amended to reflect this.	
3.61	St Helens Residents Association (Henry Peterson)	St Helens Residents Association	Streets and Spaces We support the section of the SPD on streetscape improvements, and the allocation of S106 funds to such works. There may still be scope for exploring changes to the Underground entrance on the south side of Notting Hill Gate, as part of the Newcombe House redevelopment, which would allow for step-free access to the platforms at a viable cost. We would see this as an important part of a long-term regeneration of the area.	Support noted. Opportunities for providing step free access are being actively investigated with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.	SPD amended for step free access
3.62	Natural England (Piotr Behnke)	Natural England	Having looked through the SPD there aren't broadly any issues that Natural England would like to comment on, however there are a number of positive points to make about certain policies put forward. Firstly with relation to the inclusion of islands in the middle of the roads in order to allow for additional tree planting, this is welcomed and would help "green" the environment to some degree. Within section 3.24 – Greening, the use of green walls or greenery on the streets is always a welcome addition to any streetscape and if lacking would be a big benefit – where possible. The mention of Green Walls as well as Green and Brown Roofs in building and public realm design in section 3.30 is very much encouraged as it would help boost the Green Infrastructure (GI) in the area. Finally section 3.37 which seeks to promote	Support and comments noted	Noted

			<p>sustainable travel is welcomed as a way to help reduce air pollution, which as the document identifies, is a big issue in central London areas. Where mentioned in section 4.37 the reduction of carbon emissions and energy usage as part of any works carried out, this is welcomed as a way to contribute to creating a more sustainable future for Notting Hill Gate.</p>		
3.63	Penelope Laughton		<p>1 Transport NHG is rightly described as a 'transport interchange.' (2.7, p7) with 17 million journeys start or finish at the tube station (2.7). But the SPD seems to place more emphasis on tubes than on buses (2.7), just one of the 'multiple options for travel without a car.' (3.1, p 9). Sustainable travel above ground (2.12, p7) should include a focus on buses and not just pedestrians and cyclists. After all, 10 buses pass through the junction connecting people, for example, to Worlds End and Wandsworth, neither of which may be accessed directly by tube. The SPD implicates buses as a cause for congestion at NHG (3.6, p11) but they should be seen as part of the solution. If it is made easier to switch from one means of transport to another, it will lessen the need for car travel in the area and thus lessen the traffic congestion. Firstly, developing step-free access at the tube station would make NHG a true transport hub, as it will enable many more people (including the less physically able, those in wheel chairs, people with luggage, those pushing baby carriages or shopping trolleys) to switch means of transport. I would urge RBKC to take the lead on this and to pursue this option</p>	<p>The SPD has been changed to acknowledge that Notting Hill Gate has a network of bus services.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.12 has been changed as shown in the next column.</p> <p>Opportunities for providing step free access are being actively investigated with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Notting Hill Gate tube station is not a priority for LUL so improvements including step free access are only likely to come forward as a result of developer contributions.</p> <p>Closing Pembridge Road on Saturdays is not a firm proposal and proposals</p>	<p>SPD amended to reflect network of bus services</p> <p>Step free access included in SPD</p> <p>Noted</p>

		<p>vigorously with LUL rather than leave this to the developers (3.4, p 9), as well as with TFL (3.39, p17), with the aim of providing connectivity benefits in the short, medium and long terms, and to make it their highest priority throughout the consultation, planning and development processes. Secondly, RBKC should insist that TFL reinstate the electronic bus arrival information at all bus stops in and around NHG. The option of shutting Pembridge Road to traffic on a Saturday (3.17) should be strongly resisted as it will impede flow of buses and the important connectivity at NHG. If RBKC considers this option it should be only to make the road car free on Saturdays. 2 Pavement congestion The main problem is on Saturdays, the day of Portobello Road Market (3.10, p11). The proposed solution of pavement widening (fig 3, p12) may simply lead people to stop and hang around. Although pavement widening, resurfacing and renewal or eradication of street furniture will undoubtedly improve the look of the area, I suggest that the problem concerns flow of people, not of provision of space. Any pavement widening would need to be combined with other measures that address movement of people, for example: 1 improved way-finding (already noted in the SPD 3.20, p14), ideally the now standard one used in the West End so that non-locals are presented with a known format. 2 the positive idea of crowd management (5.32, p31) and meeters and greeters (5.50, p33) would be a useful allocation of resources; this should help alleviate crime around the tube station (5.35, p 31). 3 have a new step-free exit to NHG station opposite</p>	<p>would not progress without the Council and TfL being satisfied they would not impact unacceptably on traffic.</p> <p>The SPD identifies way-finding to Portobello Road as an issue that improvements to the public realm would need to address, this is likely to involve greater use of the Legible London signage that is now being implemented across London. Support for meters and greeters but not look-a-likes noted.</p> <p>Opportunities for providing step free access are being actively investigated with developers and TfL. Paragraph 3.3 of the SPD has been amended to reflect the fact that new options have emerged as shown above.</p> <p>These ideas are noted but they are beyond the scope of this SPD.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Step free access included in SPD</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>Boots/Recipese; indicate this as the key exit for Portobello Road Market within the tube station to allow the direction of people along Kensington Park Road, as well as along the overly congested and dangerous Pembridge Road. 4 create a local and transport information kiosk for the area from Holland Park to the Westway - the dilapidated convenience store on Kensington Park Road next to the Albert public house would be an ideal location for this. Joint funding from business rates and TFL. 5 inform people visiting Portobello Road Market that it may be accessed from Ladbroke Grove tube station as well as from NHG station – for example, arrive at one and leave at the other. This will necessitate communicating with writers of online, paper and digital tourist guides, public transport maps, etc, over the long term. The above suggestions would enhance the diagonal crossing noted (3.17, p13) and ensure freer movement in the area around the tube station and alternative access to Portobello Road Market. The idea of having look-a-likes at NHG is, in my mind, absurd (5.50, p33). This will only add to congestion and is more suited to the carnival atmosphere of Covent Garden or a circus, and is not certainly not appropriate to the district centre that is NHG, nor the residential properties that surround the tube station and which are found along the routes to the Market.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

