

Notting Hill Gate Draft SPD – consultation comments [5 - Identity of Notting Hill Gate]

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
5. 1 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	laure ghouila-Houri		Although I agree that the identity of Notting Hill Gate is bohemian, I think the time of 'cheap boheme' is past and no one wants that. Look at Westbourne Grove at the level of Ledbury road. This used to be a very bohemian area, around the corner from Portobello market and it is now full of high quality and trendy shop like Joseph, Zadig et Voltaire, Nicole Farhi etc... et very nice restaurant and cafe such as Bill's, Ottolengui etc.... and food deli and shops. This is what I would like to see in Notting Hill Gate. out the fast food and cheap restaurant chains and Nandos and in the trendy and nice restaurants.	The area is clearly changing and moving up market as property prices have risen, but the Council has no powers to control the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords.	No change
5. 2 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	laure ghouila-Houri		I will also be very careful with art. you may end up spending a lot of money for an ugly piece of art. Unless you commission some established British artists like Antony Gormley or Tony Cragg or even ask the Yorkshire sculpture park to lend you a beautiful sculpture of Henri Moore.	The Council has a Public Art Panel made up of experts in the field that is responsible for ensuring any public art introduced to the borough is of the highest quality.	No change
5. 3 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Kensington Heights Property Company Limited (Tim Tinker)	Kensington Heights Property Company Limited	5. Provision for Primary Health Care Facilities Residents of Kensington Heights are only too well aware of the problems caused by the arbitrary closure of the Kensington Place Surgery. Many residents transferred to the Holland Park Surgery	The requirement for a primary healthcare facility in Notting Hill Gate is identified in the document.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>only to subsequently discover that this surgery is also at serious risk due to the landlord wishing to end the lease sooner rather later. We consider the final SPD must require provision of adequate and accessible primary health care premises within the SPD area. 6. The proposed new Cultural Centre We are puzzled why this proposal is given such high priority in cash terms, as against certain other facilities residents have articulated in the consultation process, e.g. - A new Primary Health Care facility. We are also puzzled where the idea of such a large cultural facility has sprung from, as the earlier sections of the report do not appear to articulate such a facility as being a priority.</p>	<p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been re-worded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction</p>	<p>References to cultural attraction removed from the SPD</p>
5. 4 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Yashmin and Alex Jeffries		<p>Section 5: Identity of Notting Hill Gate The report has correctly identified that the shops at Notting Hill Gate meet the needs of tourists (too many coffee shops, sandwich bars/fast food takeaways etc) but not those of local residents. I would support better food supply (M&S too small, Tesco's has a poor product selection). We would welcome a Waitrose, for instance. Notably, restaurants are not mentioned in the document. There are no decent restaurants on Notting Hill Gate (the only two high quality restaurants in the neighbourhood are both on Kensington Church Street). As</p>	<p>5.8 of the SPD explains that the mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to control the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords.</p> <p>Your preference for the site behind Astley House for the farmers' market rather than behind Tesco has been noted. The</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Noted</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>for the Farmer's market, please consider the site behind the Astley House building, rather than that behind Tesco's, which I find remote and scary to enter. As for a "2000 msq 'cultural' space such as a gallery or museum, I do not support that. This would only increase footfall to an overloaded area. It is not needed by local residents. We need good shopping and restaurants instead. I also do not support the consideration to increase the heights of buildings along the Gate in order to accommodate more offices. Finally, the existing 'public art' (elephant, spiral tower) is not appreciated by many local residents. We need more trees and plants, not divisive 'artwork'.</p>	<p>Council considers it is important to retain the farmers' market in Notting Hill Gate if this is possible so this site has not been ruled out.</p> <p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been re-worded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction</p> <p>Support for trees and plants in preference to artwork noted.</p>	<p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
5. 5 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Dobson		<p>You talk of how residents want a mix of independent shops and how there are plenty of these (boutiques and vintage shops, e.g.) en route from Notting Hill Gate to Portobello Road. In the last year, several retail units have shut (Dolland & Aitcheson and Dolly Diamond, for example) and souvenir shops are taking their place - there are now six souvenir shops between Notting Hill Gate station and Portobello Road. Is that the kind of independent shop you are encouraging to move into the area? Meanwhile, the majority of the remaining retail units along Pembridge Road and Portobello Road up to Chepstow Villas are, I'm guessing, owned by the same company and selling cheap new clothes and tourist trinkets, some of which are selling goods in contravention of trading standards (Organic Hill) and of council planning (Sister Jane). These aren't the kind of independent shops the residents want. You are on record saying you want to turn the area into a tourist destination not just for foreign visitors but for British tourists too so can we expect the area to become another Piccadilly Circus? Why aren't you listening to the residents. This area is a residential area not a tourist destination point. Residents don't want a seven-day a week market - which we know the landlords of the properties in Portobello Road want - because it attracts too many people. The development proposals in your draft document reveal an obsession on the</p>	<p>5.8 of the SPD explains that the mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords.</p> <p>Trading Standards have confirmed they have been dealing with a complaint regarding Organic Hill for some time. The clothes sold are not made of "organic" cloth. The proprietor's supplier told him that he would get "organic" clothing but mislead him. The proprietor is trying to source clothing which satisfies the Soil Association guidelines for describing clothing as organic. In the meantime all the goods are marked as being non-organic and the premises have a notice in the window to that effect. The Planning Enforcement Team has received a complaint about Sister Jane which is being investigated.</p> <p>Portobello Road Market is a national and international tourist destination attracting large numbers of visitors, this SPD is</p>	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Notting Hill Gate			vibrant attractions of Portobello Market, and as a resident I welcome any initiative that aims to improve it. However, if redevelopment is to prove anything more than an expensive facelift, there needs to be a Big Idea at its heart. Given the history and identity of Notting Hill, this can only mean a gallery or cultural centre. There is a real opportunity here to create something world-class, something prestigious, adventurous, and outward-looking. I just hope the council recognizes and seizes on this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, and puts it at the heart of its plans. If you get this right, If you create an arena which visitors and residents alike are drawn to, where they can gather freely and simply enjoy being part of this fantastic neighbourhood and city, the rest will follow. It can be done.	anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.	new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.
5. 8 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Donald Cameron		(i) I am appalled that the Council is proposing to allow this level of disruption to the life of residents in an essential area that is working well to supply the needs of perhaps 100k people. (ii) There seems to be no understanding that developers are chasing profits without regard for the community and the result (like many other contemporary examples of Planning Decisions that have been granted in the area) will be harmful to the community	The Council is expecting to receive planning applications for sites in Notting Hill Gate and cannot refuse them on the grounds that development will cause disruption for residents. However, as part of the conditions attached to any planning permission for a significant development within this SPD area, the Council will require a construction management statement which sets out how the developer will mitigate	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
				<p>the impact of the development on local people and businesses, as set out in the Transport SPD. This SPD aims to reconcile the legitimate profit requirements of developers and the aspirations of the local community and the acceptability of development.</p>	
5. 9 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Donald Cameron		<p>There is not a single mention of the first driver of change i.e. residential values of £3000 plus per square foot compared to building cost of £300/sq foot There is not a single mention of the second driver of change i.e. residential values of £3000 plus per square foot compared with commercial values of £1000 per square foot There is not a single mention of the third driver of change i.e. hot money looking for a safe haven in London There is not a single mention of the fourth driver of change i.e. developers looking to fill their bank accounts All of this amounts to one thing. Buy up prime central London property with office and commercial space and raise it to the ground. Replace with high end residential. It is not rocket science. Now we have highly paid scribblers thinking of ideas and writing essays about what Notting Hill Gate could look like. There is talk about the absence of open space. What? There is no other area of London that has immediate access to magnificent open space on the doorstep. (Holland Park and Kensington</p>	<p>The SPD does not use the same terms but the SPD states the residential areas surrounding Notting Hill Gate have improved since the 1970s. It is now part of the prime central London housing market. Planning can influence the size of houses or flats, but has no power to control whether property is marketed abroad, or, once purchased, if properties are occupied or left empty. As with the mix and type of shops, this is a matter that the landowners may choose to address.</p> <p>You are correct about access to open space nearby but absence of a public open space in Notting Hill Gate was an issue that came across strongly in public</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>Gdns). There is talk about a new museum. What? There is no part of the world that has more world class museums and culture centres within a short walk or bus ride. There is no acknowledgement that building a museum is the easy part. Staffing it and resourcing it is the challenge..... This is not a task for scribblers. And our planning system needs a dose of common sense injected. Notting Hill Gate is a thriving community and supply centre for about 200000 residents. Its characteristic is Cafe Society and diversity. It is not a green field or a set of derelict buildings. It is a community. Instead of talking to developers, the six Ward Councillors could be asked to produce an "aunt Sally" of their vision for the future. After all it is their business to know the people and to know the area. This could be the starting point of a consultation. It is folly to try and engage a busy and uninformed resident body on the basis of confrontation with mass complexity and then consider the response alongside the ferocious pressure of determined developers. My aunt Sally for Notting Hill Gate would go something like: "Acknowledge the community importance of existing use such as supply and communications centre for 200000 residents - shops, transport, services, and the Cafe Society/diversity nature of the area. Which is currently working well. Any wholesale development to be confined to the existing envelope and the existing mix</p>	<p>consultation.</p> <p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p> <p>Ward Councillors have been involved in producing this SPD as set out in 1.9 of the draft document.</p> <p>The conclusion of the last round of consultation was that far from working well -there was a mismatch between the shops in the centre and local residents' aspirations.</p> <p>It would not be viable to knock down the existing buildings and rebuild them retaining the existing building envelope and mix of uses.</p>	<p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>of use - residential, retail and commercial". Simple. Everyone can understand. Knock down and rebuild is not the only way to improve appearance. The SPD ignores the fact that Westbourne Grove has reinvented itself without any grand plans or developer intervention. Even in Notting Hill Gate, the new Jamie Oliver building is an example of what is possible using the existing envelope. It is clear to me that we have to find a way to break out of Officers being led by the nose by developers, Councillors being hoodwinked and communities being destroyed. With the eventual outcome of award winning high end residential that is empty and owned by wealthy foreigners. There is no balanced approach in the current practice and this area of London is currently "hot". Notting Hill Gate and Queensway both about to be screwed over.</p>	<p>Westbourne Grove was transformed by an agent who set out to attract specific retailers to the area.</p> <p>It is the role of Officers to reconcile the aims of developers and the aspirations of residents so that acceptable development can come forward.</p>	
5. 10 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Elizabeth Shaw		<p>Very high rise buildings should be divided horizontally viz: lower levels, retail, business and community (e.g. medical facility); middle levels, affordable housing; upper levels, a mix of general housing</p>	<p>This is a helpful view but the SPD cannot set design guidance at this level of detail.</p>	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			types suitable for, single people, families and elderly. There should be separate entrances at ground floor level for the three sections. Wind at street level is a lesser evil than insufficient residential accommodation.		
5. 11 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Charlotte Pennington		We need good public lavatories - I suggest that we could have a landmark and architecturally interesting public lavatory - Sir Norman Foster etc - people would have to pay a reasonable sum to use it	The possibility of providing new public lavatory is being investigated with TfL	Noted
5. 13 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Washbourne Field Planning (C Griffin)	Washbourne Field Planning	The Museum agrees that the vibrancy of the Notting Hill area and its 'bohemian image' are essential ingredients supporting and bolstering its eclectic character, attractiveness and London-wide and international appeal. It is important that these character traits are not diluted or sanitised as a consequence of new development – and such individualistic and subtle characteristics require a sensitive approach, understanding and respect for this special neighbourhood's varied and diverse heritage. 2. The Museum supports Notting Hill Gate as a genuine focus of cultural activities, which is a key tenet of the SPD. The policy document endorses the suggestion that a museum would best support the existing independent 'creative arts offer' and help establish a distinct identity for Notting Hill Gate as a cultural destination. The Museum of Brands could be an ideal candidate to help deliver this aim. The Museum's breadth of appeal and	The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been re-worded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>participation in a wide range of activities could help contribute to the idea of a 'cultural hub', which is of course promoted in the SPD. The Museum could also act as a catalyst for new employment opportunities, particularly for associated businesses and those involved in the wider creative sector. 3. The Museum is supportive of proposals for a cultural facility to be provided as part of the redevelopment of Newcombe House. Nonetheless, it is important, in our view, for the Brief to acknowledge that other sites/development opportunities may come forward within the boundary defined in Figure 2, or nearby, and which could be equally well-suited to fulfilling the Council's aspirations for a cultural hub in the area. The SPD should not preclude the balanced consideration of alternative locations. This is of paramount importance.</p>		
5. 14 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Christopher Buckmaster		<p>The SPD talks about the identity of NHG paras 5.1-5.3. It talks of the area's bohemian heritage and making the street a cultural hub, but apart from referring to the building, David Game House, it studiously ignores what goes on within David Game House. It talks of developing a new cultural attraction 5.20, but ignores the cultural contribution of large numbers of students presently based on David Game House. I would hope that their contribution to the vitality of the area is recognised and appreciated. If they are ignored then</p>	<p>The 2.25 of the revised SPD included reference to people who study in Notting Hill Gate.</p>	<p>2.25 Addition of reference to people who study in the area.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			developers may well argue that our omission of their importance and contribution to NHG indicates that the Council sees them of no value and the College can easily be trashed. I would hope that the final SPD refers to the students of David Game as having a positive contribution to NHG and that the continuance of the College would be welcomed by the Council.		