3.64	John Learmonth		<p>Jameson Street to NHG pedestrian link. As Jameson Street residents we want to say very clearly that we do not want this link nor is it needed (see sections 3.11, p 11, and 6.15, p43). Such a link would most certainly “expose” our “quiet residential area of Hillgate Village to the busy high street along Notting Hill Gate” (section 3.11, p11), leading to more noise (despite being so close to NHG, Jameson Street is relatively quiet, shielded as it is by David Game house etc – such a “link” would destroy this tranquillity), rubbish and pedestrian traffic, adding to the existing rat-run vehicles. · Cycling. Any increased provision for cyclists is to be welcomed (see section 3.12, p13), however what is really needed are dedicated cycle lanes. We are sure we do not have to remind everyone that one cyclist has already been killed on NHG.</p>	<p>Newcombe Option 2 : Comprehensive approach which includes re-creating a pedestrian link to Jameson Street is unlikely to come forward and has been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>A compromise needs to be found that addresses the needs of pedestrians and cyclists. The Council is investigating a more ambitious public realm improvement scheme and this might include separate cycle lanes.</p>	SPD amended to reflect cyclists needs
3.65	John Learmonth		<p>New Tube entrances. As we have already stated, spending large amounts of money relocating the tube entrances is not a good use of resources or of space. · Bus stop. We would question the proposed new location of the Pembridge Road bus stop being very close to stops on Kensington Mall and on the north side of NHG past Linden Gardens.</p>	<p>Opportunities for providing step free access are being actively investigated with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.</p>	SPD amended for step free access
3.66			<p>Ref: Notting Hill Gate Supplementary Planning Document Draft of November 2013 Page 12 3.12 bullet point 7: Redesigning the mini roundabout at the junction of Pembridge Road and Kensington Park Road to provide wider footways: (1) Although the estate agents’ of Notting Hill like to think of everywhere in the treasured Royal Borough as a ‘village’, don’t forget that Pembridge Road and Villas are part of a main ‘A’ road</p>	<p>Concern about relocating bus stop close to other bus stops and redesigning the mini roundabout noted. The scheme as described has been tested. It would not proceed without TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic, including large lorries, would be acceptable.</p>	Noted

			<p>the A4206. Occasionally very big and very long articulated lorries will still need to negotiate your proposed modified mini roundabout and widened footways. (2) The pedestrians' safety aspect associated with the long-existing 'double kerbed' part of the west side footway of Pembridge Road would have benefited from some explanation, at least for the historical record as to why it cannot be removed. (3) Please, I urge you to not 'lose' the mature tree by the mini roundabout because of some or other unforeseen eleventh hour problem of traffic management which regretfully required its removal.</p>	<p>This text has been added to in the SPD</p> <p>Concern noted.</p>	
3.67	Morven Hutchison		<p>I would like to make a plea for a lift into the underground at Notting Hill. It is not easy trying to carry a suitcase up or down any of the stairs. Especially if one is going to Heathrow via the Paddington Express, where there are again another set of stairs to reach the platform for the Circle/District Line. On a Saturday it is also particularly crowded when trying to get anywhere to a tube because of the tourists trying to get to Portobello. You already know that and hopefully with wider pavements, different entrances things might improve.</p>	<p>Opportunities for providing step free access are being actively investigated with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>SPD amended for step free access</p>
3.68	Iain Milligan		<p>1. A comprehensive planting of large deciduous trees down the centre of Notting Hill Gate, rather than the somewhat timid approach adopted in the SPD. This has worked well in many cities and avoids the problem of skewed growth against buildings. It would be a good counterpoint to the trees in Holland Park Avenue.</p>	<p>At this stage the scheme has not been finalised so the amount of trees and greenery is only indicative. The final scheme would include more detail on planting plans.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

3.69	Peter Barnes		I believe this is an opportunity to provide a new entrance to the underground station which should not be missed. 3.10 Crowds only occur in this location on Saturdays and are only a minor problem. Crowds are part of the atmosphere of the market area. Visit any popular market in the world and it will be crowded.	Opportunities for providing step free access are being actively investigated with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect this. Comment on crowds noted.	SPD amended for step free access
3.70	Penelope Laughton		Air pollution is also referred to (3.29 and 3.30; 3.33) and all means possible should be used to reduce car use and traffic jams, including easing flow of buses and facilitating inter-changeability between all forms of public transport for all type of people (see comments above), as well as increasing amount of greenery that has a proven benefit to the air environment (see section 8 below). I am concerned that the SPD proposes new paving (3.13, p13) but does not acknowledge how this will be swiftly defaced by chewing gum (I suggest RBKC inspects the area under the canopy next to south entrance to tube for example) or for cleaning the paving (currently the pavements in this same area are covered with a greasy film and are swept but never washed).	The public realm proposals recognise that Notting Hill gate is a public transport hub and aim to reduce the dominance of cars. At this stage the scheme has not been finalised so the amount of trees and greenery is only indicative. The final scheme would include more detail on planting plans. Removing chewing gum is a costly street maintenance issue, but not one that can be addressed in an SPD. The Council's Street Cleansing Section puts a lot of effort into removing chewing gum.	Noted Noted
3.71	Sally Young		3.4 Public Transport: step-free access to the underground would be tremendously helpful and another entrance off the main thoroughfare on the south side of Notting Hill Gate might be useful. 3.8 As a pedestrian I agree that docking stations for the Barclays Hire scheme add to the difficulties of moving about. (I work in Soho during the week and the Cycle Hire racks	Opportunities for providing step free access are being actively investigated with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect this. Concern about cycle docking stations, cyclists	SPD amended for step free access Noted

			<p>there are not only an obstacle for pedestrians, but also a hazard for fire evacuation). 3.12 As a pedestrian and a local motorist, I would be concerned about increasing cycle space on the roads - as it is, clusters of Barclays hire cyclists (particularly at weekends) gather in the roadways, discussing where to go. It is rare, on a weekday (as I cross Bayswater Road to get to the bus stop opposite the Czech Embassy) to see cyclists observing any traffic lights. 3.16 I would also be concerned to see traffic-free measures at weekends. I realise Portobello Road creates its own problems, but local residents on the northern side of Notting Hill would find themselves quite restricted if pedestrian areas were created. 3.17 I cross Oxford Circus four days a week by bus - and can quite obviously see that people do not fully understand, nor abide by, the diagonal crossings. But we might have more chance at NHG since there are more residents. 3.21 Would the local residents really use a public space for 'community activity'? The area outside Newcombe House, although trying bravely to improve, is usually filled with alcohol-drinkers - especially in the evenings, which precludes anyone else from wishing to linger there.</p>	<p>and their behaviour noted.</p> <p>The suggestion to close Pembridge Gardens on Saturdays is not a firm proposal. It would not proceed without TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable.</p> <p>If a new space was created by redevelopment of Newcombe House it would be publicly accessible privately owned space so the owners would be able to control who uses it.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
3.72	Penelope Laughton		<p>8 Identity, public realm and sense of place The SPD states that NHG 'lacks a public space that could be the focus of community activity. 'Its proposal for 'privately owned, publicly accessible space' (3.24; and see 3.36) should be avoided as it is not truly 'public realm'. The solution proposed is a 'winter garden' within a redeveloped</p>	<p>The option to create true public realm does not exist in Notting Hill Gate.</p>	<p>No change</p>

			<p>Newcombe house (6.8) is a nice add-on but RBKC could be more ambitious in how they invest any money derived from developers with regard to improving the sense of place in the whole of NHG. Many places within towns and cities construct positive identities based on the introducing of 'landscaping' in a bold and through-going way: consider New York's Hi-line park, or the proposals for linking the South Bank, starting at Vauxhall, with a continuous landscaped riverside park, or the 1.2km avenue of plane trees in Mannheim Germany. These are all large-scale, linear, long-term projects, but with some thought and imagination, the funds currently allocated to the proposed Winter Garden could be otherwise used to add substantially to the sense of place at NHG, one that truly contributes to the public realm. Indeed, it could be argued that the money allocated to public art, would be more helpfully and less controversially invested within a landscape scheme. Firstly, I would suggest considering uses of the unusually wide, south facing pavements in front of United House to Ivy Lodge. As well as a new step free tube access on the corner outside Boots (see section 1), some of the space might be adopted for additional exterior seating for cafes, or the addition of street food stalls. Adding further benches on the wide pavement would encourage people to stop and rest. Rather than using long benches parallel to the road (as now), the Council could adopt a more varied approach, with shorter more informally arranged seats. Secondly, and probably more importantly, the number of trees and other permanent greenery could be</p>	<p>The public realm proposals presented are only an initial scheme, The Council will also investigate implementing a more ambitious scheme. Whichever goes forward landscaping and planting would fully considered when the scheme is finalised.</p> <p>Preference for landscape over public art and suggestions on positioning of benches noted.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---------------------------

			<p>increased both to provide shelter and shade and to filter the strong winds, the latter answering the matter of the occasionally 'very windy micro climate' (4.5, p19). Spending money on planting and maintaining many more trees in the public realm will have a significant impact on how people perceive the built environment (some additional trees are noted on fig 3, p12; and see note on 3.25, p 15, and 3.30, p15). Just compare the tunnel of trees along Holland Park Avenue to the tarmac of NHG. Why not aim to have a continuous avenue of plane trees from Shepherd's Bush round-about to Bayswater Road / Kensington Park Gardens? A number of charitable organizations in London focus on the preservation of trees or their introduction to improve environments and I am sure they would assist in developing a plan. Before considering fashionable 'green walls' (3.25) I would urge RBKC to investigate their likely costs and proven benefits, as well as their long-term viability and maintenance cost before adopting this option. It is widely acknowledged that trees work on many levels (shelter, air quality, taking pleasure in nature) so why not continue with what is proven? RBKC has shown itself open to innovation with the change in public street design in Exhibition Road and Kensington High Street (including: road and pavement surfaces and layouts, street furniture, location of cafes) and it would be welcomed if an equally bold approach to the public landscaping of NHG is adopted rather than the rather timid proposal of a private Winter Garden.</p>	<p>Comments on the cost / benefit of green walls noted.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--------------

3.73	Mr. Roome		<p>3.13 York stone. A commendable idea of quality, but it cracks and dislodges readily a single heavy delivery achieves this. It then holds water, and ices. It dries slower than cement paving. It costs. 3.23 and 3.24: NB small some tiny, impromptu spaces in the City of London, here and there. Element of surprise and pleasure. No need for "obvious" spaces?</p>	<p>York stone is not a strong as some granites but it has been used by Council for some years and is considered sufficiently hard wearing for a footway. There is a clear appetite amongst local people for a useable open space.</p>	<p>Noted. Open space requirements included in SPD</p>
3.74	Diana Lennard		<p>There is a lot to take in the Supplementary Planning Document of November 2013 What most concerned me was the idea of removing one lane of traffic between Kensington Church Street and Pembridge Road and reducing the junction at Notting Hill Gate with Kensington Church Street from 4 lanes to 3 and providing wider nearside lanes giving cyclists more space on the carriageway.(not quite clear exactly which areas you are referring to here but to reduce the traffic lanes and then give cyclists more space is to again reduce the space available for cars. When you bring into that equation the fact that lorries load and unload in the main road to the shops since they can no longer (due to their increasing size) get into the car park behind Newcombe House there are going to be a lot of traffic jams. The other main problem is the pedestrian crossing at Pembridge Road (near the Gate) on Saturdays...it is a nightmare for traffic as you have identified - I am not sure however that closing Pembridge Road on a Saturday is necessarily the answer - could you try a Pelican crossing first - tourists are usually much better than locals at obeying the "don't walk" and "walk" signs. Closing it to traffic</p>	<p>Currently there are three lanes of traffic in each direction along the central part of Notting Hill Gate and four lanes at the top of Kensington Church Street. These would be reduced to two lanes on Notting Hill Gate and three lanes at the top of Kensington Church Street. The inner lane would be widened to create more room for bicycles. This would reduce the space available for cars but the scheme as described has been tested by the borough's Transport Department. It would not proceed without TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic, including large lorries making deliveries, would be acceptable.</p> <p>Suggestion of a pelican crossing at Pembridge Road noted. The suggestion of closing</p>	<p>Changes as per Councils response</p> <p>Noted</p>

			on Saturdays may lead to major congestion elsewhere as cars reverse, turn round and generally try to renegotiate the area.	Pembridge Road on Saturdays is not a firm proposal.	Noted
3.75	Julia Chappell		At 8 minutes short of midnight for comments I'd just like you to note one thing. At present traffic flow in Notting Hill Gate is almost 100% satisfactory. If the southbound Pembridge Rd bus stop is moved into Notting Hill Gate that will hugely change the rate of flow. The pavements in Pembridge Rd are really not too bad except Saturdays sometimes. The need to be re-laid and that would help. But stifle the flow of traffic in Notting Hill Gate and pollution will increase hugely. It's not a good idea as yr new plans for street balance with pavements look good. Everywhere with more buses now they do hold up traffic and in that spot it would not be good	Congratulations on getting your comments in before pumpkin time! Your concerns about moving the bus stop are noted but the scheme as described has been tested by the borough's Transport Department. It would not proceed without TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable.	Noted
3.76	Savills (Matt Richards (Representations on NHG SPD on behalf of Stranton Properties	Savills	Para 3.3 - The initial aspiration to enhance the public realm by bringing tube entrances into buildings is welcomed. However, we have significant concerns that that this is discounted as unfeasible. Significant benefits to the public realm could be secured through such proposals. We are aware that London Underground Ltd see this as a real opportunity and benefit to be delivered from the wider regeneration of Notting Hill Gate, and they should be properly engaged with so that this can be further progressed. Suggestion: To hold further discussions with London Underground Ltd and other interest parties,	The Draft SPD reflected the Council's understanding at the time of publication. However, the Council continues to investigate opportunities for providing step free access with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect the fact that it may be possible to deliver step free access as part of development proposals.	Step free access included in SPD