5. 15 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Christopher Buckmaster		It is important that we keep Notting Hill Gate as an exciting vibrant place. One of the elements in this is David Game College on Notting Hill Gate, which has a large and multinational group of students. In 20 years as a councillor for Campden ward I have never once had a complaint about these students, who add youthful vitality to the area. I would like the SPD to seek some protection for this valued and important contributor to NHG. I have twice expressed these views to Penelope Tollitt, who characteristically totally ignored me. I am asking that this view is considered and I hope the appropriate protection is written in to the final version of the SPD	The Council has no control over the continued presence of the David Game college in Notting Hill Gate. The lawful planning use of David Game House is offices, the college is operating in these premises under a personal planning permission.	Noted
5. 16 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Peter Thompson		Section 5.18-20: I am deeply sceptical that such a space would be economically viable and feel that the funds should be devoted to other public domain improvements that would likely be used by many more people. There are already a number of cafes and coffee shops in the Gate area, spending £8	The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>to add another seems unnecessary. Section 5.45, 46: The level of local public interest should be measured; specific proposals should be put to some form of local consultation before being embedded in the SPD at the expense of other public domain improvements.</p>	<p>owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p>	
5. 17 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Stephen Crompton		<p>Section 5.10: The Saturday Farmers' market is a very important part of the community and, if it is to be moved, a replacement at least as large and accessible must be provided.</p>	<p>5.10 acknowledges this point and the Council is attempting to find a suitable new location.</p>	No change
5. 18 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	G. Keating		<p>sections 5.43 to 5.46 recommend the addition of "a new attraction". I strongly disagree, because (1). Notting Hill Gate already has a strong unique character that would be distorted and altered by such a new attraction that would become another "me-too" site; (2) there is a cost, which will be borne by residents (a) directly in the form of ongoing running costs and (b) in the form of planning concessions that would have to be made to any developer who agreed to fund the capital cost of such an attraction.</p>	<p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p>	<p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.</p>
5. 19 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Ian Harris		<p>I am a resident of over 25 years standing. I am generally in favour of improvement and change and am largely in favour of the ideas and proposals in the consultation document. I also congratulate those</p>	<p>Your comments are appreciated. 5.10 of the SPD acknowledges the value of the market to local people and the Council is attempting to find a suitable new location.</p>	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>responsible for their very thorough and thoughtful job. However, I very much object to the Farmers' Market. The market is one of the few remaining aspects in Notting Hill Gate that revolves around the residential community in my neighbourhood. The Portobello/Westbourne Grove circus, while wonderful I'm sure for the traders there, is for tourists and visitors, not for locals. It would be a dereliction of your duty and a breach of the laudable principles stated in your consultation document if the Farmers' Market were to be closed down or moved to Kensington. I am, however, content if the Farmers' Market is to be moved to one of the three suggested possible locations near to the current site. I was surprised to read that this change might take place as early as January 2014, given that the consultation is still in train this month. Are we being consulted or being told in this instance?</p>	<p>The space the market currently occupies is private land, the Council has no control over decisions taken by the landlord.</p>	
5. 20 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	David Game College (David Game)	David Game College	<p>Since 195, the main College has been located at David Game House, 69 Notting Hill Gate. The College is a well respected institution, and has received a "Good" overall Ofsted rating, with three "Outstanding" categories including teaching. We provide a key service for the local area, in particular we have a strong connection to many of the embassies in the area and provide tuition for the children of embassy employees. Therefore, in reference to the above redevelopment, we</p>	<p>The Council has no power to require the College be retained within the borough.</p>	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			would strongly request that the College be retained within the Borough as a provider of independent educational services given our history and our contribution to life and services within the Borough. We would be grateful if you would review our situation and try and ensure our continued presence within the Borough.		
5. 21 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Michele Hillgarth		I think shop development should be given carefully so that it does not end up being like Kensington High Street. It should concentrate on boutique and vintage shops. Business shops such as estate agents are in far too much quantity and should not be able to open more, as otherwise it could end up in Geneva where it is only banks, jewellery and chocolate shops. I don't think we need any museums as this is not the part of London for that. But there should definitely be more space for pavement areas and benches and sculptures and greenery. There is a serious lack of good restaurants around Notting Hill Gate, but many in the surrounding streets, and that should be increased. Resident parking and metre parking is very poor - especially in Notting Hill Gate village and the tiny one way streets should not be allowed to have 2 sides of cars parked on the wrong side of the road, as you constantly find lorries in those streets scratching cars or creating traffic jams as they can't get through. Big lorries delivering whatever from building materials to consumer goods should have	The SPD explains that the mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords. The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction. You concerns about parking are noted but it is difficult to see how this could be resolved and we	No change Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			restricted hours to early mornings for deliveries. Priority should be given to more specific shops to make it look more attractive and individual taste and industries supported.	suspect local people would be very unhappy if parking was restricted to one side of the street of smaller roads as suggested. Similarly, restricting deliveries to the early hours could result in more people being woken up.	
5. 22 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Dickson		5.11 behind shops E of M&S would help encourage visitors to Portobello market to peel off and is also more convenient to other food shopping and - importantly - a bigger space 5.19 could the cultural facility involve local businesses/art/craft based and act as a showroom rather than be an add on. Thinking of the Tabernacle which has become a well used space and runs art exhibitions etc.	This is an interesting point. The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been re-worded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.
5. 23 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Bulmer Mews Management Limited (J Gardner)	Bulmer Mews Management Limited	p28 -why isn't Fox Primary School's car park shown as an option for the Farmer's Market, as it will help retain it in the area? 5.23 - it is important that the concept of small shops and business units is retained, as this helps give the area some unique shops who can afford the rents. Whilst large retailers like bigger stores, this does not encourage diversity nor allow small businesses to exist. The concept of	The farmers market was located in Fox School car park at one time but it was relocated because the early morning set up noise disturbed residents. The smaller shops in the centre are located along Kensington Church Street and the far east and west of the centre. These are	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>business hubs misses the point. 5.49 - £300k (i.e. £100k pa) seems pricey for a Town Centre Manager and I am not sure this is money that is well spent as the role will be coaxing others to join in, rather than see any power. I would rather businesses in the area contribute to a budget - like a service charge - for the promotion of the area, e.g. Christmas lights and other area wide projects, than for an individual. 5.50 - I don't see the value in Red Caps for the area. 5.54 - the word "reasonable" should be deleted from the wording "maximum reasonable" amount of affordable housing, as this statement is qualified by a sit viability assessment as to what is financially (and therefore reasonably) viable. 5.56 - it would be useful to say here why older peoples flats would be good here - i.e. transportation and shops.</p>	<p>areas that are not expected to come forward for redevelopment.</p> <p>References to the opportunity to appoint a Town Centre Manager have been removed from the document, as have references for housing for older people.</p> <p>5.54 has been re-worded.</p>	<p>Reference to Town Centre Manager removed.</p> <p>3.5 Housing development guidelines reworded</p>
5. 24 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Diana Williams		<p>5. 'The Elephant' is a well known object and should be retained but sited where it is not s hazard to anyone with sight problems. It as 'no give' so I ended u with a bruise!! 6. I believe the small and well established shops at the top end of Ken Ch St. should be kept as they are well used and add character. 7. The abundance of coffee shops should be curtailed to allow for alternative, useful and interesting shops - bring back a little shoe shop 8. Last but</p>	<p>Concern about the positioning of the Elephant noted. The Elephant is unlikely to remain in its current location if Newcombe House is redeveloped.</p> <p>The shops at the very top end of Kensington Church Street are not particularly small and they are likely to be redeveloped, but the smaller shops further south are</p>	Noted.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>not least there must be toilet facilities (fully accessible) and readily available for local shoppers and visitors to Portobello Market.</p>	<p>unlikely to be redeveloped.</p> <p>2.18 of the revised SPD explains that the mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords.</p> <p>The Council is investigating the possibility of providing accessible public lavatories in the underground station with TfL</p>	
5. 25 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Shala Kaussari-Dick		<p>Identity of Notting Hill Gate: It is correct to say that the shops at Notting Hill Gate meet the needs of tourists (far too many coffee shops, fast food takeaways etc) but not those of local residents. A better food supply (M&S too small, Tesco's has a poor product selection) would be great. As for the Farmer's market, please consider the site behind the Astley House building,</p>	<p>2.18 of the revised SPD explains that the mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>rather than that behind Tesco's, which I find remote and scary to enter. I do not support a "2000 msq 'cultural' space such as a gallery or museum. This would only increase footfall to an overloaded area. It is not needed by local residents. We need good shopping and restaurants instead. I also do not support the consideration to increase the heights of buildings along the Gate in order to accommodate more offices. Finally, the existing 'public art' (elephant, spiral tower) is not appreciated by many local residents. We need more trees and plants.</p>	<p>Your preference for the site behind Astley House for the farmers' market rather than behind Tesco has been noted. The Council considers it is important to retain the farmers' market in Notting Hill Gate if this is possible so this site has not been ruled out.</p> <p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been re-worded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p> <p>Support for trees and plants in preference to public art noted.</p>	<p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.</p>
5. 27 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	White		<p>Totally erroneous suggestion of £8 million new cultural facility the money for which will ultimately come out of public funds. 2 Farmers' Market adds cultural identity 3 Important to deliver on primary health care centre</p>	<p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as</p>	<p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
				<p>a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p> <p>The SPD acknowledges the Saturday Farmers' Market is extremely popular and identifies the requirement for a primary healthcare centre. producers. It also offers a community meeting place,</p> <p>3.6 of the revised SPD states a new primary healthcare centre will be sought.</p>	
5. 28 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	English Heritage (Richard Parish)	English Heritage	Section 5. Identity of Notting Hill Gate. The Grimsey Report, which builds upon the recommendations of the Portas Report emphasises the need to understand retail trends and encourages local high streets to build robustness through broadening cultural activities and technological engagement. This would support the promotion of a new cultural attraction. However, Notting Hill Gate is well placed to offer a broad range of independent cultural activities which should be promoted in conjunction with any single initiative. We would therefore support the opportunities set out in this section but would emphasise	Support for promotion of cultural activities noted but the opportunity to provide a new cultural attraction has been removed from the SPD. 2.18 of the revised SPD notes the mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			the need to retain a strong independent mix of businesses and cultural activities as these contribute to local character.		
5. 29 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Alessandra Masoero		It's important to improve the quality of the restaurants and shop and keep the area for the farmers market!	2.18 of the revised SPD notes the mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords The area currently occupied by the farmers' market is private land outside the Council's control.	No change
5. 30 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	St Helens Residents Association (Henry Peterson)	St Helens Residents Association	The proposal for a 'cultural attraction' The report from BOP Consulting concludes that Notting Hill Gate needs a sizeable new museum or gallery as a cultural focus. This element forms a key part of the SPD which sees such a facility as a means of 'establishing Notting Hill as a cultural destination' (Para 5.16 of draft SPD). The draft SPD goes on to assert (in the Development Guidelines at 5.44 to 5.46) that the council should require from S106 contributions a space of 2,000 sq.m as a 'black box' space within the Newcombe House redevelopment, at a cost of £8m. We consider the BOP study to be a very weak evidence base for such a conclusion. The case studies that it covers bear (in our view) little or no relation to Notting Hill	The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction. The BOP study built upon the Council's Cultural Placemaking Strategy which highlights the	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>Gate. Amongst our own membership in North Kensington there is some support for a mixed use cultural/arts centre, but more on the lines of Kings Place (the new venue near Kings Cross which combines two performance spaces with a gallery, cafe, and restaurant and conference facilities/meeting rooms). Current cultural activity in Notting Hill and the north of the borough suggests demand and ongoing support for this type of mixed use space (5x15 lectures/discussions and other performances at the Tabernacle, Lutyens and Rubenstein literary evenings in Portobello, the Gate Theatre and Bush Theatre in Shepherds Bush). But whether 2,000 sq.m of 'black box' space is what is needed is another matter. Use of £8m of Section 106 contributions for this purpose is a huge opportunity cost as compared with other priorities identified in the draft SPD. The existing cultural providers in the area (Arts Club, Gate, Coronet, and Gate Theatre) are a major asset which should be built on.</p>	<p>importance of planning for culture in making successful places. The case studies investigated other cultural facilities that have been delivered recently through s106 agreements or other private investment.</p>	
5. 31 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Forsters LLP, on behalf of the Notting Hill Arts Club.		<p>5. There is only one mention of the Club in the draft SPD (at paragraph 2.6). This reference combines the Club with other venues and states that venues such as these help contribute to the lively atmosphere and bohemian heritage of the area. 6. The Club believes that this passing reference in paragraph 2.6 underplays the importance of the Club and if, left in its</p>	<p>The Council does not consider the text changes proposed are appropriate but has amended the text for Site 2 to address the Club's concerns 'The design ensures existing uses and activities are not compromised'.</p>	<p>Text change Development Guidelines Site 2: Astley House</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>current form of words, exposes the Club to significant risk in any redevelopment proposals. 7. The Club would propose that in addition to the current paragraph 2.6, a new paragraph 2.7 is inserted, as follows: "The Notting Hill Arts Club is a cultural icon in the world of music. It has existed as its current location since 1997 and continues to provide a platform for new and existing bands. The importance of the Club is recognised in the Council's "Scoping Study" (June 2013) prepared by BOP Consulting. Any proposals for redevelopment within the local area will need to reflect the significant planning benefits that cultural icons such as the Club bring to the local area. The Council will positively seek to ensure that any redevelopment proposals include specific provisions for the protection of the Club, including any land-use based legal measures which may be necessary in to protect the Club's ongoing operations at its current location."</p>		
5. 32 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	W. M. and D. L. Gabitass		<p>1. Notting Hill Gate basically has the amenities that satisfy the requirements of its residents. It can and certainly should be improved but it is already a busy place and we query why it needs to become a "destination". Given the proximity of Oxford Street and the Westfield shopping centre it is unlikely that a destination for shopping will succeed. The Council seems resolute that it should be a destination for cultural activities (paras. 5.43-46) seemingly</p>	<p>The Council's analysis agrees with your position that Notting Hill Gate is unlikely to be a shopping destination.</p> <p>The idea of providing a new cultural attraction came from concern about the need to protect the area's existing strength in culture and the evening economy and the Council's Cultural</p>	<p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>because it has received advice that this is possible. But is there residents' support for this and what is the problem to which this is a solution? This idea strikes us as a local authority prestige project that excites councillors and their staff but not residents and consumes scarce resources. 2. We appreciate that the Council has noted (para.5.4) what residents have had to say about shopping and the farmer's market in particular (Para 5.11). We heartily support that. 3. We share the reluctance of other residents to see luxury apartments developed, given the high risk that these will be marketed abroad and end up as "ghost" residences (Para 5.29). 4. We do not want any encouragement of night time entertainment business. Notting Hill Gate's residential areas are very close to the commercial, especially on the south side and no one wants the noise, dirt and anti-social behaviour involved except the promoters. At the time the licensing legislation changed, the Council's environmental staff was very useful in dealing with inappropriate pub applications to extend hours in residential areas on the same grounds and we would hope that the Council retains the same outlook.</p>	<p>Placemaking Strategy which identifies the importance of planning for culture in making successful places. There was reasonable support for a cultural facility when the idea was raised at the September Issues and Options consultation. In the second round of consultation, the idea has been met with a mixed response. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been re-worded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p> <p>Planning can influence the size of houses or flats, but has no power to control whether property is marketed abroad, or, once purchased, if properties are occupied or left empty. As with the mix and type of shops, this is a matter that the landowners may choose to address.</p> <p>Your endorsement of the Council's environmental team is appreciated.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
5. 33 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	E M Pedraz-Estevez		5. Community Facilities & Events: Very much welcome the observations submitted. 6. Additional Housing: Under 5.55 does require action. Adding to 5.56. Only hope that COUNCIL will receive generous proposals for older people, including a good range of tenure/s. IDENTITY: Under 6.11 and 6.12. These two items, very much in need and I hope that the Council will have many submissions/s.	Support for community facilities, events, affordable housing and housing for the elderly noted, and a cultural facility noted. The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been re-worded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.
5. 34 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Estelle Beverley Hilton		5. IDENTITY OF NOTTING HILL GATE NHG is my village! It's the heart of a large residential area, intersected by busy E-W and N-S roads, with office workers coming in on week days, and huge numbers of tourists on Saturdays. shopping by all means bring in more 'high quality' food shops, but not if it means driving out any of the current useful places - post office, fish shop, hair dressers, soft furnishings, independent Calders pharmacy, wonderful, treasured Tylers hardware shop, Chegworths, farmers market, pet shops, Ryman's, print shop, picture framers, etc -	The mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords. We are not aware of any specific research into the overlap of shopping by office workers and tourists but both are likely to use sandwich shops and coffee bars. Footfall is much higher on	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>as well as Tesco and M&S. Has any research been done into the overlap of shopping by office workers and tourists - i.e. sandwich shops, coffee bars, tourist gift shops, remainder books, etc.? Footfall weekdays v. Saturdays? Restaurants - Kensington Place will be a loss, and there's nothing of its calibre. Tourist destination A film has turned Notting Hill into a free tourist destination on Saturdays.. They come to find a dream! They don't really know what they've come to see (I live nearby and they ask me all the time 'where is the blue door?')They come to see a quaint area of London, not a modern shopping mall or office blocks. Help them to get to Portobello as quickly and efficiently as possible. Let Portobello entertain, feed and satisfy them. Let Portobello direct them to the Brands Museum. The majority of the visitors are young, not big spenders. The antique and bric-a-brac hunters go early in the morning, before the crowds. Museum : there are excellent transport services to the nearby riches of London's museums and galleries. No need for one at NHG. Better to put the £8m towards a health centre, more trees, more open space, lower development height and maybe tidying up the north side of NHG. How about a Notting Hill Trail - giving history of the area, buildings, and people via plaques, signs and murals? When the rest of NHG is polished up, the little independent one storey shops on the north side of NHG will look even more</p>	<p>Saturdays.</p> <p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</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 be consulted upon separately.</p> <p>Suggestion of a Notting Hill Trail and improving shop fronts on the north side of Notting Hill Gate noted.</p> <p>This data is not available but the proposal is not to reduce the amount of office space.</p>	<p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>scruffy. But their quirky individuality is part of the character of NHG. How about RBKC creating an attractive overall design for the whole run and offering the owners a grant to join in? NHG has excellent transport services to the West End, and to Westfield's with its parking. We don't need big chain stores. But creative individual designer shops would add to the NHG flavour. Offices - what is the current area of office space? What is the proposed area after development? How many people come in to work each day? How many come in by car, and by public transport? Expected increase in nos. of people? Night life- how many come into the area in the evening for bars, restaurants, clubs, cinemas, etc? Expected increase? Car parking: current no. of visitor car parking places? Proposed no. during various stages of the redevelopment - more or less than currently? Current no. of residents with cars? Expected no. of car-owning residents in the future? No. of parking places available?</p>		
5. 35 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Marion Gettleon		<p>1. In my lifetime Notting Hill Gate has never been a "place." It's a hideous road junction surrounded by a truly appalling buildings of various eras and with a handful of exceptions, very little quality. 3. RBKC has done the NHG area and Portobello/Golborne Markets untold damage by endlessly banging the "tourist" drum. So as well as a major arterial road,</p>	This SPD is concerned with Notting Hill Gate not the markets.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>NHG is ruined by hordes of tourists leaving the underground station heading past seedy shops north towards the Markets. It's high time RBKC stopped damaging the Markets and acted to support them. They are an internationally acknowledged social and cultural treasure - if only the Council chose to recognise the fact. The Markets need "clients/customers," not thousands of 20 year olds taking photos and buying a coffee. 4. Despite everything there are a few good shops. High quality retailers who serve the community have to be encouraged - a matter for the freeholders.</p>		
5. 36 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Deborah Collinson and Associates (Deborah Collinson)	Deborah Collinson and Associates	<p>What Notting Hill Gate does not need is more coffee bars and eateries. We need independent, useful shops like Tylers, Calders Chemist, and Video City. There is a need for small flexible offices attractive to media, creative and start-up businesses. We also don't need more expensive flats which will be bought by foreign nationals and never lived in. Most of the residents bought their houses a long time ago, but are not wealthy. Those who are will go to Westbourne Grove or Marylebone High Street.</p>	<p>The mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords.</p> <p>The opportunity to create a business hub providing flexible office space has been identified.</p> <p>Planning can influence the size of houses or flats, but has no power to control whether property is marketed abroad, or, once purchased, if properties are occupied or left empty. As with the mix and type of shops, this is a</p>	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
				matter that the landowners may choose to address.	
5. 37 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Deborah Collinson and Associates (Deborah Collinson)	Deborah Collinson and Associates	Where will the Farmers' market go? This is not about making Notting Hill a destination, it already is. There is too much focus on this and not enough about the needs of residents. There must be a balance. It is about making money for developers.	Two possible locations for the Farmers' Market are being investigated: West Mall behind Astley House; the car park behind Marks and Spencer (see Figure 9); and the service yard behind the units between Tesco and Marks and Spencer. Concern about needs of residents noted, the SPD has been altered to reflect the views of residents.	No change
5. 38 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	N. Lindsay-Fynn		Section 5: Identity of Notting Hill Gate The report has correctly identified that the shops at Notting Hill Gate meet the needs of tourists but not those of local residents. More local shops and restaurants of quality are needed rather than all the snack bars and coffee shops.	The mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords.	No change
5. 39 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Elizabeth Clarke		Public Art Presumably meaning mostly sculpture. Please may this be noble, timeless, and enduring - not tacky, whimsical and soon dated, like the elephant with the sharp pointed trunk (so unlike an elephant) and the barely visible tiny tots and other clutter on the rooftops. Examples of fine sculpture are the boy on the dolphin on the Chelsea Embankment, the cheetah	Your concerns about public art are noted.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			in Grosvenor Gardens, the horses in Piccadilly Circus. To say nothing of Eros, Peter Pan, etc. Please, nothing abstract. "Identity" N.H.G. has its own strong identity. No tinkering required here.		
5. 40 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Elizabeth Clarke		<p>Attracting More Activity to the Area (Conference centre, health centre, etc.) Please, no. The place is crowded enough as it is. It is not necessary to spend £8 million (! - are you serious?) on a "community art centre" when there is an under-used public library in a very handsome building just round the corner. Something could be done with this, surely? If such a thing is felt to be really necessary? Farmers' Market This must be retained, and not shunted too far away.</p>	<p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p> <p>The value of the Farmers' Market is acknowledged and two possible new locations are being investigated: West Mall behind Astley House; the car park behind Marks and Spencer (see Figure 9 of the draft SPD); and the service yard behind the units between Tesco and Marks and Spencer.</p>	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.