			<p>including developers and landowners, to explore further the feasibility of relocating tube entrances within buildings. Comment: The opportunity exists to reverse the decisions made in the 1950's but this will only occur if the ambition for the buildings and spaces that resulted from this intervention are encouraged to change. The SPD is not considered ambitious enough to achieve a step change in the character of the area. For example paragraph 3.4 seems to deny that the road is a public space as well as a vehicle space and that changing the buildings at its edge should be encouraged to support this spatially. This means that greater enclosure of the space should be encouraged. Para 3.4 – We note the acknowledgement that changes to the location of tube entrances may involve our client's site. Suggestion: The address is incorrect and should change to 66-74 Notting Hill Gate. Comment: Figure 3 – The relocation of the bus stop from Pembridge road to the main highway outside of no. 66-70 Notting Hill Gate limits the extent to which the pavement widening can extend along the main road, which we consider is to the detriment of the public realm enhancement. The incorporation of a bus stop in the location proposed outside of no. 66 – 70 Notting Hill Gate, combined with a lack of pavement widening will run counter to the aspiration that the Gate's pedestrian flow be enhanced. The diagram also does not consider the potential for some tube entrances to be relocated within the development sites. Suggestion: It is suggested that Figure 3 be amended to show a more progressive pavement</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.4 has been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>The proposal is to relocate this bus stop from Pembridge Road because it causes congestion on Saturdays just at the pinch point where large numbers of people pass on their way to and from Portobello Road. There would be less congestion in the location proposed.</p> <p>Figure 3 is an initial scheme, the Council will also investigate the opportunity for a more ambitious public realm scheme. It would not be appropriate to alter the diagram at this stage.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Step free access included in SPD</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>widening scheme along the gate in an eastward direction from the corner of Pembridge Gardens and that the relocated bus stop from Pembridge Road not be proposed outside of no. 66-74 NHG. It is recommended that a note be added to the diagram that considers the potential for some development sites to accommodate tube entrances. This should not be an explicit requirement, but set out as an aspiration. Comment: Para 3.16 – highlights that results from the public consultation of the public realm proposals identified that the proposals were not ambitious enough and we wish to reiterate this point of view and urge the Council to look again at the extent of the proposals. Suggestion: The public realm proposals should be revised to be more ambitious in respect of enhancements to the pedestrian environment on the Gate. Com Para 3.33 – we welcome the recognition by the Council that further options in terms of public realm improvements will be investigated. Suggestion: The SPD should not be adopted until further consultation is carried out in respect of transport and public realm improvements.</p>	<p>The SPD has been amended to reflect the opportunity to achieve step free access as part of redevelopment.</p> <p>The public realm improvements presented are initial ideas they would not be implemented without further design, testing and consultation. This will be taken forward outside the SPD although the Council is consulting on the revised SPD.</p>	Noted
3.77	Penelope Laughton		<p>10 Summary Changes to transport facilities should make NHG a hub in nature, and not just in name, by fully integrating buses, by providing step-free access to the tube and by providing free, public, bus information. Tourists need to be proactively managed on a Saturday not only by physical changes, but also by re-routing people and by coordinating the planning of Portobello Road Market with that of NHG.</p>	<p>Comments noted, these ideas are beyond the scope of the SPD but will be considered in further developing the public realm scheme.</p>	Noted

3.78	Way West Press (Tim Burke)	NHIG	<p>STREETS AND SPACE. ? The Group welcomes the extension of public space sought by the Council as part as the redevelopment of Newcombe House: the public courtyard, doctor? surgery and adjacent shops. 2.1 Public Realm ? Nonetheless, the public realm approach outlined in the SPD feels piecemeal with comparatively minor pavement and traffic improvement which lacks the vision and needs required for the 21st century city. ? Notting Hill Gate is the main gateway to Notting Hill, one of London most celebrated neighbourhoods, and it cannot remain the simply traffic junction it currently is, tinkering at the margin is not the right approach. For example: a major bus stop to the East of Pembridge Gardens might actually exacerbate congestion. ? The option of repositioning access to Portobello Market to Ladbroke Grove Station from Notting Hill Station to relieve weekend congestion is not addressed. (Note: Ladbroke Grove is 100m to market not the 900m from Notting Hill). Piecemeal pavement widening is not the right solution. ? Step-free access to the tube must be a priority. This might be achieved by locating one lift on the Southern side, between the current stairs leading to ticket hall. If not, broader alternatives should be sought. ? Nowhere in the SPD is a coherent commitment demonstrated to makeover Notting Hill Gate? public realm, as one authored spatial- totality. ? Improving Notting Hill? public realm should beginning with mapping the 10 approaching site-line vistas from: Holland Park Ave, Campden Hill Rd, Farm Pl, Callcott St, Farmers St, Kensington Park Rd, Pembridge Rd,</p>	<p>The Council will investigate whether there are further options to achieve a step change in public realm quality.</p> <p>The scheme as described has been tested by the borough's Transport Department. It would not proceed without TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable. This SPD is concerned with Notting Hill Gate not Ladbroke Grove Station and re-directing visitors in the manner suggested is beyond the scope of a planning document.</p> <p>The Council continues to investigate opportunities for providing step free access with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Key views have been identified (see Notting Hill Gate supporting documents on website), the options to develop open spaces were investigated and realistically the only opportunity is as part of redevelopment of</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Step free access included in SPD</p> <p>Reference to open space included in SPD</p>
------	-------------------------------	------	--	--	--