5. 41	Elizabeth Clarke		Crime Have you tried suggesting to the	Policing is not a planning matter	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Identity of Notting Hill Gate			Police, or even insisting, that there should always be a bobby on the beat in the area? Or two or more, but never walking together, always separately. This is the best deterrent and reassurance. Disneyfication ("Meeters and greeters", redcaps etc.) Please, not. Leave look-alikes and actors to private enterprise and the Portobello.	but there is a new policing model which will see more officers on the beat. References to a Town Centre Manager have been removed.	References to Town Centre Manager removed
5. 42 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	J Loxton Peacock		I have lived in this area since 1971 and I would like to say that I find the prospect of this development very exciting. Back in 1971 we lived in Campden Hill Square what attracted us, having come from Chelsea was that it had a village atmosphere ,sadly that soon changed with the dreary huge houses built where the Water Tower used to be and the rest of dreadful development in Campden Hill Road ! I think to recreate the village atmosphere would be a great way to go but with style and to create a continuity with Portobello Road. Forget impersonal modern structures and dreadful red modern red brick.	Regrettably it will not be possible to create a true village atmosphere in such a busy location.	No change
5. 43 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	The Cherry Tree Residents' Amenities Association (Thomas Blomberg)	The Cherry Tree Residents' Amenities Association	While we welcome the Council's initiative in preparing the draft SPD, we are especially concerned that it prioritises an undefined but very large and costly cultural centre, while it puts a new GP surgery at the very back of "the wish list". It should be the other way around. There are currently no surgeries at all in the Campden Ward, and the Holland Park Surgery, which several thousand Campden Ward residents use,	The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>must soon new premises but has so far been unable to find any - largely due to the enormous property prices in our area. A new, large primary healthcare centre in Notting Hill Gate, which on completion could be handed over to either the Council (and thus become part of the Council's property portfolio) or to the new NHS Property Services Ltd (which already manages some 4,000 surgeries and hospitals across the UK, whereof close to 500 in London), and then is let to a GP team at a reasonable rate, would ensure a permanent surgery for the area, irrespective of property prices or of GPs retiring.</p>	<p>anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p> <p>The requirement for a new primary healthcare centre has been identified in the SPD. How the property is let a matter for the NHS not a planning document.</p>	
5. 44 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Norland Conservation Society (Georgiana Lebus)	Norland Conservation Society	<p>* Cultural facility - there is already a considerable amount of fixed formal (concert hall museum, gallery) provision within close reach, at Kensington and south Kensington. Any cultural facility in Notting Hill Gate should reflect the character of the area and the existing cultural offering in its cinemas, theatres, and clubs. I don't believe a space at the back of one of the buildings (e.g. Newcombe House) would achieve the footfall or the identity consolidation that is needed to justify the cost and support the NHG brand. The Scoop at More London was designed to attract people to the area which was being regenerated - and its prominent outside location helped hugely to put City Hal and that area on the map. Similarly Delfina's</p>	<p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p> <p>The Council investigated all possible locations for the Farmers' Market in Notting Hill Gate with</p>	<p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>restaurant and art gallery and Vivienne Westwood's fashion museum are unique to the area, with very strong relevance and roots to it. If there were to be one, it should be prominent accessible (from the underground exit) versatile and flexible, perhaps accommodating pop-up events. * The Farmer's Market should not be regarded as simply as space which is required once a week but an integral part of the community and its attractions for residents and visitors. Perhaps rather than consigning it to the back of M&S it would merit an upgrade to a more prominent position than even it enjoys now - the success of the market in the Duke of York's Square shows the possibility of making almost street theatre out of a food offering in the public realm. * Community facilities - a primary health care facility is of paramount importance - and it must be easily accessible by those who by virtue of age or infirmity are unable to walk distances. * The importance of the retail mix cannot be overstressed - both from the point of view of encouraging the animation of the streets and serving the visitor and local community. As many buildings as possible should be accessible from the street on NHG - providing a reason for people to linger in the area and animate it. But some shops/businesses make a much bigger contribution to the community and the spirit of the place than they product offering. Tylers is a case in point, having a</p>	<p>the market operators and Ward Councillors. The only feasible locations are: West Mall behind Astley House; the car park behind Marks and Spencer (see Figure 9); and the service yard behind the units between Tesco and Marks and Spencer.</p> <p>SPD commits to providing a new primary healthcare centre of 800m2 GIA as part of s106 requirements.</p> <p>The Primary Healthcare Centre would be provided in an accessible location.</p> <p>The mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords. The best way for local people to treasure shops is to use them as much as possible.</p> <p>It is likely that most buildings would be accessible from the street.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			reputation for being wholly reliable as a source of items that you count on being able to obtain , as well as many others which you don't expect but are delighted to find and are a bonus - and often save residents the time and pollution of going elsewhere in London to buy certain essentials. Tylers is much more than a shop for this reason. In some respects it encapsulates the quirky , modest, more than it appears to be place that is Notting Hill Gate. There are very few shops in London which are such solid anchors in their locality and they should be treasured.		
5. 45 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	St Helens Residents Association (Henry Peterson)	St Helens Residents Association	Character of Notting Hill Gate the Council needs to be clear as to whose voices should be listened to, in shaping the future character of NHG – local residents, the wider constituency of Londoners, or tourists and visitors from outside London and abroad? We would argue strongly that the council should listen primarily to local people. The Gate currently has a unique mix of good and less good qualities, the product of its history as much as market forces. Consultation responses have stressed that the area has some characteristics (variously described as 'bohemian' or 'weirdness') which should not be lost through bland commercial redevelopment. The future of Notting Hill Gate needs some bespoke solutions which play into its present character and qualities. It will otherwise risk losing its attraction to	The Council has listened very carefully to local people, most of the people who attended the Issues and Options consultation were residents and their views have been reflected in the draft SPD. The identity chapter has attempted to define the area's unique characteristics – good and bad. The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>visitors from abroad as well as from the rest of the UK. There are risks of development in NHG being driven by the maximisation of commercial and residential floor space within a part of London that (by inner London standards) has yet to attain peak values. High end retailing combined by high value residential redevelopment will continue to drain and local feel from the area, especially if (as elsewhere in the borough) new residential units are sold offshore and severely under-occupied. Affordable housing should feature more prominently in the SPD, and the council should be seeking to meet its targets for affordable housing as part of the developments rather than off-site. If the Gate becomes an increasingly exclusive high-value residential area, it will continue to lose much of its character. There are risks with the current draft SPF of the council imposing a 'vision' of Notting Hill that does not reflect what local residents and regular visitors want. The outcome of the present consultation exercise needs to demonstrate that the council is in serious 'listening' mode and willing to reconsider some elements of the present proposals.</p>	<p>area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p> <p>The purpose of this SPD is to strike a balance between the financial requirements of developers and the aspirations of local people.</p> <p>The SPD states the Council's policy for affordable housing is set out in Core Strategy policy CH2. This is normally provided on site. Whether affordable housing can be delivered on site will be considered as part of individual planning applications, this cannot be determined through an SPD.</p>	
5. 46 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	St Helens Residents Association (Henry Peterson)	St Helens Residents Association	The proposal for a 'cultural attraction' The report from BOP Consulting concludes that Notting Hill Gate needs a sizeable new museum or gallery as a cultural focus. This	There was reasonable support for a cultural facility when the idea was raised at the September Issues and Options consultation.	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>element forms a key part of the SPD which sees such a facility as a means of 'establishing Notting Hill as a cultural destination' (Para 5.16 of draft SPD). The draft SPD goes on to assert (in the Development Guidelines at 5.44 to 5.46) that the council should require from S106 contributions a space of 2,000 sq.m as a 'black box' space within the Newcombe House redevelopment, at a cost of £8m. We consider the BOP study to be a very weak evidence base for such a conclusion. The case studies that it covers bear (in our view) little or no relation to Notting Hill Gate. Amongst our own membership in North Kensington there is some support for a mixed use cultural/arts centre, but more on the lines of Kings Place (the new venue near Kings Cross which combines two performance spaces with a gallery, cafe, and restaurant and conference facilities/meeting rooms). Current cultural activity in Notting Hill and the north of the borough suggests demand and ongoing support for this type of mixed use space (5x15 lectures/discussions and other performances at the Tabernacle, Lutyens and Rubenstein literary evenings in Portobello, the Gate Theatre and Bush Theatre in Shepherds Bush). But whether 2,000 sq.m of 'black box' space is what is needed is another matter. Use of £8m of Section 106 contributions for this purpose is a huge opportunity cost as compared with other priorities identified in the draft SPD.</p>	<p>In the second round of consultation, the idea has been met with a mixed response and the Council has amended the SPD as shown in the next column.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			The existing cultural providers in the area (Arts Club, Gate, Coronet, and Gate Theatre) are a major asset which should be built on.		
5. 47 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	St Helens Residents Association (Henry Peterson)	St Helens Residents Association	Town Centre Manager We support the use of a £300k of S106 funds to support a Town Manager post. The range of independent shops in Notting Hill Gate, such as Tylers Homestore, Video City and the antique shops in Kensington Church Street are much valued. While the council has no direct control over retail uses, a Town Centre manager could help to bring together developers and landlords and to influence the choice of retail tenants in ways that will ensure all local character is not lost.	Support for a Town Centre Manager noted but this has been removed from the SPD because it is not something the Council can expect developers to fund.	Reference to a Town Centre Manager removed.
5. 48 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Elizabeth Pencavel	Westway Development Trust	At Westway Development Trust we believe that large scale regeneration projects such as Notting Hill Gate must provide real benefit to the local community and to that end we would encourage RBKC to maximise the potential of the Section 106 on this development to be deployed in targeting the extremes of disadvantage which exists in the north of the Borough, where we have a particularly strong footprint. Of particular interest to Westway Development Trust and our communities is the proposed cultural facility (section 7.5 of the Notting Hill Gate SPD). We note with interest the indicative S106 allocation for this facility, which at £8million is a	The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>significant contribution towards such a facility. Some desk based research indicates that relative to other investment in the museum sector, this would enable a substantial cultural facility to be developed, and to that end, we wish to particularly highlight a number of matters: 1) We note within the 'Scoping study for a new cultural facility at Notting Hill Gate' authored by BOP Consulting for RBKC in June 2013, that they recommend 'initiating a competition that invites bids from promising organisations both within and outside the Borough'. We support this proposition and agree that given the scale of investment available here to the cultural sector a robust and transparent competitive process must be established to ensure optimum value is derived. 2) This report also notes that the Museum of Brands is a 'promising contender' in providing such a facility. We do not support this proposition. As a benchmark, the reconstruction of Shakespeare's Globe, the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, was delivered for £7.5m. We cannot envisage how £8m could be spent on re-housing what is essentially a private collection of brand memorabilia. 3) We believe that the proposed cultural facility could be provided within our estate, and could be incorporated within our 'destination' vision for Acklam Village/Portobello Road. Such a proposal would leverage the already significant tourist footfall in the area. It would also act</p>	<p>WDT's request for s106 contributions for: maximising opportunities for skills development and local employment through the development; enhancing local parks in the wards neighbouring this development; and signage to Portobello are noted. These requests are not closely linked to Notting Hill Gate and are best addressed through the CIL 123 list which identifies CIL funding priorities.</p> <p>Signage to Portobello from Notting Hill Gate is identified as an issue in the SPD.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>as a valuable catalyst in bolstering economic prosperity in a highly disadvantaged part of the Borough, through the provision of jobs, opportunities for enterprise, education and skills programmes; it would also act as a powerful catalyst for innovation and creative development, which alongside our proposed enterprise and third sector hubs, provides a creative cluster which would transform this community. A report published by the DCMS last week underlines our proposition that the cultural industries are a powerful economic catalyst in driving growth, investment and tourism. 1</p> <p>4) Westway Development Trust is in a unique position in respect of this proposal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide land, resources and potential match funding for such a facility b. Build creative alliances and partnerships in support of the facility; we have more than 100 creative organisations and artists affiliated with us and we are plugged into some key government programmes such as the Creative & Cultural Skill's Creative Employment Programme c. Provide a strong interface for such a facility with local communities and disadvantaged groups through our large scale learning and engagement programmes <p>We also wish to make a number of additional comments in response to the consultation: ? The importance of maximising opportunities for skills development and local employment through the development and the</p>		

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>Borough's commitment, that as a minimum, industry benchmarks for apprenticeships, local labour etc. will be deployed in working with the developer. ? Our desire for S106 funds to additionally be used to enhance local parks in the wards neighbouring this development, as well as the immediate ward. ? Our support for the proposed improved signage in the area. Portobello Market as the third most popular tourist attraction in the area is poorly served by the current lack of quality signage. Should the Borough require more involvement with the local community and local businesses on this project WDT would be pleased to facilitate this important element of dialogue during the planning process. I hope these comments are helpful and I look forward to further involvement in this regeneration programme, in particular that of the cultural facility development, in due course.</p>		
5. 49 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	John Learmonth		<p>· The Farmers' Market. The draft SPD acknowledges this is a key local amenity (see section 5.10, p29). However, the draft SPD gives no firm commitment that the Farmers' Market will be retained in the area, instead giving the following weasel-worded sentence: "If possible the Saturday morning Farmers' Market will be relocated within Notting Hill Gate" (section 5.51, p 33, and our italics). Also, the Farmers' Market is not mention as a "Developer contribution" in section 7, p55 and, in addition, one of the parking sites the draft SPD identifies as a</p>	<p>It is not possible to give a firm commitment that the Farmers' Market will remain in Notting Hill Gate because it is currently located on private land that the owners want to develop. The Council will have to view any planning application for development that comes forward for this site on its merits and cannot require in an SPD that all or part of the site is not developed. However, the Council hopes that a</p>	Noted.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>possible new location behind M&S in figure 9 on page 28 is deemed later on in the document (section 6.26, p49) as “not essential” and so being ripe for development! We must go back to basics here and strongly challenge why the Farmers’ Market should be moved at all – the car park behind Newcombe House is an ideal location for it and also for the public space which the draft SPD so rightly says NHG lacks (see sections 3.21-3.24, p14). A really attractive piazza, protected from the wind on all sides, could be created here with shops opening both onto Ken Church St as well as onto the public space. The draft SPD says that the car park “will be required for redevelopment” (section 5.10, p29, our italics). Oh yes? By whom? The Council needs to take a stand here and insist this space is kept for the public and for the Farmers’ Market. The development options for the car park proposed in this draft SPD, such as a mews or a covered arcade, will lead to either a half-empty row of shops no one visits in an arcade no one has any cause to walk through (the arcade at High St Ken station is hardly a good example to follow but at least people have a reason to walk through it to get from the High Street to the tube) or a row of expensive, unoccupied for most of the year houses in a street no one ever goes down; moreover, the wording for the options outlined in the draft SPD (pages 41 and 43) appear unclear and in places, such as what</p>	<p>new publicly accessible space can be provided in this location.</p> <p>The Farmers’ Market has very specific requirements in terms of the space required and vehicle access. The other two feasible sites for relocation of the Farmers Market: West Mall behind Astley House; the car park behind Marks and Spencer (see Figure 9); and the service yard behind the units between Tesco and Marks and Spencer; are also private land and would require the landlord’s agreement.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			will and will not be permitted behind Newcombe House, seemingly contradictory. An attractive piazza would attract people to linger, sit, have a cup of coffee, as well as being an excellent venue for the Farmers' Market and other events. However, if the draft SPD is adopted as it stands, there is a real danger of ending up with an unattractive mess of an area but one which will very likely maximise profits for the developer and minimise utility for residents and visitors alike.		