			<p>Kensington Church St, Palace Garden Terrace, up to Ossington St (near Kensington Gardens), followed by the locating of key wayfaring points, some to be the location for a number of well designed mini-piazas or stopping points. ? Subsequent placing of creative street lighting must also enhance the public? journey from wayfaring points to mini piazza? and beyond.</p>	Newcombe House.	
3.79	Way West Press (Tim Burke)	NHIG	<p>Also a significant public art work must be at the heart of any new public realm, it'd act, be the destinational anchor for the re-representation of Notting Hill Gate as one of the world's most famous urban boulevards. ? The traffic flow studies? and the „Notting Hill Gate Station Entrance Relocation Feasibility Study? are both welcomed. 2.2. Public Art ? We wish to restate N.H.I.G? commitment and track record regarding public art, and wish to underline the role such artworks now play in regenerating Britain? 21st century City-scapes. ? Public Art spend should not be left to the goodwill of the developers, and must be at the heart of regenerating Notting Hill? Public realm. . ? The SPD should mandate „signature? Art projects, underscoring the (s016) public art policy that is now widely recognised: see the Eco Halo or the proposed Thomas Heatherwick Underground Entrance Commission (see appendix) for example. ? The Heatherwick Commission would be the greatest public art endeavour in the Royal Boroughs history, and would signify Notting Hill? presence on the world stage. Heatherwick being rightly acclaimed as the greatest British public realm artist since</p>	<p>Support for significant public art noted.</p> <p>The Council wishes to see public art integrated into the development. It would not be appropriate for an SPD to specify particular projects although the Eco Halo was mentioned in 5.40, or how project should be delivered.</p> <p>The SPD has been changed to reflect opportunities to provide step-free access to the tube.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Step free access included in SPD</p>

			<p>Gilbert Scott. Also the commission is attractive to T.f.L as there are agreed potential synergies, similar in design underground stations, such as Bank for example. ? N.H.I.G has a good relationship with Thomas Heatherwick, as the Group commissioned some of his first work: the? Notting Hill Gate hairy building?, which went on to become, in another form, the acclaimed Shanghai „airy cube? However the Group will not initiate the £880.000 commission and start fund raising until the SPD resolves how best to generate step free access to Notting Hill Gates ticket hall, and onto the Circle Line platforms.. ? Also local artists and school projects could play a role in brightening, reinventing the Gate. These projects could be run by RBKC Arts/ N.H.I.G while any development is underway, and would help local purchase of any scheme. This could be similar to the funding given to the Portobello Art Wall project run by Officer John Hampson.</p>		
3.80	The Ladbroke Association (Robina Rose)	The Ladbroke Association	<p>Even the curved corner edges of pavements form a visual relief from the relentless concrete blocks enclosing this ancient roadway*, the dome of the coronet an apparition (photo enclosed). The euphemistic phrase "high quality" is splattered across the document but what does it actually mean? (in any given context). *the roadway, and the underground, not only make it the traffic hub it is, but constrain and divide it, its high traffic levels "a deterrent" creating a "poor quality street environment" central to its problems. Not possible to lower the road, as is being proposed with Hammersmith</p>	<p>High quality in this context means high quality design, materials, implementation and maintenance.</p> <p>Creating a pedestrian bridge goes against all current thinking about how to make cities liveable spaces which is concerned with redressing the balance between the needs of cars, which have been over emphasised in the past, in favour of pedestrians and</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>No change</p>

			flyover, because of the underground, so why not a "bridge" public space as with the park(s) at Mile End and the proposed forested bridge over the Thames by Thomas Heatherwick? Raise up the public domain?	cyclists. Such a bridge would require ramp access, but there is no space to accommodate this, and even if it could be built it would create an unpleasant shaded tunnel like environment at street level.	
3.81	The Ladbroke Association (Robina Rose)	The Ladbroke Association	Finally "Greening". 1. See "bridge" above. 2. Where there is to be no wholesale rebuilding (e.g. Campden Hill Towers) look at eg. the Athenaeum Hotel in Piccadilly, entirely green cladding all the way up - What a way to "green the gate" (John Scotts original idea with NHIG). Radical transformation or what? (+ the forested bridge realm) =Curved Winter Gardens everywhere, festooning flat rooftops wherever they remain. The Hanging Gardens of Notting Hill.	Comment noted, green walls are mentioned in 3.25.	Noted
3.82	David Marshall		We believe you should look much more positively at encouraging cars to Notting Hill Gate, making it possible for at least a further 90 cars to be parked underground at two levels on the North side as well as a further 90 cars to be developed on the South side below the developed Newcombe Place Piazza behind Newcombe House. Obviously major encouragement should be given to small electric cars but if we don't try to make such space available for car parking then we don't encourage retail use of Notting Hill Gate. Car parking is essential and we can do it.	Research by the LGA has shown that shops consistently overestimate their car borne trade and underestimate the spending of pedestrians. Pedestrians visit more often and spend more as a result. Increasing parking provision would not be consistent with our Core Strategy which seeks to encourage use of public transport, walking and cycling. This SPD has to be in accordance with the Core Strategy. When new off street parking is provided the Council would require a proportion of the spaces to	No change

				have electric charging points.	
3.83	Penelope Laughton		10 Summary The greening of NHG's truly public spaces should be a priority within any scheme, and the focus for money donated by developers	Comment noted.	Noted
3.84	David Marshall		IF THOMAS HEATHERWICK CAN PUT A GARDEN OVER THE THAMES HE CAN SURELY PUT A BRIDGE OVER NOTTING HILL GATE!	Putting a bridge over Notting Hill Gate goes against all current thinking about how to make cities liveable spaces which is concerned with redressing the balance between the needs of cars, which have been over emphasised in the past, in favour of pedestrians and cyclists. Such a bridge would require ramp access, but there is no space to accommodate this, and even if it could be built it would create an unpleasant shaded tunnel like environment at street level.	Noted

3.85	GVA (Fred Drabble)	GVA	<p>3. Street and Spaces Public Transport 3.1 At paragraph 3.4 the possibility of providing step free access to the underground (District and Circle Lines and possibly Central Lines) is introduced, with the text stating that the Jameson Street substation, which is owned by London Underground Limited [LUL], "could come forward for development" presenting opportunities for a new station entrance. 3.2 Whilst we do not contest that the substation could come forward for development in the future and that the delivery of step free access to the District and Circle Lines and possibly Central Lines could provide significant public benefit, we note from our discussions with LUL and the Council that this opportunity remains untested as LUL is yet to conclude the feasibility assessment of its substation rationalisation, making the inclusion of this option premature. It is uncertain whether this option, which was presented to stakeholders only 3 weeks before the draft SPD was published, can be delivered within the medium term (i.e. the lifetime of the plan), as LUL has confirmed that it will be required to maintain, albeit potentially rationalise, the existing substation. Furthermore, the SPD does not clearly reference the numerous constraints to redeveloping the substation site, which would be required if the rationalisation works are to be viable without cross subsidy and in the absence of an identified budget. There are significant structural constraints associated with linking the District and Circle Line, and building above the substation, as well as significant Rights of Light and daylight/sunlight considerations associated with any increase</p>	<p>The Council accepts this option is now unlikely to come forward and it has been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to reflect the opportunity to provide step free access to the tube station as part of development proposals.</p>	<p>Step free access included in SPD</p>
------	--------------------	-----	--	---	---