5. 50 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	John Learmonth		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of Council commitment and weasel-words. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.48, p 33: "The Council will investigate with developers the potential to appoint a Town Centre Manager..." Section 5.50, p 33: "Encourage the landowners in Notting Hill Gate to work together..." "Investigate the opportunity for restaurants and cafes to provide community lavatories..." Section 5.51, p 33 – re Farmers' Market already noted above. Section 5.53, p34: "...encouraging development of at least one 'business hub'..." Section 6.21, p43: "The Council will encourage the provision of a primary healthcare centre..." Does the use of these weasel-words (our italics) mean that the Council is unwilling or unable to commit? We should be told. 	We regret that you consider the document contains weasel-words but a supplementary planning document can only supplement existing planning policy, it cannot introduce new policy, or require things that are not controlled by planning law.	Noted.
5. 51 Identity of Notting Hill	John Learmonth		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shops, offices and houses. The draft SPD acknowledges residents' desires to have independent, useful shops and office space 	The mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no	Noted

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Gate			<p>and not more expensive housing. Yet the draft SPD is very unclear how or if this can be delivered when faced with the developers' need for profit. Statements such as 5.8 and 5.9, which are wishy washy and unclear, are not encouraging especially when set alongside the weasel-words already identified above. And will a Town Centre Manager (£300k for 3 years seems a lot of money for one person) really help especially when he/she can only "encourage" (section 5.50, p33) landlords to do things and perhaps he/she will be too busy "providing a photo opportunity for visitors by using look-a-likes or actors" (section 5.50, p33) to do much in the way of encouraging in the first place? Also, the draft SPD is far from clear how much existing office space will be retained and how much lost to residential. For example, it says the Council will seek "at least 3,888m² of office floor space" to be in the Newcombe House site (see sections 6.11, p41, and 6.19, p43, our italics) but this number is not very useful when it's not stated what proportion this represents of existing office space. Regarding retail, for the area Ivy Lodge to United House the Council says it will permit the "introduction of modern double height shop fronts similar to Itsu and Recipease" (see section 6.29, p51). Yes indeed, these are precisely the sort of bland, chain, expensive, not very useful shops such new premises will attract and which the draft SPD acknowledges</p>	<p>powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords.</p> <p>References to a Town Centre Manager have been removed.</p> <p>Office space will be retained or increased.</p> <p>The evidence to support this statement is provided in the supporting documents. The fact</p>	<p>References to a Town Centre Manager have been removed.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			residents don't want – we can't imagine Tylers being able to afford the rent! In addition, we must take issue with the statement in section 5.5, page 27 that there are “affordable retail units” in the area – there are clear examples in recent times of local, independent, useful shops being forced out by high rents, such as the fishmonger on NHG, to be replaced by more sandwich and coffee chains.	that there are affordable units does not preclude individual businesses being unable to afford rents in particular units.	
5. 52 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	John Learmonth		Culture and Art. Yes, all very nice but should not take priority over other more important issues such as retaining the Farmers' Market. The draft SPD proposes a cultural centre which “would be ‘black box space’ without natural light that could be located in a basement or within deep-plan upper floors away from the street frontage” (section 5.17, p29). This sounds deeply unappealing and unattractive - what would such a space be used for anyway and what's happened to the Council's commitment to move the NHG library onto the Gate (RBKC CSD section 16.3.16, p205)? It's interesting that each landowner “...will be expected to appoint a public art advisor...” (sec 5.61, p35) and yet they can only be “encouraged” to provide facilities like a new GP Surgery. Priorities need to be addressed here.	Support for the Farmers' Market noted.' Black box space' may not sound attractive but most cultural attractions like museums, theatres and art galleries do not have natural light. The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD. The wording in relation to public art advice has been amended to '

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
				The wording in relation to public art advice has been amended to 'encourage to seek advice from an advisor on public art'.	encourage to seek advice from an advisor on public art'.
5.53 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Penelope Laughton		3 Shops The SPD states that the shops reflect NHG's dual function as a transport hub and as a 'centre serving the day-to-day needs of local people.' (2.9, p7). This is true but the shops that appeal to the different segments are highly contrasting: McDonalds, Prêt a Manager and many other fast-food outlets for visitors, and shops such as Tesco and Tylers for residents. SPD admits that the retail offer is constrained by Portobello Road, Kensington High Street (which has its own problems), Westfield, Holland Park Avenue (2.9, p7). Each of these has a more distinctive offer than NHG, but RBKC admits that it is not within its power to dictate which retailers take leases (5.8, p27). However, insisting on a variety of size of outlet will at least encourage different types of retailer – the needs of a newsagent, pet shop, or independently owned cafe are significantly different to that of a café chain or mini super market. I am thus concerned that the proposals for Ivy Lodge to United House include the addition of double height shop fronts with the concomitant larger internal space. It is also extremely worrying that the SPD notes that 'there may be an opportunity to encourage	The evidence suggests that there are a lot of smaller affordable shops in Notting Hill Gate (see evidence documents for details). Residents have also reported the need for another food store which would require a larger unit. The smaller retail units are located in Pembridge Road and Kensington Church Street and are unlikely to be redeveloped.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>retail consolidation by allowing loss of retail units' (5.9, p27; 5.23, p 30; 5.53, p 34) which would mean a reduction in variety of retail offer and potentially squeeze out the independent businesses that locals so value. It should not be forgotten that a small retail unit housing an independent shop is as much about entrepreneurship as a business hub with flexible office space. In the final plan RBKC should stipulate that a high number of smaller units will be included in any redevelopment of retail space at NHG.</p>		
5. 54 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	The Kensington and Chelsea Foundation (Diana Spiegelberg)	The Kensington and Chelsea Foundation	<p>I would like to comment on the Borough's plans for the redevelopment of Notting Hill Gate and the possibility of the Museum of Brands relocating from Colville Mews and being part of the Notting Hill Gate development. The Kensington & Chelsea Foundation has a very positive and growing relationship with the Museum of Brands. We recently collaborated together to produce a seminar for charities titled 'Marketing Matters'. We worked together with the Dalgarno Enterprise Hub to create a day-long session for 15 local charities and voluntary organisations. The Museum of Brands sourced guest speakers with different expertise from a number of different sectors, all of whom gave their time on a pro-bono basis. The response from all participants was excellent or good. We believe that the Museum of Brands is a real asset to the Borough and relocation to</p>	<p>Support for the Museum of Brands noted. The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p>	<p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			Notting Hill Gate could enhance the potential for collaboration with the Kensington & Chelsea Foundation further. In particular, we believe there is considerable potential for us to work together to encourage more brands and corporate partners to get involved in local charities and community groups, which fits well with the Foundation's growing corporate engagement programme.		
5. 55 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Morven Hutchison		I think the shops are all rather 'bitty' and the overall view is not very attractive. I know that the Council does not control what shops take over empty spaces, but we do seem to have rather too many sandwich bars/coffee houses and no electricians since the excellent one in Church Street went.	Your concern is noted but as you say this is a matter for individual landlords not in the Council.	Noted
5. 56 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Amanda Hayes		Having heard of the plans to renovate the centre of Notting Hill and build a cultural attraction into the area I would like to propose the Museum of Brands as the attraction. The Museum is currently in a hidden mews and shows a quirky fascinating subject matter that is also of great value educationally. I originally trained as a designer. I taught and acted as a London-wide advisor on art and design and therefore have firsthand knowledge on the importance of this type of resource for design students moving into the commercial world. I recently retired as Vice Principal of the Kensington and Chelsea	Support for the Museum of Brands noted.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			College and know the value that my staff and students placed on visits to the Museum and am aware that they are trying to move.		
5. 57 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Peter Barnes		5.10 I believe it is essential to retain the Farmers Market in its present location. It should not be relocated to the options suggested as these sites are far too small. 5.11 I believe that a cultural hub would be a facility which would struggle to attract visitors given the many cultural amenities already existing in the borough.	The Farmers' Market is currently located on private land the Council cannot require that it is retained in this location. The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been re-worded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.
5. 58 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	J B Kinsman		It seems as if consent has already been given for a steep rise in retail rents and a massive increase in luxury accommodation at the expense of affordable accommodation and office space. I would have thought RBKC would be in sympathy with those of us who don't want to live in a Canary Warf style desert. The huge hike in	Retail rents are agreed between individual landowners and occupiers, and, as with residential housing prices in the area, they reflect the market value of the property. This is not within the control of the Council.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			the property values in the area have already destroyed the eclectic mix that the area was once famous for, the last remnants of which are to be seen in the happy mixture of the high street businesses. So please let's not destroy that because of some property developers' desire for extra cash.		
5. 59 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Sally Young		5.4/5.5 The mix of retail units is not entirely unsatisfactory, although the area closest the tube is not very attractive, but it unfortunately shares the same problem that all tube stations seem to generate: quick-profit landlords with take-away (although most of these on the southern side are smart and well-kept) food outlets. It is a relief that there are not more multiple fashion retailers (5.6); we understand that rents in Kensington Church Street are high and that many small retailers (e.g. Persephone Books) did not think it worthwhile extending their short lease; or taking on a new one. There is much turnover towards the northern end of Church Street on the western side, with difficult landlords. 5.8 A Town Centre Manager would seem to be a good idea - but please make sure that they have plenty of experience - perhaps an ex-diplomat, given the mix of landlords in the area! 5.10 The Saturday farmers' market is a great draw and makes good use of the current unappealing area behind Newcombe House. It would be a sadness if this could	<p>The mix of shops is not something that can be controlled through Planning. The Council has no powers to determine the type of shops and restaurants that occupy individual premises. This is controlled by individual landlords.</p> <p>References to the opportunity to appoint a Town Centre Manager have been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>Your support for the Farmers' Market is noted, we are trying to find an alternative location.</p> <p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>References to the opportunity to appoint a Town Centre Manager have been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>not be re-located nearby. I notice it brings in a greater mix of people than at the beginning, with many older residents shopping there. 5.16/5.20 Given the imminent arrival of the Design Museum on Kensington High Street, the other small museums in the Borough (Leighton House and the Victorian house in Gloucester Walk, the Brand Museum in Colville Mews), why do we wish to attract more people to an area which (apart from Portobello Road) mainly serves local residents? Perhaps a small concert hall/art gallery could provide a combined cultural front, but those residents (and visitors) who wish to go to the wonderful Coronet and Gate Cinemas (not to mention the Gate Theatre) already come, without further promotion. 5.26 As an older (but still working) resident of the Borough, I am very heartened by the thought that RBKC might 'review its offer for older people!' Especially since the sale of the residential facility in Vicarage Gate and the simply dreadful block of flats that is going up in its place (some of which at the eastern end of the development will have no view at all, barring the side walls of the houses in Palace Gardens Terrace). 5.31 Portobello Road Market - if you encourage visitors to the market to spend more time in Notting Hill Gate, we will be swamped by people! I cannot imagine that most of those visiting the Market would stop by a cultural centre - and surely the local business already have the advantage of the</p>	<p>area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been re-worded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p> <p>Support for housing for older people noted.</p>	<p>removed from the SPD.</p> <p>Specific reference to housing for older people has been removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			massively increased Saturday footfall? And, please realise, this will be to the detriment of the local residents, who infrequently visit the Market.		
5. 60 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	The Theatres Trust (Rose Freeman)	The Theatres Trust	Culture and the Evening Economy We support the section on Culture and the Evening Economy and note that a new cultural attraction is being considered which would provide a 'shop window and marketing presence' for neighbouring cinemas and theatre. We especially support para.6.16 which will conserve and protect the Coronet cinema and its environment and hope that some time in the future the building may be returned to theatre use. A cinema is only a leisure facility because it can only offer an audience the opportunity to consume and watch films whereas a theatre is both a leisure, an arts and a community facility that can offer opportunities to participate, perform, to make shows, learn life-skills and the crafts of the industry, and provide entertainment.	The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been re-worded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.
5. 61 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Penelope Laughton		5 Energy consumption and pollution Noise pollution is not only caused by traffic but also by people and the development of a 'evening economy' (5.13, p 29) will create noise pollution at a time when residents wish to rest and be peaceful. 6 Commerce and sense of place The SPD rightly comments that the demands on NHG are many (5.1, 5.2). As well as local retail, business and residents needs the locality is	Concern that the evening economy will create noise and pollution at a time when residents wish to rest noted. Concern that NHG should be resource for locals and a conduit for visitors to the market noted. View that a sense of place hard to	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>skewed by the exigencies of Portobello Road Market that gives the Borough and influx of tourists on Saturday. Contrary to the SPD (5.31, p31), I believe this influx should not dominate the development of NHG whose identity is very different to that of the market. I believe that RBKC should make this distinction clearly in any changes it seeks to make to NHG and the surrounding streets that, in the words of the SPD, have 'large numbers of people passing through.' (my emphasis). NHG should be primarily viewed a resource for locals and as a conduit for visitors to the market (see section 1). Buying goods, accessing services, spending time in cafes, enjoying leisure amenities, ease of ambulation and a planted environment all contribute to sense of place. A sense of place hard to fabricate from scratch and RBKC would be wise to build on what is already there, including the Farmers Market (FM) which should be a priority. With 1500 people visiting per week (5.10, p29), the FM is meeting place, alternative food supply, part of 'food corridor' (Clarkes, Kensington Place Fish Shop, Chegworth Valley Farm Shop, Lea and Sandeman) which suggests that NHG could be further developed as a high quality 'food quarter', bringing in not only locals but also people from a wider radius. In my mind this is a key opportunity that RBKC should not miss. London has a diverse food culture derived from all corners of the globe and is</p>	<p>fabricate from scratch and RBKC would be wise to build on what is already there, including the Farmers Market which should be a priority, noted. We are trying to find an alternative site for the Farmers' Market, your</p> <p>Preference for this being a 'new public space' behind Newcombe House is also noted</p> <p>The SPD linked the 'evening economy' with 'culture' because they generally take place in the same timeframe and people who visit the theatre or cinema may also go to a pub or a restaurant as well. Only a few people participating in the evening economy have a negative impact on local residents.</p> <p>Preference for support for cultural</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>accessible from 5 star restaurants to street food, from Harrods food hall to Borough Market. With backing from RBKC, developers and local businesses, there is no reason why NHG could not become a specialist food destination in London and thereby develop high quality commerce in the area, well suited to the changed profile of the locality due to the increase in property prices, as well as attracting regular visitors from further afield. In the light of this, I am most concerned that the alternative spaces for the FM are very poor substitutes for the current space (5.11, p29) and, further, that RBKC is considering moving the market to Kensington High Street (5.11). Elsewhere the SPD says: 'if possible the Saturday morning Farmers' Market will be located within Notting Hill Gate.' (5.51, p33 - my emphasis). To build on the current interest in high quality produce, RBKC should include a proper and permanent place for the FM in NHG in its final plan, perhaps the 'new public space' behind Newcombe (6.10). In addition, it is important to note that if new development south of Newcombe on Kensington Church Street is allowed this will uproot and destroy the very locations of some of the key food shops I refer to above. Whilst not considering the potential for further developing a sustainable local food-based economy, RBKC welcomes the development of a 'evening economy' (5.13, p29) which it admits is highly contentious</p>	<p>facilities in the Holland Park area rather than developing something for Notting Hill Gate.</p> <p>Concern about the evening economy noted, this has been removed from the SPD.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>for local residents (5.13, p29). NHG and the surrounding streets already have many drinking venues, from small pubs to All Bar One, as well as the ones on or near to Portobello Road and it is highly questionable as to whether more are needed. I would be interested to see the evidence gathered that indicated a demand for venues 'that are busy in the evenings so the centre could be a stopping off point on the way home from work.' (5.13, p29). Contrary to the SPD, I do not consider that NHG needs more animation (5.48, p33) in the evening. The SPD calls for a town centre manager (5.47-5.50, p33) but this is partially predicated on the contentious issue of galvanizing 'the local evening economy' (5.50, p 33) and admits that the role can only attempt to persuade landowners to cooperate with, for examples, lettings and fascias (5.50). Also, the SPD only refers to a 3 year tenure – what are RBKC's plans for subsequent years? The limited remit and short-term life of the role lead me to question whether this proposal is a worthwhile investment, unless there is a clear and long-term strategy for developing NHG as a distinctive retail centre, such as a food quarter. 7 Culture and sense of place I am concerned that in the SPD RBKC conflates the discussion of the 'evening economy' with 'culture' (5.12-5.20, p29; 5.44, p 33). The two should be treated as entirely distinct as their impacts on locals are very different: the first is likely</p>	<p>The interest in venues 'that are busy in the evenings so the centre could be a stopping off point on the way home from work' came from consultation workshops.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>to be adverse, the second beneficial at best or benign at least. With regard to culture, I wonder if it would be better for the RBKC to attend to the nearby Holland Park area which is already rich in cultural venues (Leighton House, Lindley Sambourne House and Holland Park House, and the soon to be opened Design Museum) rather than devoting £8 million to create something that is as yet ill-defined, both in terms of user and location. Why not market these current venues and those in NHG (the 2 cinemas and the theatre) together? And why not include cultural locations in the north of the Borough as well? As the SPD says, 'planning for culture is essential for making successful places.' (5.14, p29). I therefore suggest better coordination of what we have, rather than creating something new at such a high cost, particularly in the light of my next point. The SPD states that the creation of the cultural facility 'would be at the expense of other public benefits' (5.19, p29). This rings alarm bells. I would like to know what might be disadvantaged if the cultural facility is developed so that I may respond appropriately.</p>		
5. 62 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Gerald Eve LLP (Samuel Palmer)	Gerald Eve LLP	Chapter 5 - Identity of Notting Hill Gate Paragraphs 5.48 – 5.50 – Town Centre Manager Paragraph 5.48 stipulates that the Council will investigate the potential to appoint a 'Town Centre Manager' in order to support provision of a vibrant range of	References to the opportunity to appoint a Town Centre Manager have been removed from the SPD, because this is not something the Council could expect developers to fund.	References to the opportunity to appoint a Town Centre Manager have been removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>shops, businesses and facilities. The cost of funding this post is estimated at £300,000 and the purpose of the role is set out in Paragraph 5.50. Whilst there is acceptance to the principle of a Town Centre Manager and to the majority of the bullet points listing the purpose of this role, there are three specific bullet points which are overly prescriptive. These are: i) Encourage landowners in Notting Hill Gate to work together to manage their individual lettings to achieve an overall mix of shops, cafes and restaurants that best meets the requirements of residents, workers and visitors: not an identikit High Street; ii) Identify opportunities for shop front improvements and work with property owners to deliver improvements; and iii) Investigate the opportunity for restaurants and cafes to provide community lavatories that are freely available for use by non-customers. Paragraph 5.53 – Retaining and improving the quality of office space Paragraph 5.53 encourages the development of at least one ‘business hub’ providing flexible office space ranging from set down space to small office units, with some shared facilities like a café and conference rooms. The process by which office leases are controlled and issued does not form part of the planning process and is not able to be controlled by such. The leasing of office accommodation is a commercial issue and part of the management of our client’s wider portfolio</p>	<p>The Council accepts that how leases are controlled and issued does not form part of the planning process, but the public are concerned about development forcing out the creative businesses that currently have offices in NHG. Encouraging provision of more flexible space is a way to overcome this concern.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>from which value is extracted. Whilst it is important to recognise the Councils aspirations for a 'hub' there are a range of factors, beyond planning, that could make this unviable. Paragraph 5.55 – Providing additional housing Paragraph 5.55 states that the Council will: "...require a mix of sizes of private homes, with at least 75% (by floor area) meeting, or being comparable to, the sizes set out in the Mayor's Housing Standards". The objective of this statement is unclear and needs to be clarified. The objective of the Mayor's space standards is to ensure minimum space standards in order to create appropriate levels of amenity. It is not the intention to require schemes to be arbitrarily limited to a floor space. In this respect the requirements of 'being comparable to' the Mayors space standards needs greater explanation to avoid this being misinterpreted as an overly prescriptive approach to restrict the size of units.</p>	<p>This has been removed from the SPD.</p>	<p>Reference to Mayor's Housing standard removed from SPD.</p>
5. 63 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Mr. Roome		<p>5.12 Add NH Arts Club, for its demographic destination draw and its name for national interest. 5.13 See enclosed Evening Standard article showing that there need not be any neighbourhood amenity problem if Astley House incorporates extra residential. 5.14 to 5.20 and 5.31: This reads as a sudden dive into "trying too hard". 5.43 to 5.46:£8m is too large a sum, presuming a high risk of failure the intention</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.20 of the SPD reduced, refers to three clubs. The text for Site 2 Astley House has been amended to respond to this concern.</p> <p>Support for role of NHGI, but rejection of their suggestion of cluster of towers to deliver public realm projects, noted.</p>	<p>Revised text Site 2: Astley House</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>internal, windowless, footfall-less "space" - seems fey and feckless. Institutions which actively seek out stations - V&A, NPG, IWM, BFI et. al. will not look at this. Commercial galleries require "souk momentum" (see the worry in Cork Street with the Poole Estate). Until 1992 there were over 25 galleries in a cluster on and around Portobello - now there are two. The Public gallery in the Iomaeli Centre, South Kensington closed to become AKF offices due to lack of visitors, despite promotion and being among the museums. .39 to 5.41 Great credit should be accorded to NHIG for valiantly interpolating its own impromptu projects to humanise NHG while others looked away, The necessarily incidental nature of its contributions will be overtaken by broader interventions once developments proceed with the SPD as litmus test. NHIG's acute, experienced and humane sense of observation should continue to be regarded, and its incidental rejects may continue to find some place. However, complete objection must here be lodged to a suggestion by NHIG that a "wow factor" cluster of towers should be allowed as quid-pro-quo for public realm projects at street level. 5.54 - 5.55 See comment in 4.5 and 4.6 above. Let's recreate a living mixed community. Let lights come on at night, No more Wycombe Squares on Thornwood Gardens around NHG. 5.59 5.63: The disadvantage of merely incidental public art is what may</p>	<p>Rejection of creation of unoccupied apartments, noted but who purchases apartments and whether they chose to occupy them cannot be controlled by the planning system.</p> <p>Concern that incidental public art quickly becomes passé noted, this is why the Council is keen for developers to seek the advice of public art advisors.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			produce initial pleasure turns tired, familiar and so passé' - but lingers on.		
5.64 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Mr. Roome		5.13 Evening Standard article enclosed: 'Ministry of Sound club in deal with developer over noise' 07.01.14. Showing there need not be any neighbourhood amenity problem if Astley House incorporates the residential.	Repeat of previous comment.	
5.65 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Penelope Laughton		9 Housing and social amenities Regarding Housing (5.24-5.29, p 30), in my mind it would be highly beneficial if RBKC could insist that affordable housing should be part of any development package and that this housing should be in the same locality (and certainly in the Borough) and not in another area of London or the UK. If it cannot prevent 'luxury apartments' that benefit chiefly the developers, at least it has the power to dictate the provision and location of low cost housing. Further, the development guidelines on housing for older people (5.56, p34; 6.12, p41, 6.20, p 43) are weak, welcoming and permitting proposals rather than insisting on them. Would the Council consider reinforcing this element of the development guidelines? With regard to the primary healthcare centre (5.58, p35), the SPD indicates this will be funded by money from developers but not the role of the health authorities. Is this part of a holistic plan for RBKC for providing services for local residents, or will it affect other local surgeries adversely?	Concern that affordable housing should be provided on site noted and that the Council should insist on, not welcome housing for elderly people, noted but a Supplementary Planning Document can only supplement existing policy it cannot contain new policy. We have been notified of the need for a Primary Healthcare centre in the area by the NHS, they not the Council, are responsible for provision of these facilities. The SPD identifies the Post Office as a serving day-to- day needs.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			Other local amenities (for example the full service Post Office) should be recognized as key for both local businesses and residents.		