			<p>in massing. We comment on this further when assessing the 'comprehensive approach' at Section 6 of these representations. 3.3 In chapter 1 of the SPD it is stated that one of the purposes of the document is to "provide certainty in the planning and development process". However, as stated above, the inclusion of options which are untested and unlikely to come forward in the plan period is helpful to neither residents nor landowners. 3.4 Recommendation: On the basis of the above, we request that Paragraph 3.4 is amended to emphasise that there is no certainty that the substation is capable of coming forward to provide a satisfactory step free route to the underground platforms in the medium term (i.e. the expected delivery period of the SPD). We suggest that the text is amended to read as follows: "This may present an opportunity to provide a new station entrance on the south side with step free access to the District and Circle and possibly Central Lines. However, it is noted that there is no certainty that a satisfactory solution can be delivered during the plan period due to a series of constraints." Traffic Dominated, Unpleasant Environment for Pedestrians and Cyclists 3.5 We note the Borough's recognition of the unpleasant street environment at Notting Hill Gate in Paragraphs 3.5 to 3.18 and support the SPD's aim to improve this environment for both pedestrians and cyclists. As the Council is aware, achieving level access across the Newcombe House site and improving permeability has been a key priority of the design team. 3.6 However, we consider that improvements to the street</p>	Support noted.	
--	--	--	---	----------------	--

			<p>environment that rely upon the redevelopment of David Game House (such as the reinstatement of the historic connection from Jameson Street to Notting Hill Gate - Paragraph 3.11), are potentially misleading as they are unlikely to come forward in the medium term (i.e. the expected delivery period of the SPD), due to a number of constraints, including but not limited to, the fact that many of the ground floor retail uses at David Game House are subject to existing long leases and that the building lies above the station ticket hall preventing substantial ground works, as discussed in further detail at Section 6 this representation. 3.7 Recommendation: On the basis of the above, we request that Paragraph 3.11 is deleted in its entirety. Failing that, as a minimum, we request that Paragraph 3.11 is amended to include a reference to the constraints associated with the redevelopment of David Game House to demonstrate the likelihood of this option being delivered. The amended text might read: "Redevelopment may provide the opportunity to reinstate the historic connection from Jameson Street to Notting Hill Gate as a pedestrian-only link. However, it should be noted that there is no certainty that this will be capable of being delivered during the SPD period due to a number of constraints limiting the redevelopment potential of David Game House upon which this relies." Lack of Public Space 3.8 We agree with the Council's assessment in Paragraphs 3.21 to 3.24 that Notting Hill Gate lacks a public space that could be the focus of community activity and we recognise that the existing public space in</p>	<p>3.11 has been removed.</p>	
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------	--

			<p>front of Newcombe House is very poor quality and too 'windy' to be a comfortable place to sit. 3.9 As the owners of Newcombe House, we are committed to delivering a new, level and accessible, high quality courtyard space that could be the focus of a community activity and a comfortable space to linger. As proposed by the Borough in Paragraph 3.24 and 3.26, this is likely to be in the form of privately owned, publicly accessible space within the Newcombe House redevelopment. We therefore consider that our aspirations match those of the Borough in relation to public space and note that our development site provides the only opportunity to deliver a meaningful new public space. Deliveries / Off – Street Servicing 3.10 We note the Council's intention for servicing to place no greater burden on Notting Hill Gate than currently exists and we support efforts to ensure that the environmental quality of the area is not compromised by redevelopment opportunities. 3.11 The owners of Newcombe House are committed to ensuring that any future redevelopment will enhance the environmental quality of Notting Hill Gate and will therefore seek servicing strategies that are appropriate and well managed. On this basis, the existing local condition has been thoroughly assessed by TPP and they have in turn provided comments on the proposed servicing options set out in the SPD at Appendix 1. 3.12 In summary TPP note that, whilst the capacity of the proposed on-street servicing bays is considered sufficient, the loading bay on the south of Notting Hill Gate adjacent to Newcombe House could be</p>	<p>The Council agrees.</p>	
--	--	--	--	----------------------------	--

			<p>improved by making it a tapered-entry "shared space" servicing bay capable of accommodating two medium goods vehicles. This will ensure that there is sufficient servicing provision to prevent delivery drivers stopping kerbside and causing obstruction to the free-flow of traffic along Notting Hill Gate; will ease manoeuvres into the loading bay; and will allow for pedestrians to safely use the space during peak hours when the loading bay is non-operational. 3.13 Recommendation: Figure 3 – We request that the on street parking bay on Notting Hill Gate is amended to provide a tapered-entry "shared space" servicing bay capable of accommodating two medium goods vehicles. 3.14 TPP also provide further comments on servicing in relation to the two options for Newcombe House set out in Chapter 6 of the SPD. These comments are set out in Appendix 1 and are summarised in Section 6 of this representation.</p>	<p>This is a very specific comment, which would best be resolved as part of a planning application. In general the Council seeks for servicing to be carried out off-street wherever possible.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
3.86	A concerned resident		<p>The North end of Ken Church St or a 4-5 lane speedway. Cut it down to two lanes and use land gain for 'market' space. Rear end of Campden Tower and Ivy Lodge could be new market space with low rent space under new development. Create more ways through to rear with small shops etc. Create generous entrance to station where substation is, or north side as per sketch. Create open urban space at corner of Pembridge Rd paid for by greater redevelopment. Bend Notting Hill Gate to create space. A landmark building opposite north end of Campden Hill rd.</p>	<p>The north end of Kensington Church Street was considered as a potential location for the Farmers' Market but this space is used by buses. Generally retailers resist double entrance shops because this makes shoplifting more difficult to control. Assessment of the rateable values in Notting Hill Gate showed (see analysis of available retail evidence) that there are</p>	<p>Noted</p>

				<p>many affordable units around the centre so more units were not needed. The feasibility of providing an open space at the bottom of Pembridge Road was investigated but this is not financially viable because of the very high value of the building in its present use.</p> <p>6.27 The West Block has been identified as a location where additional storeys would be appropriate so the building is similar to adjacent buildings, but a landmark building is not thought appropriate in this location.</p>	
3.87	H M Fox		<p>3 Streets and spaces Measures are required to improve the street environment. The influx of visitors seeking the Portobello market makes access along the pavements extremely difficult every Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Steps should be taken to divert these visitors down Pembridge Gardens and also to divert the route of the buses which currently cause blockages with crossing pedestrians in Pembridge and Chepstow Roads.</p>	<p>Pembridge Gardens is a residential road and does not provide a direct route to Portobello Road so this solution is not acceptable. The possibility of making the top part of Pembridge Road pedestrianised on Saturdays will be investigated.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Noted</p>
3.88	Kennedy		<p>I object to the proposal to narrow the already heavily congested space between the mini roundabout (in Pembridge Road) and Notting Hill Gate and to the moving of the bus stop into the main traffic area on Notting Hill Gate.</p>	<p>Objection noted, the scheme as described has been tested by the borough's Transport Department. It would not proceed without TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

				This SPD is concerned with Notting Hill Gate not Ladbroke Grove Station and re-directing visitors in the manner suggested is beyond the scope of a planning document.	
3.89	C Pinder		I wholeheartedly support the proposal to achieve 'step free access' to the District/Circle lines and - preferably - also to the Circle Line. I am a disabled local resident and am unable to use the underground at Notting Hill station as I cannot climb the many stairs from the District/Circle Lines to the ticket hall and again the stairs from the ticket hall to the street level. This would transform my life, but would also help disabled visitors coming to Notting Hill Gate for e.g. Portobello Road market	Support noted, the Council continues to investigate opportunities for providing step free access with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect this.	Noted
3.90	C Pinder		The proposals (page 12 Sketch of public realm proposals) show a few new trees to be planted on Notting Hill Gate. In my view, this is not nearly enough greenery. Trees and shrubs in the central reservation are the main way in which this ugly street scene can be beautified, but it appears that only nine new trees are being proposed (though the drawing is not clear). I would support a significant replanting scheme of trees, shrubs and planters, both on the pavements and in the central 'islands'. In terms of transport, I have strongly supported elsewhere in this consultation the provision of 'step-free' access to the Underground at Notting Hill - essential for disabled people such as me. I do not support relocating the	The scheme illustrated is the initial concept only, a detailed landscape proposal would be included when the proposal is finalised. TfL have minimum standards for bus network accessibility, which take account of the needs of disabled people. Any	Noted Noted

			<p>bus stop from Pembridge Road to Notting Hill Gate itself. This means a long walk for disabled people from e.g. Tesco's to the Southbound bus routes and puts a new stop too close to the next stop at Palace Gardens Terrace. I have written elsewhere about the space in front of Newcombe House.</p> <p>Undesirable people (drunks, beggars, pickpockets) already congregate here and I am opposed to provision of "a public space to linger" for this reason.</p>	<p>proposals to change the location of bus stops would be assessed against these criteria.</p> <p>If this space was provided it would be privately owned and the owners could prevent any undesirable activities.</p>	Noted
3.91	Mary-Lu Bakker		<p>I don't think the underground access should change, it seems a lot of money for not much benefit and the pavements are wide where the entrances are</p>	<p>The Council continues to investigate opportunities for providing step free access with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect the fact that new more affordable options have emerged.</p>	Step free access included in SPD
3.92	Roger Laschelles		<p>There is quite a pressing need for off street parking.</p>	<p>It is not clear what sort of parking you are concerned about but the Council does not see parking as a priority in this area. Making the area safer and more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists is considered more important.</p>	Noted
3.93	Alastair Coutts		<p>I generally agree with the evaluation of the main problems of the existing situation, namely the poor pedestrian environment, caused by traffic noise and pollution and by the windy microclimate, and the tired 1950s buildings with their awful rear service areas. There seem to be many possible solutions and it is not clear exactly what powers/ influence the planners have in promoting</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The Council is committed to investigating a more ambitious public realm scheme that may include some form of prioritised segregation.</p>	Noted

			<p>these, but I make the make the following comments and suggestions: 1. reduce traffic noise and pollution, with traffic restrictions and more pedestrianisation by, EITHER provide multi user/ sharing roads (as in Scandinavia or a more rational Exhibition Road scheme). OR provide more segregation of modes using cycle ways. with the greatest priority given to pedestrians, followed by cyclists, buses and least to other road users. 2. Improve tube station ticket hall and entrances (particularly the north-west and south-west ones) to increase capacity and pedestrian flow. Encourage the installation of step-free access. The LUL station has been mentioned in this regard and could be developed. The tube entrances need not be located in Notting Hill Gate if properly signposted. Encourage the building of entrances in building redevelopment: such 'integrated' entrances are widely used on other motor systems, including Hong Kong.</p>	<p>The Council continues to investigate opportunities for providing step free access with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect the fact that new more affordable options have emerged.</p>	<p>Step free access included in SPD</p>
3.94	Mary-Lu Bakker		<p>I think bicycles have a hard time navigating at Notting Hill Gate.</p>	<p>Concern noted, this issue is recognised in the SPD.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
3.95	Architects Appraisal Panel AAP (Paul Williams)	Architects Appraisal Panel AAP	<p>The current proposals to narrow the carriageway and extend the footways ease pavement congestion, but do not address the heavily trafficked roads that dominate the townscape. The proposed median strip and street trees softens the street scene and eases crossing, but is little if any advance on the Kensington High Street</p>	<p>The Council is committed to investigating a more ambitious public realm scheme that may provide a better solution. The only feasible opportunity for a new open space is within redevelopment of</p>	<p>Noted. Step free access included in SPD</p>

			<p>model. Exhibition Road should be more the approach, perhaps carried forward with partial or timed closures, cycle lanes and future proofed for reduced private car use. Station entrance improvement(s) should be part of the package, and are there any opportunities for a new plaza?</p>	<p>Newcombe House. The Council continues to investigate opportunities for providing step free access with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect the fact that new more affordable options have emerged.</p>	
3.96	Knox-Peebles		<p>3.4 It will improve NHG immensely if the entrances to the underground are redesigned; at the moment they are very difficult to navigate, as is the concourse, if at all crowded (most of the time). step-free access should be available for all three lines</p>	<p>The Council continues to investigate opportunities for providing step free access with developers and TfL. The SPD has been amended to reflect the fact that new more affordable options have emerged.</p>	<p>Step free access included in SPD</p>
3.97	Knox-Peebles		<p>12 Cntd. I seem to have logged out by mistake all green phase for crossings - yes Wider footpath - yes Yes, must change positions of bus stops - too much congestion yes - keep same number of Pay & Display for visitors to shop etc the mini-roundabout at Pembridge Rd/Kensington Pk rd is dangerous - no-one sure who should go first - often cannot see past the busses and a fight between cars to get onto the space before the lights - would wider footways help? yes definitely need wider cycle lanes and yes, please use better paving the current reconstituted slabs are hideous and out of keeping with Kensington's presumed educated taste! 3.17 I like this idea - would it work or would it be too complicated -the space nowhere near as large as Oxford Circus 3.18 YES!! that part of Uxbridge Road is disgusting, filthy, gives the impression of danger and being enclosed</p>	<p>Support and comments noted.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

			<p>and trapped - NO-ONE uses it voluntarily despite it being a way of avoiding the noise and fumes of NHG 3.19/20 please improve the signs - the faux Victorian ones to Portobello Road are ridiculous and insulting.</p> <p>3.21 - public space would be great - but where??? the piazza (attempt) outside Waterstones is nice idea and people sort-of use it, but it is wind-blown, noisy and fumed</p> <p>3.22 I never knew the raised bit outside Newcombe House was supposed to be a public space! the bit below just seems to collect rubbish and the elephant, fun though he is, obstructs what space there is (when is the Knot coming back???)</p> <p>3.23 NHG is a wind-tunnel - I have seen elderly people struggling to use the ATM outside Tesco's without being blown away - as you round the corner from Uxbridge Street the wind hits you - but I don't see how this can be altered given Campden Hill Towers has to stay?</p> <p>3.24 possibly behind the new Newcombe House? It would be sheltered but would need very open and welcoming access to work</p> <p>3.35 The Rear of Astely House, like the Eastern end of Uxbridge Street, is a disgrace - full of rubbish bins and the extremely ugly rear of buildings - no-one would walk through it from choice, though it should form a quite short cut towards Kensington Gardens. the same goes for the service yard behind Campden Hill Towers - all these spaces look uncared for and not just unwelcoming but even repelling - they give the impression of being grubby and possibly dangerous, especially after dark.</p> <p>3.39 Yes 3.42 Yes - how can this be achieved? what route can they take?</p>	<p>The only feasible opportunity to provide an open space is as part of redevelopment of Newcombe House.</p> <p>The Knot is unlikely to be reinstated as it requires a very detailed and invasive structural survey.</p>	<p>Reference to open space included in SPD</p> <p>No change</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

3.98			<p>2.5 Definitely improvements for residents should have priority; we live here. 2.6. this paragraph describes a lot of what makes NHG different and special 2.7 The choice of transport is a definite plus for residents and, obviously, makes it accessible to visitors - everything that can be done should be to ensure that all the transport strands run smoothly 2.8 Yes, the traffic makes NHG quite unpleasant to walk along - the fumes and the noise and sense of possible danger to the infirm or children. the pavements are often crowded and this, too takes away the pleasure one should have in strolling 2.12 Yes, 2.13 Yes, if possible, district heat and energy source (I don't think I read anything about this further on? - what are pros, cons, likelihood? 3.6 yes - nightmare of constant parades of buses - we want lots of buses, but maybe spread out a bit? 3.7 this put traffic a priority over people. 3.9 the cycle lanes are not continuous - as a driver I am very nervous about hitting a cyclist. Yes, Barclay cycles add to the clutter, but what is the alternative? 3.9 yes - pedestrians from large clusters while waiting to cross - one is encouraged to cross at the last moment which can be dangerous 3.10 this congestion makes it hard for residents who want to shop, to negotiate the pavements - if possible, I don't come out on a Saturday morning 3.11 it would be nice to reinstate an original link, but Hillgate Village must be allowed to retain the peace and intimacy that makes it special; we would not like to encourage tourists to flock there to take photographs etc. at the moment we are like a real village. 3.12 yes to removing clutter what would happen if the lanes were cut?</p>	<p>Comments and support noted.</p> <p>The CCHP network opportunity is set out in the Council's Core Strategy so it has not been repeated in this document.</p> <p>This option is now unlikely to come forward and paragraph 3.11 has been removed.</p> <p>The scheme as described has been tested by the borough's Transport Department. It would not</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Link removed in SPD</p> <p>Noted</p>
------	--	--	--	---	---

			would there be long traffic jams (more pollution).	proceed without TfL being satisfied that any impact on traffic would be acceptable. This SPD is concerned with Notting Hill Gate not Ladbrooke Grove Station and re-directing visitors in the manner suggested is beyond the scope of a planning document.	
3.99	Scott Enterprise (Property Development & Consultancy) (J. S. M. Scott)		AIR POLLUTION. N.H.G. is in 20% of Worst Air Pollution Zones in London. We urge consideration of the Eco Halos for which Planning Consent was granted (Dante Leonelli environmental sculptures Notting Hill Gate Improvements Project).	This project is identified as one idea for Notting Hill Gate in paragraph 5.40	Noted
3.100	Scott Enterprise (Property Development & Consultancy) (J. S. M. Scott)		OPEN SPACE & GREEN PLANTING. 2 important/vital requisites and insist on proposals being easy to understand - to a scale/comparable to existing buildings.	Noted, the public realm proposals in the document are only initial ideas, the final scheme would include detailed landscape proposals.	Noted
3.101	Scott Enterprise (Property Development & Consultancy) (J. S. M. Scott)		UNDERGROUND TUBE. N.H.G. is unique in having no Art intervention (Eduardo Paolozzi tiles in Tottenham Court Road). Thomas heatherwick should be commissioned to do something, at least a tile scheme, which is a popular form of station art.	Notting Hill Gate is not a priority for investment for TfL so any investment in art in the tube station would have to be funded by development in Notting Hill Gate. Currently step free access has been identified as the investment priority.	Step free access included in SPD

3.102	Scott Enterprise (Property Development & Consultancy) (J. S. M. Scott)		PUBLIC LAVATORIES. Piers Gough proposals herewith. Beautifully executed and 50p charge, and they would pay themselves - the space is available behind steel doors. I would be happy to contribute a substantial sum towards this much needed facility.	This generous offer is noted. The Council is investigating the possibility of reinstating the public lavatories in the station with TfL.	Noted
3.103	Scott Enterprise (Property Development & Consultancy) (J. S. M. Scott)		LOSS OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE. We must secure public open space ... to sit in comfort in the open air. This is a paramount requirement to match the losses.	The Council is keen to see new public open space being provided as part of proposals.	Reference to open space included in SPD