5. 66 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Savills (Matt Richards (Representations on NHG SPD on behalf of Stranton Prope...	Savills	<p>Comment: Para 5.9 – the comment that the opportunity to encourage retail consolidation by allowing loss of retail units for office entrance foyers is considered overly restrictive. If there is considered scope to consolidate retail provision, then the re-use of retail uses for other town centre uses (such as cafes/restaurants) should be considered as these can significantly enhance the vitality and viability of the District Centre. Suggestion: It is suggested that the text be expanded at Para 5.0 so that alternative town centre uses be considered. Comment: Para 5.13 – the recognition of the role that restaurants play in encouraging a day to evening economy is welcome, although there is an abrupt and unsatisfactory end to considering the benefits that new and potentially high end entertainment uses can bring to Notting Hill Gate, which if properly managed and controlled, are substantial. Suggestion: The SPD should allow for a flexible approach to the loss of Retail (Use Class A1) uses where the site is being holistically redeveloped and there is an opportunity to secure a high quality Restaurant (Use Class A3) use, which the Council could control through the imposition of conditions in order to safeguard</p>	<p>Retail consolidation is not being encouraged in this SPD, allowing loss of retail units for office entrance foyers is the only circumstance where this would be allowed so both the suggested changes are rejected.</p> <p>Our residents are particularly concerned about the loss of shops they find useful so this change would not be appropriate.</p> <p>We find it surprising you could draw this conclusion as considerable attention has been paid to understanding what is special and unique about Notting Hill gate and how this can be built upon.</p>	Noted

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>residential amenity. Comment: The only reference the document makes to 'viability' is here and that the 'messy, more affordable and colourful vitality' is seen as an important thing to preserve. This seems to suggest that the RBKC do not wish to regenerate Notting Hill Gate but are rather happier to maintain it in its failing state. It is disappointing to believe this might actually be the case having for so long been involved in a process which we understood had the goal of regenerating the locality. Comment: Para 5.24-5.29 – we welcome the recognition of housing being an appropriate land use in Notting Hill Gate and the acknowledgement that this is a sustainable location with good transport links. We do not consider it justified that the SPD be prescriptive in respect of the size and type of units over and above that set out in the Core Strategy. Suggestions: Planning applications should be assessed on their merits with a mix of housing required that reflects that set out in the Core Strategy.</p>	The reference to size of housing units has been removed.	The reference to size of housing units has been removed.
5. 67 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Way West Press (Tim Burke)	NHIG	<p>IDENTITY 4.1. Community Benefit ? The Group feels that the SDP should place a greater focus on promoting Notting Hill? vibrant community life or „community-Planning-Purchase,? within planning. IV. IDENTITY 4.1. Community Benefit cont . ? The Council should have a proactive „community-Planning-Purchase? Policy, over a ten year period, to better preserve</p>	A proactive purchase policy to preserve local shops is not a planning matter. The 15% for community planning purchase proposed could not be put forward in a supplementary planning document which can only supplement existing policy, not create new policy.	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>local shops such as Tylers Homecare, Calders the Chemists or the Farmers? Market. This could be via „forward guidance? To Landowners as to shop use, say: 15% for „community-Planning-Purchase? To be cross subsidised via the 85% higher end retail rental. The Council must use all statutory powers available to best support the continued provision of „community retail? As described. ? The Council should also be alert to the unintended consequences of redevelopment. For instance, the suggested addition of residential floor space to Astley House would inevitably results in the loss of the popular and influential Notting Hill Arts Club. This perverse outcome (which undermines the Council? vision of the Gate as a Cultural Hub) could be avoided if only sole „office use? was granted for the additional floor space. ? The Group supports the SPD? commitment to maintaining office space. ? The Group broadly welcomes the appointment of a Town Centre Manager. But thinks more detail is required. The Group also asks, might such a post be also made for „ortobello,?that has such a thriving S.M.E economy? ? We very much welcome the commitment to the replacement of the GP surgery. 4.2. Affordable Housing ? The SPD should do more to avoid the area being transformed into a "buy to leave" graveyard by the development of luxury apartments. ? There</p>	<p>Support for maintenance of existing office space noted.</p> <p>The text for Site 2 Astley House has been amended to reflect this concern.</p> <p>References to a Town Centre Manager have been removed. Portobello Road already has a Markets Development Officer.</p> <p>Support for replacement GP surgery noted. An SPD cannot control who buys and apartment or if they chose to occupy it.</p> <p>It is not possible to provide precise figures on affordable housing and its location in an SPD, this is dependent on a viability assessment and has to wait until the scheme has been designed and there is a planning application.</p> <p>Affordable housing requirements are set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and</p>	<p>The text for Site 2 Astley House has been amended to reflect this concern.</p> <p>References to a Town Centre Manager have been removed</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>must also be provable, described by unit not via figures, affordable or social housing gain in the SPD. We welcome housing for the elderly. ? The SDP should request the provision of on-site social housing to preserve the area fast disappearing social mix. At the very least units ? should be built either in Notting Hill or within the Royal Borough? boundaries, not elsewhere. ? Too little emphasis is given to affordable housing bearing in mind the existing Royston Court on the corner of Ken Church St and Kensington Place which contains at least 21 affordable housing units and which developers will probably wish to demolish. We must at the very least protect existing affordable housing in any development. 4.3. Cultural Hub ? The Group feels that the Gate? many and well-loved existing cultural facilities should be improved (e.g. the Coronet and the Gate cinemas, the Gate Theatre) or preserved (e.g. the Notting Hill Arts Club) before an additional attraction is provided. Continued use-class? and listing? designation for theatre and cinemas must be guaranteed in the SPD. 4.3,1 Significant Cultural Facility ? The draft SPD? proposals for a new „significant cultural facility? Are worrying for several reasons: (i) the rationale is weak, with little relevance to the life of residents; (ii) the cost of this new facility would claim the lion? share of s.106 contributions; and (iii) the seemingly preferred candidate for the space does not offer compelling credentials to say the</p>	<p>anchor the centre’s strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p> <p>There is no question of changing the use class of the cinema or theatre, these are protected by Core Strategy policies, which the SPD does not need to reiterate.</p> <p>The BOP study was designed to identify how cultural facilities had been delivered via s106 or similar funding elsewhere, not to investigate the opportunity at Notting Hill Gate.</p>	<p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>least. ? From published documentation and conversations with the Council, developers and third parties, the Group understands that the Museum of Brands is the Council? favoured contender for the proposed new space – so much so that the requested 2000 sq.m has allegedly been specified to meet their needs following a scoping meeting in January 2013. The Group contends that the Museum of Brands is a curious choice for such a valuable public asset. How it relates to Notting Hill? identity is also unclear, as is its charity status. Why the Council would favour a museum that is not Arts Council England accredited Museum is also unclear? ? The Group would welcome a breakdown of the £8m costing for the proposed facility as well as guarantees regarding the implementation of an open and transparent tender process for the space, if a new attraction for the Gate proves to be the right way forward. ? ? Further the Group must express concern that the Council commissioned „coping Study for a new cultural facility at Notting Hill Gate? by B.O.P did not interview one local Black arts manager, practitioner, or user, of which there are many, despite recognising 23% of Notting Hill/ North Kensington residents are ethnic, the majority Black. This seems an irregular oversight seeing as the Tabernacle Arts is approximately 90m away from the Museum Of Brands. We further worry that Notting Hill Gate? „significant cultural facility? by</p>	<p>Support for re-locating and expanding the work of the Gate Theatre noted.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>default, might be an attraction solely for White middle class residents, and wealthy visitors who can afford a museum/ attraction that charges admission. We further highlight the Equalities Act? sets out a "statutory duty to determine which socio-economic inequalities they (public bodies) are in a position to influence?. No such determination throughout the SPD appears to have been made. ? The Group feels on reflection, if the Royal Borough should seek to attract a „significant cultural facility?/ Museum, it must ensure an open tender process, that a well established public funded body, not a private individual or collection is sought. Any such „Museum? Must be free by admission, generate ethnic visitor monitoring, have an accredited education outreach programme, have a track record of curatorial excellence, and a significant ongoing exhibition programme.</p> <p>4.3.2. Other Options ? The Royal Borough should also consider the Gate Theatre for (s106) re-location, which is a champion of „world theatre.?The Gate? current „diversity rich? Work could be expanded to include a writing programme and a young people? theatre, which could recruit from the Borough? schools. ? Also other sites could be considered for the „cultural institute? Apart from Newcombe House, such as the Coronet Cinema for example. ? However it is to be strongly advised, that the Royal Borough employ an outside Planning Officer with relevant Museum relocation</p>		

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			experience, as ? this is a complex sector, fraught with cost over-runs and project collapse. If a new cultural attraction for the Gate proves to be the right way forward.		
5. 68 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Penelope Laughton		10 Summary Independent shops should be nurtured as sites of entrepreneurship, including the provision of small retail units. Existing communities of commerce should be noted, respected, harnessed and developed, and NHG be developed as a food quarter to benefit the immediate vicinity as well as attract shoppers from further afield. In a part of the Borough with existing cultural institutions, any development should firstly focus on supporting these, rather than spending money on new ventures. Low cost, affordable housing and housing for the elderly in the locality should be an explicit priority.	Repeat of previous comments	
5. 69 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	The Ladbroke Association (Robina Rose)	The Ladbroke Association	The same thing applies to the notion of the "cultural hub". The "bohemian heritage" did not "stem" from post-war Caribbean settlement, but is far more complex and older - intellectual, literary, and political. Let us not short-change Notting Hill by presenting it with a pastiche of itself - (such as "photo opportunity for visitors by using look-a-likes or actors") It is exactly what made the real Travel Bookshop go bust.	This text has been amended.	Chapter 2 Understanding Notting Hill Gate text amended.
5. 70 Identity of Notting Hill	GVA (Fred Drabble)	GVA	Identity of Notting Hill Gate Cultural and Evening Economy 5.1 The SPD identifies Notting Hill Gate as a focus of cultural	The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Gate			<p>activities and states that additional cultural uses will be sought to strengthen the area as a cultural hub. 5.2 The owners of Newcombe House are supportive of the Council's aspirations for new cultural uses and will seek to accommodate a new facility of an appropriate size on-site at Newcombe House. To identify the type of facility that is sought for the area and to ensure its success, discussions have been undertaken with the Council, key stakeholders and local residents. Thus far, a suitable occupier has not been identified. In the absence of an identified occupier we do not consider it appropriate to identify the size or type of new facility in the SPD and recommend that the guidance remains flexible to ensure that potential future cultural uses are not prejudiced. 5.3 We are aware that the Council has undertaken its own research in the form of a Scoping Study and this identified the Museum of Brands as a forerunner for the new facility. We understand that the 2,000 sq. m requirement has been set on this basis and not as a result of a full needs assessment. We do not consider however that a cultural facility such as this is 'local' in the way envisaged by the SPD as it would largely rely upon a regional visitor base and commercial funding. From our involvement with the Notting Hill Gate Improvement Group, we are aware that this view is shared by many other stakeholders who do not support the introduction of the Museum</p>	<p>cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p>	<p>removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>of Brands to the area. 5.4 The draft SPD at Chapter 6 later states that the Council will seek space for a cultural facility of at least 2,000 sq. m at the Newcombe House site (such a facility would not be viable without coming at the expense of other significant public benefits). We comment further on this requirement at Section 6 of these representations however we would like to emphasise that, whilst we remain committed to the delivery of a cultural facility at the site of an appropriate size, such a quantum of space is not feasible to deliver at Newcombe House - It should be noted that 2,000 sqm is equivalent to almost all of the existing retail floor space. The requirement for a cultural facility should therefore be flexible with regard to the quantum of floor space and not be prescriptive in this regard, when no occupier has been identified. 5.5</p> <p>Recommendation: In this context, we request that Paragraph 5.17 is amended to read: "The scoping study also investigated case studies of where cultural facilities have been delivered through developer's S106 agreements. The study illustrates that there are a range of options for new facilities within the SPD area and these will be used to guide proposals. However, the end user for a new cultural facility and size requirement should relate to need. It identified a space of approximately 2,000m2 would be required to accommodate an appropriate cultural</p>		

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>attraction. This would largely be 'black box' space without natural light that could be located in a basement or within deep-plan upper floors away from the street frontage. A ground floor presence will be required, which is large enough to accommodate the expected visitor numbers, and which will provide the public face of the facility." ? Paragraph 5.46 should be amended to read: "The Council will require provision of a space of an appropriate size 2,000 sqm to accommodate this cultural attraction. And This may include the provision of a 'shop front' for this and other attractions in the area as part of the redevelopment of Newcombe House." ? Housing / Providing Additional Housing 5.6 Paragraph 5.55 states that "the Council will require a mix of sizes of private homes, with at least 75% (by floor area) meeting, or being comparable to, the sizes set out in the Mayor's housing standards". 5.7 Policy CH2 of the RBKC Core Strategy currently provides flexible housing policies in recognition of the demand for a wide range of housing products across the Borough. By setting more prescriptive floor space standards as in Paragraph 5.55, the SPD is not consistent with the adopted development plan. Furthermore, by restricting the ability of developments to provide the right type of product appropriate to the local market context, the SPD may render opportunities unviable and have potential implications for the delivery of</p>	<p>This text on floorspace standards has been removed from the SPD, and references to housing for older people have been removed.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 Development Guidelines: General Points – 3.5 Housing amended text.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>schemes. We have previously made extensive representations to the Core Strategy Review on this basis and we summarise these again below. 5.8 As stated in the NPPF, development should not be subject to policy burdens which threaten the ability of the scheme to be developed viably. To ensure viability, the NPPF emphasises that developments should be able to provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable. It must be emphasised that any further restrictions and policy burdens applied to developments will restrict the viability of the development to provide other planning benefits, including potentially design quality, public realm benefits and other Section 106 contributions including affordable housing. 5.9 The NPPF makes no provision for local planning authorities to control the type of residential product that may be delivered. We support this approach without the need to introduce additional planning policy control. We do not consider that it is appropriate to define and control the size of residential units. National and London Plan policy already requires developments to optimise the potential of the site whilst having regard to meeting local housing need (see Paragraphs 17 and 58 of the NPPF). 5.10 We understand that the policy is seeking to optimise housing delivery. However, optimisation should not simply mean</p>		

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>"maximising" unit numbers on a site but rather ensuring that an appropriate number are provided, having regard to local demand and context. Clearly the prevailing demand in RBKC is for units already in excess of the Mayoral standards. 5.11 In summary, sufficient flexibility should therefore be retained to provide a residential product appropriate to the local market and housing need. By designating and setting an arbitrary limit on the size of units, this policy may unduly restrict the flexibility of developments to adapt to their local context and subsequently affect the viability of the redevelopment opportunity. 5.12 Notwithstanding our concerns in respect of the justification for this policy (as set out above and in our representations to the Partial Review of the Core Strategy), we strongly question the legitimacy of introducing this policy prematurely within the consultation draft NHG SPD, when the emerging policy is yet to be considered by an Inspector at an Examination in respect of the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. 5.13 It is our view that Government guidance is clear in that SPDs should not be used to prematurely introduce new policies. The NPPF states at Paragraph 153 that "supplementary planning documents should be used where they can help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery, and should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on</p>		

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>development". The supporting National Planning Practice Guidance prepared by DCLG clearly states in respect of supplementary planning documents that supplementary planning documents "should build upon the policies in the Local Plan, and cannot be used to introduce new policies or revise existing policies; nor should they add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development". 5.14 The justification used by the Council for this policy in Paragraph 5.29 is that there is great reluctance to see luxury apartments developed, which "would add little life to, or damage the area, with low, or no, occupancy rates". Paragraph 5.29 states that, "planning can influence the size of houses or flats, but has no power to control whether property is marketed abroad, or, once purchased, if properties are occupied or left empty". There is an assumption here that if a flat is large or 'luxury', it is not sold to owner occupiers. However, we challenge this judgement and object to the proposed link between large units and under-occupation. The current proposals for the Newcombe House site respond directly to a client brief which seeks to both provide appropriate amenities for new permanent residents and to enhance the existing local community. To achieve this, the design has focused on the provision of appropriate new facilities for local residents, including local convenience retail units and welcoming public and private amenity space. Great</p>	<p>This text has been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>This text has been removed from</p>	<p>Text removed from SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>care has also been taken to design internal residential layouts that are attractive places to live, i.e. through the provision of a large number of large, double aspect units. 5.15 Recommendation: On the basis of the above, we request that Paragraph 5.55 is deleted. 5.16 In relation to the mix of units sought by the Council, we note that the SPD does not encourage the provision of family housing within new redevelopment opportunities, whilst it does support the provision of homes for older people. However, we consider it unnecessary for the Council to be so prescriptive and object to the inclusion of this statement. It would be more appropriate for the Council to encourage landowners to provide a range of units in the context of the local market and housing need, assessed on a site by site basis. As set out by the GLA, all units should meet lifetime homes standards and 10% should be wheelchair accessible. Policy therefore already encourages flexibility in units to cater for people of disparate needs. 5.17 Recommendation – On the basis of the above, we request that Paragraph 5.56 is deleted and 5.26 is amended to state: "The area surrounding Notting Hill Gate has low numbers of families with dependent children. However, the Council is keen to encourage a mix of units on sites that come forward for residential development."</p>	<p>the SPD.</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.26 and 5.56 have been deleted.</p>	
5. 71	H M Fox		5 Identity of Notting Hill Gate 5.11 A	Concern about use of the site	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Identity of Notting Hill Gate			<p>proposal to remove the Farmer's Market to the space behind Marks & Spencers would have the disadvantage 1. no through access as enjoyed in the present site of the Farmer's market. This would greatly increase congestion and render difficult the considerable traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian that currently serves the market. 2. The area behind Marks and Spencer is about half the size of the existing space occupied by the Farmers' Market and abuts immediately on solely residential properties and gardens exposing the market to fox and other rodents attracted by the market's food products. A similar problem had already to be dealt with in this space some years previously by insecure dustbins belonging to Marks and Spencer containing discarded packets of food.</p>	<p>behind M&S for Farmers' Market because it is too small and surrounded by residential properties, and the risk of attracting vermin, noted.</p>	
5. 72 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Sophie Stovin		<p>Regarding the relocation of the Farmers Market to behind Marks and Spencer. Please consider that all the access for the stall holders is via the entrance on Pembridge Road, obviously no access should be made available via Victoria Gardens as this is residential and we could not tolerate all the noise of deliveries etc. early on a Saturday morning. Also to consider the impact of people arriving and parking in the already very limited residents parking available in this area. I would strongly object to this site if no proper measures were taken to protect the residents from disturbance in the morning.</p>	<p>If the Farmers' Market were to relocate to behind M&S access via Victoria Gardens would not be proposed. Concerns about noise nuisance early in the morning in a residential area also noted.</p>	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
5 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Mackenzie		I think the Farmers' Market is a very important amenity in the area. I believe it is vital to find a site for it close to where it is currently located. Please make sure that the market can be relocated to one of the identified sites.	Support for retention of the Farmers' Market noted.	No change
5. 73 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	C Pinder		The report has correctly identified that the shops at Notting Hill Gate meet the needs of tourists (too many coffee shops, sandwich bars/fast food takeaways etc) but not those of local residents. I would support better food supply (M&S too small, Tesco's has a poor product selection). We would welcome a Waitrose, for instance. Notably, restaurants are not mentioned in the document. There are no decent restaurants on Notting Hill Gate (the only two high quality restaurants in the neighbourhood are both on Kensington Church Street). As for the Farmer's market, please consider the site behind the Astley House building, rather than that behind Tesco's, which I find remote and scary to enter. As for a "2000 msq 'cultural' space such as a gallery or museum, I do not support that. This would only increase footfall to an overloaded area. It is not needed by local residents. We need good shopping and restaurants instead. I also do not support the consideration to increase the heights of buildings along the Gate in order to accommodate more offices. Finally, the existing 'public art' (elephant, spiral tower) is not appreciated by many local residents. We need more	Support for better food provision noted, but the type of shops and restaurants is in the control of landlords not the Council. Your concern about the site behind Tesco as a potential site for the Farmers' Market is noted. The SPD proposes retaining not increasing the amount of office floorspace. Preference for trees and plants over artwork noted.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			trees and plants, not divisive 'artwork'.		
5. 74 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Architects Appraisal Panel AAP (Alfred Munkenbeck)	Architects Appraisal Panel AAP	The cultural activity is imprecise and the AAP supports the additional work to define its contribution and space requirements. It warns of the difficulties of securing such uses and questions whether other more commercial functions could provide the distinctive 'anchor' use, such as a covered sky lit market similar to the former Kensington Market or, on a smaller scale, Spitalfields and Camden Markets. This could build upon the existing farmers' market, which would be a shame to lose.	The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.
5. 75 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Bernard Doherty		(after the redevelopment of Newcombe House): I think the rest would follow and the opportunity of finding a place for a cultural centre would present itself. Other owners would be encouraged to upgrade their holdings.	Your view that after redevelopment of Newcombe House the rest would follow is noted.	No change
5.76 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Alastair Coutts		Encourage or require more cultural use and independent shops, both upmarket and bohemian. Encourage a wider selection of up-market mini supermarkets and discourage the down-market fast-food and other chain stores.	Support for independent shops provision noted, but the type of shops and restaurants is in the control of landlords not the Council	No change
5.77 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Architects Appraisal Panel AAP (Paul Williams)	Architects Appraisal Panel AAP	Importantly, the focus should be on improving Notting Hill Gate and not on resolving access to Portobello Road. This should not become a distraction. If	Comments noted. The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>anything, part of the area's charm is discovering the way to Portobello Road. Any measures to improve access to the market should be distinctly low-key, rather than any major interventions. Regarding the character, the town centre has an existing vibrancy that could be enhanced, though the Panel is unconvinced that a new museum or similar cultural facility is necessarily the answer, and particularly given their general scarcity (e.g., Earl's Court experience). It may well work to invite 'cultural tenders', though the Panel is cautious of tying any master plan or individual development to a particular 'footloose' cultural activity. Other non cultural facilities could work just as well and should be considered, such as a university or business hub (e.g., King's Cross) or simply more restaurants to encourage those returning from Portobello Road to linger. Could Notting Hill Gate become a restaurant food hub, and is any thought being given to working with the farmers' market?</p>	<p>anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been reworded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p>	
5. 78 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Jeffrey Manton		<p>Any cultural attraction should bear in mind the consultation's clear responses on the environmental impact of noise and footfall. This is a primarily residential area to south and north. Any increase in noise and nuisance and the associated detritus on the streets would be a step back and not forward. The consultation points to arts or culture used by local residents as much as</p>	<p>Concern about cultural attraction generating noise and footfall that will drive away residents noted.</p> <p>The new cultural attraction was identified as a way to build on and anchor the centre's strength as a cultural hub and focus of the evening economy. Since the</p>	<p>Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>outsiders as part of the local retail mix and not as an attraction to bring more people into the area. Note the comments about the existing crowding driving residents away in consultation. Residents will be increasingly driven away if the cultural/arts centre increases footfall. The identity desired was one of community and attraction to residents in consultation akin to Marylebone and the density and height of building and the retail centre in a 'Winter Garden' are in direct conflict with this response to consultation. Lower rise and opportunities for more smaller retailers that residents will use were cited.</p>	<p>consultation the Coronet Cinema has been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and a cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. The SPD has been re-worded to remove references to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction.</p> <p>Desire for community akin to Marylebone and concern that the density and height of buildings are in direct conflict with this noted. However, Notting Hill Gate already has tall buildings and it is not viable to replace them with low rise buildings.</p>	
5. 79 Identity of Notting Hill Gate	Knox-Peebles		<p>I have commented on paras 5.1 to 5.49 - I lost the box, so hope it came to you 5.50 this appointment is cheap at the price if he/she are good - and essential given the number of individual developers THEY MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO MAKE A MESS OF THIS ONCE IN LIFETIME CHANCE TO IMPROVE nhg but I do object to the idea of photos taken with Look-a-likes - surely we can come up with something better than that - it's feeble and very backward looking. 5.53 - be very careful about increasing office space, particularly if it means sacrificing small individual shops and concerns. However I</p>	<p>Support for Town Centre Manager noted but this has been removed from the SPD because it is not something the Council can expect developers to fund.</p> <p>This SPD is proposing to retain not increase office provision, the loss of shops would only be considered if it was to enable provision of an office hub that could house creative businesses.</p> <p>Concern about public art noted but the Council's Public Art Panel has</p>	References to Town Centre Manager removed.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			agree with fostering the creative business in the area as that will feed into NHG DNA 5.54 please, as much affordable housing as possible - ordinary working people are the lifeblood of an area - if they are forced out it will become a dormitory/holiday home for the wealthy 5.55 why are our houses to be of a lower standard than the Mayor's ??? 5.56 YES and as part of development - not somewhere else 5.61 - as before - art should be idiosyncratic and individual NOT chosen by a committee or it will be worthless - just visual wallpaper. Lighting is a good idea	been successful in preventing proliferation and driving up the quality of public art in the borough. Support for lighting noted. The SPD was not proposing lower housing standards than that of the Mayor. This section has been removed from the SPD.	References to the Mayor's housing standards removed.
5.80	Scott Enterprise (Property Development & Consultancy) (J. S. M. Scott)		CENTRAL MUSEUM. (of Brands or other). This is not desired by local people or visitors. The area is not a destination: it's a throughfare; we must make it a pleasure to pass through, by cinemas, theatre and restaurants etc. and fine architecture.	Lack of support for museum noted, this not proposed it was quoted only as an example. The take-over of the Coronet by a new owner who is intending to open a theatre as well as a cinema should help to make Notting Hill Gate more of a destination.	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.
5.81	Scott Enterprise (Property Development & Consultancy) (J. S. M. Scott)		SECURE LOCAL TRADE & LIFE. Notting Hill Arts Club, Tylers Hardware, space for small family run businesses. Follow the lead of Marylebone High Street in principle. FARMERS' MARKET. Grave concern at loss of current ideal site. Anxious to secure that one shop at least is maintained for Farmers' Produce and at a modest rent.	Support for 'principle' of Marylebone High Street and family run businesses in Notting Hill Gate is noted but this is controlled by landlords not the Council. Support for the Farmers' Market noted.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD