

Notting Hill Gate Draft SPD – consultation comments [Site 1 - Newcombe House sites]

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Site 1. 1: Newcombe House sites	Johnston		I am very concerned about the plans to build anything higher than 2/3 stories in the current Newcombe House parking lot. The proposal for a six story structure would substantially compromise the natural light we would benefit from; particularly on the lower floor. In addition, our privacy would also be severely affected purely because of the number of windows that would look down on our property. I strongly urge you to exclude this from being one of the possibilities allowed for in the proposed redevelopment of Notting hill Gate.	References to taller buildings have been removed from the SPD.	References to taller buildings have been removed from the SPD.
Site 1. 2: Newcombe House sites	laure ghouila-Houri		I am opposing spending money on commissioning a piece of art. Try first to work with museum to convince to lend you some sculpture. Or with the London Mayor office which manages the 4th plinth on Trafalgar square where a new sculpture is on display for some time on the plinth and then disappears. You might end up with one. They are usually very interesting. Instead of spending money on Art, I would rather have beautifully designed green spaces within the urban landscape.	Opposition to commissioning public art, suggestion to work with a museum for a sculpture loan or with the GLA on something like the 4 th plinth at Trafalgar Square and support for provision of green spaces noted.	No change
Site 1. 3: Newcombe	laure ghouila-		As per Newcombe House itself hard to	Support for “interesting,	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
House sites	Houri		judge before being proposed some plans. It has to be a landmark building. Interesting, aesthetically beautiful. It has to be a strong positive contribution to the area. I am opposed to affordable housing being on the same site. They should be relocated in west Kensington towards Golborne road, not in the heart of Notting Hill Gate.	aesthetically beautiful” building on the Newcombe house site noted. Architectural style and design issues will be subject to the submission of a planning application. Opposition to affordable housing provision in Notting Hill Gate noted.	
Site 1. 4: Newcombe House sites	Irving		I reject both Options 1 and 2 because of the proposed heights of the new buildings. I think such tall buildings at street level will diminish the conservation areas, spoiling views from side streets and making the main roads oppressive.	Option 2 has been removed from the SPD and Option 1 no longer refers to a tall building.	Newcombe House Options 2 removed from the SPD.
Site 1. 5: Newcombe House sites	Nellen (Gideon Nellen)	Nellen	1 I oppose the suggestion of a "tall slender" building to replace Newcombe House. Newcombe House is currently far too tall and out of scale. An elegant building of 6 floors should be the guideline, I suggest, which would be in scale with the area. This is a chance to rectify this past mistake. 2 As Newcombe House is currently all offices, any replacement should also be entirely offices ALL AT OR ABOVE GROUND FLOOR LEVEL. Additional above ground office accommodation should be required to make up any lost office space as a result of the reduction of the height of Newcombe House. The current trick of developers meeting the office requirement underground should be resisted. Office	Opposition to a tall slender building to replace Newcombe House noted, this option has been removed from the SPD but it would not be financially viable to replace Newcombe House with a lower building. Council policy is to retain office space. Opposition to a 'winter garden' and 'shopping mall' as being out of character with the surrounding area noted. The Council noted your support for an active and lively streetscape. The SPD seeks to improve the streetscape through identified public realm improvements ensuing	The SPD has been amended to remove references to taller buildings.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			accommodation above ground is desperately needed in the area and should be encouraged preferably multi tenanted office space rather than single occupancy. 2 A "shopping mall" or a "winter garden" should both be resisted as being out of character with the area. They would also I believe an active and lively streetscape.	environment is improved for pedestrians.	
Site 1. 6 Newcombe House sites	Charlotte Pennington		6.2 I live opposite the substation and it is already very tall - I am concerned that it must not be made taller as definitely morning light would be affected and reduced from the East The road to the side of the substation is very useful for redirecting larger vehicles down and in particular when there is a blockage or slow delivery down Jameson Street In view of the traffic flow in Hillgate village the vehicles travel down Jameson in order to get into Hillgate St and Farmer Street I do not want another pedestrian path from Jameson St onto NHG. As it is the alley way next to the Gate Cinema is full of people smoking 24/7. We already have people sitting on our walls eating their Prêt, Macdonald or Eat sandwiches and leaving rubbish behind. It will take away the peace and privacy. People will all cut through a private area from the tube. Burglars will be able to get away more quickly and therefore it will make our houses and cars more vulnerable.	The substation is now unlikely to come forward for development and Option 2: the comprehensive approach has been removed from the SPD, together will all references to creating pedestrian access to Jameson Street.	Newcombe House Options 2 removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Site 1. 7: Newcombe House sites	Peter Thompson		<p>Section 6.2: Disagree that general height increase along Ken Church St and NHG would be acceptable Section 6.5: Disagree with the option to extend pedestrian connection from Jameson St to NHG, though would be happy with redevelopment of Hobson, D Game and Newcombe where that did not involve general height increases. Would be happy for the tower to be higher as a well designed landmark. Section 6.7 on: No comment is being made on parking for the potential increase in residents and office workers in this development. Section 6.15: I would object to a pedestrian connection between NHG and Jameson St. Section 6.17: I would object to a mid-rise development. I assume a development across the access road to the rear of D Game and Hobson House would not mean spanning Uxbridge Street; rather it would be between David Game House and the LUL substation on Jameson St. Otherwise I would object to spanning Uxbridge St. I object to 6 storeys to west of pedestrian link, 8 to the east side. Section 6.19: Don't agree with the cultural facility Section 6.22: Disagree with addition of extra 2 stories to Astley House. Section 6.23: No mention of parking for additional residents. Section 6.29: Object to additional height where building is not below general building height in area.</p>	<p>Opposition to height increases along Kensington Church St and Notting Hill Gate and providing pedestrian access to Jameson Street and support for option one which has a greater focus upon a landmark building at Newcombe House noted. The SPD has been amended to remove Option 2: comprehensive approach as this is now thought unlikely to come forward. References to the opportunity for a taller building on Newcombe House have also been removed.</p> <p>References to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction have also been removed.</p> <p>Objection to additional height on Astley House noted, but the Council does not believe this would have an unacceptable townscape impact.</p> <p>The Council's parking standards are contained in the Transport SPD. Provision would depend on the specific development scheme proposed so this issue would be dealt with as part of a planning application.</p>	<p>Newcombe House Options 2 removed from the SPD.</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
Site 1. 8: Newcombe House sites	Dickson		6.9 winter gardens please -6.11 cultural facility - how will this involve the local community?	Support for 'winter garden' noted. 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 and the Council has altered the SPD to remove references to a new cultural attraction.	Reference to the opportunity to create a new cultural attraction removed from the SPD.
Site 1. 9: Newcombe House sites	Estelle Beverley Hilton		When Newcombe House was built in the late 1950s the impact of it on NHG was mitigated by setting the ground floor back from NHG, and setting the tower back from the shop level below. The proposals bring its footprint right forward so that the main height and bulk of the building is pushed to the edge of its boundaries. This will make it a much more oppressive and overbearing presence on NHG, casting a much bigger shadow over the roadway. The draft SPD drawings don't give any idea of what we're in for. We need 3D computer generated images from the point of view of the pedestrian - not birds' eye view sketches. How about a rounded our 'chamfered' corner at the junction of NHG and Ken Ch St. to soften the huge mass. And please not dark red brick. Do we need a 'landmark' building? Certainly nothing like no. 1	The SPD has been amended to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings. This SPD is only considering the height and size of buildings. The architectural design and materials used on individual developments will be the subject of planning applications. Request for a Health Centre for residents on the South side of Kensington Church Street noted, the need for a primary healthcare centre has been identified in the SPD. Preference for multi tenanted office space at Newcombe House site, rather than single occupant noted but this controlled by the landowner not the Council.	The SPD has been amended to remove references to taller buildings.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>Knightsbridge. As far as most residents are concerned, it should be as elegant and unpushy as possible. I can't understand from page 43 what heights are proposed: the danger is that the maximum all round will be applied for and pushed through. a) 8 storeys, with everything on the south side raised to the same height and bulk as the Czech embassy, and six storeys down Ken Ch St? Or b) 25 storeys (tall, slender) with all other buildings remaining 4 storeys? Or c) 17 storeys, with a mix of buildings along the south side and down Ken Ch St of 3, 4, and 5 storeys? Newcombe House is already too tall for its dominating position at the top of the hill. It dwarfs the charming - and very expensive - little Hillgate terraces to the south. It shouldn't be any higher than it currently is, and should be set well back from the corner of the site. I understand that the architect Thomas Heatherwick came up with a very good redesign for Newcombe House a few years ago. Please can we see it? Associated building on the south side and down Ken Ch St should be no more than 5 storeys max, with top floors get back to let in afternoon light and reduce apparent mass. It should accommodate a Health Centre for the benefit of residents, rather than a museum for outsiders. Everything should be done to discourage the building of the kind of flats that</p>	<p>References to housing for older people have been removed from the SPD.</p>	<p>References to housing for older people have been removed from the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			become buy-to-leave. (NB 'maximum reasonable amount of affordable homes' What does this mean. What's an affordable home in Notting Hill terms? 'Provision of housing specifically for older people' How old, How controlled? Will both these groups be within a housing association? Who will be eligible?)		
Site 1. 10: Newcombe House sites	Shala Kaussari-Dick		It is correctly identified as an 'eyesore'; it would be great if it could be knocked down. But if it has to stay, I am strongly opposed to any increase in its height.	The SPD has been amended to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.	The SPD has been amended to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.
Site 1. 11: Newcombe House sites	Shala Kaussari-Dick		Focus on Newcombe House": I do not support the following: "mid-rise development of 8 storeys on the corner of Notting Hill Gate and Kensington Church Street falling to 6 storeys to the south and west; or, a tall, slender and elegant corner building that delivers a compelling case of demonstrably greater public benefits". It is the hideous tall buildings (Newcombe House, Campden Hill Towers) which have spoiled the area already. No further development above the existing buildings should be allowed. I am also completely opposed to any increase of height of David Game House and Hobson House. I am concerned about the 'winter garden' proposal (in front of Newcombe House) which might only further increase the use of this space by	Opposition to any increase in building heights noted the SPD has been amended to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings. If it was developed the 'winter garden' would be privately owned and managed to prevent any antisocial activities on their premises. Responses to consultation on the Draft SPD were generally against provision of a new attraction that would bring more people into Notting Hill Gate, particularly in view of the cost.	The SPD has been amended to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings. 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
			vagrants and beggars. Finally I do not support the development of a 'cultural space' in this area. This will unnecessarily increase traffic to the area even further and does not address the issue that the current mix of retail outlets at the Gate does not reflect the needs of residents.	The Coronet Cinema has recently been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre so the area will have a new cultural anchor and references to the opportunity for a new cultural attraction have been removed..	
Site 1. 12: Newcombe House sites	Shala Kaussari-Dick		It is correctly identified as an 'eyesore', if were possible to knock it down, I would support that. But if it has to stay, I am strongly opposed to any increase in its height.	Support for a redevelopment option rather than a refurbishment option noted. The SPD has been amended to remove references to tall buildings	The SPD has been amended to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.
Site 1. 13: Newcombe House sites	corinnebunce Bunce		23rd January 2014 To Whom It May Concern RE: Development Of Newcombe House I live in Jameson Street and have been living here for 15 years. I am very concerned about the proposals to build at least three stories on the Farmers Market plot as well as the plan to increase the building heights at Kensington Church Street to at least six stories possibly eight. I feel that the natural light to our property will be interrupted as well having a huge intrusion into my family's life. People will be able to see directly into our house. Our kitchen has a glass roof and our ground floor living area has a	Newcombe House Option 2 – comprehensive approach has been removed from the SPD, references to taller buildings have been removed and only additional one set back storey is proposed for David Game House. Any proposals will have to consider their impact on residential amenity.	The SPD has been amended to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>floor to ceiling glass door onto our patio. This has enhanced the amount of light in our living areas. This proposal would take away all the benefit of light as well as our privacy. It would be like living in a fish bowl. The light and privacy would be disturbed throughout the back part of our property. I am enclosing photos to highlight this disturbance. I understand the proposal also highlights possible increase in the height of David Game House, Hobson House as well as the Substation. This will really impose on our properties in Jameson Street from every angle. I am enclosing a photo from my front bedroom window. At the moment these buildings are 4 stories height. At 6 or 8 we will feel imprisoned and the Hillgate Village we all love will be destroyed. I understand the desire to lower Newcombe House but this should not be at the expense of light and privacy to the residence of Jameson Street. Please look after the residence of Jameson Street and consider the impact of these proposals on our day to day living.</p>		
Site 1. 14: Newcombe House sites	Fiona lindblom		<p>I do not support an increase in height. The building is already out of scale with its urban environment</p>	<p>Noted the SPD has been amended to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.</p>	<p>The SPD has been amended to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.</p>
Site 1. 15: Newcombe House sites	The Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	The Kensington Society	<p>Phase 1: Redevelopment of Newcombe House The Society recognises that there are hopes riding</p>	<p>The Council hopes that a new public space will come about as a result of redevelopment or</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>on this site to provide shops, offices and housing and, in the draft SPD developed by the planners, an aspirational major cultural hub. In our analysis we have adopted priorities, which are; * A new focus for Notting Hill Gate: a new public space This new public open space would act as a focus for community and local activity with links to Notting Hill Gate, Kensington Place and, most importantly, open to Kensington Church Street, which could also accommodate the weekly farmers' market; * Community facilities including a new primary health care centre - GP surgery + pharmacy - and, perhaps, a small-scale cultural activity close to or in the new square; * a new entrance to the Underground station, set far enough back from Notting Hill Gate to facilitate step-free access to the station concourse – paid for by TfL</p> <p>* a replacement for Newcombe House with shops on the ground floor, six floors of offices to ensure replacement of office floor space and housing above. This should be a permit-free and car-free development. A tall building, but not much more than current Newcombe House. This scheme omits the suggested major cultural hub. The Society considers that this would be a high-risk proposal with no real local support and which would make demands on the development (2,000sqm of space</p>	<p>refurbishment of Newcombe House and some redevelopment in the car park.</p> <p>This development will not generate sufficient demand to justify provision of a new healthcare centre but the requirement for this to be provided in Notting Hill Gate has been identified in the SPD and this will be funded through NHS and possibly wider CIL contributions.</p> <p>Notting Hill Gate is not a priority for TfL and so they will not fund provision of step free access, however it is possible that this could come forward as part of planning applications and the SPD has been amended to reflect the fact that this is more affordable than initial studies suggested.</p> <p>The idea of creating a new cultural hub has been removed from the SPD.</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
			costing £8m of S106) Its omission or considerable scaling down would greatly reduce the pressure for an 81m high building.		
Site 1. 16: Newcombe House sites	Estelle Beverley Hilton		<p>6. DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES BY SITE Site 1. Newcombe House When Newcombe House was built in the late 1950s; the impact of it on NHG was mitigated by setting the ground floor back from NHG, and setting the tower back from the shop level below. The proposal brings its footprint right forward so that the main height and bulk of the building is pushed to the edge of its boundaries. This will make it a much more oppressive and overbearing presence on NHG, casting a much bigger shadow over the roadway. I don't think the draft SPD drawings give any idea of what we're in for. We need 3D computer generated images from the point of view of the pedestrian - not birds' eye view drawings. How about a rounded or 'chamfered' corner to at the junction of NHG and Ken Ch St. to soften the huge mass? And please not dark red brick. Do we need a 'landmark building?' As far as most residents are concerned, it should be as graceful/elegant and unpushy as possible. I can't understand from page 43 what heights are proposed: the danger is that the maximum all round will be applied for and pushed through.</p> <p>a) 8 storeys, with everything else on</p>	<p>The SPD has been altered to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.</p> <p>Request for 3D model drawings from street level noted. Suggestion to 'soften' the corners of buildings by rounding them at the Newcombe House site noted but this SPD is concerned with height and massing rather than the detailed design of the buildings.</p> <p>The Council understands this was a proposal from Notting Hill Improvement Group.</p>	The SPD has been altered to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>the south side raised to the same height as the Czech embassy (7 storeys) and six storeys down Ken Ch St? Or b`) 25 storeys ('tall, slender') with all other buildings remaining at 4 storeys? Or c) 17 storeys, with a mix of buildings along the south side and down Ken Ch St of 3, 4, 5 and 6 storeys? Newcombe House is already too tall for its dominating position at the top of the hill: it dwarfs the charming - and very expensive - little Hillgate terraces to the south. It shouldn't be any higher than it currently is, and should continue to be set well back from the corner of the site. Associated buildings on the south side and down Ken ch st should be no more than 5 storeys max, with top floors set back to let in afternoon light and reduce apparent mass. I understand that the architect Thomas Heatherwick came up with a very good proposal for Newcombe House some years ago. Please can we see it? It should accommodate a Health Centre for the benefit of residents, rather than a museum for outsiders. Everything should be done to discourage the building of the kind of flats which will become buy-to-leave. (NB: 'maximum reasonable amount of affordable homes' What does this mean? What's an affordable home in Notting Hill terms? "provision of housing specifically for older people' - how old? How controlled? Will both these</p>	<p>'Maximum reasonable amount of affordable homes' is a policy test as set out in Core Strategy Policy CH2. You can see the full policy in chapter 35. Maximum reasonable recognises that in some developments it may not be viable to provide 50% affordable housing. ,Affordable housing consists of social rented housing and intermediate rented</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			groups of homes be within a housing trust? Who will be eligible?)	which costs less than the full market rate. The Council has no control over who purchases housing sold on the open market. References to housing fro older people have been removed from the SPD.	
Site 1. 17: Newcombe House sites	J Loxton Peacock		I like the idea of introducing Duke of York Square element in existing grotty car park behind Kensington Place.	Support Noted.	No change
Site 1. 18: Newcombe House sites	TFL (Laura Stritch)	TFL	The following comments represent the views of Officers in Transport for London Commercial Development Property Team (TfL Property) in its capacity as a significant landowner only and does not form part of the TfL corporate response. This Representation should not be taken to represent an indication of any subsequent Mayoral decision in relation to the emerging policy document. Our colleagues in Borough Planning will provide a separate response regarding TfL wide operational and land use planning/transport policy matters. Overall TfL Property welcomes the development principles associated with TfL land on Site 1 'Newcombe House Sites' of the draft SPD, a copy of our landownership is enclosed in the letter. The draft SPD sets out two development scenarios for Site 1,	Newcombe House Option 2: comprehensive approach is now thought unlikely to come forward and has been removed from the SPD.	Newcombe House Option 2: comprehensive approach has been removed from the SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>these are (i) development focussed on Newcombe House only and (ii) a comprehensive redevelopment scheme encompassing properties along Uxbridge Street. Overall, TfL Property supports the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to encompass a building of six to eight storeys in height, subject to satisfying operational requirements. Whilst we support the principle of development, a number of technical and operational issues will need to be discussed further. Appreciating the above matters, TfL Property is eager to work with the Council and pro actively assist in the delivery of the Notting Hill Gate SPD. **Please see attached plan. 22nd January Our ref: Response to consultation document - Draft Notting Hill Gate Supplementary Planning Document. Land Ownership Location Plan - Notting Hill Gate and Property Asset Register (PAR) Legend. **</p>		
Site 1. 19: Newcombe House sites	St Helens Residents Association (Henry Peterson)	St Helens Residents Association	<p>A new public square as part of the Newcombe House development We support the idea put forward by the Kensington Society of applying Section 106 contributions to the provision of a public square within the Newcombe House redevelopment, entered off Kensington Church Street. As noted in the draft SPD, Notting Hill Gate currently lacks any public space that is neither windswept nor surrounded by traffic. A public square</p>	<p>Support for public open space opening on to Kensington Church Street noted. The SPD was drawing the distinction between public space and privately owned publicly accessible open space. There is no opportunity to create true public space.</p>	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>within the development, sheltered from wind and traffic while also open to Kensington Church Street and with entry and exit routes to Notting Hill Gate, would provide a new focus for the area and a good location for active frontages, cafes, restaurants and retail (as at Duke York Place, off the Kings Road). The 'shop front' element of a small scale cultural facility could also be located here, as could a GP surgery. A public square of the size suggested in the Kensington Society/Malcolm Reading submission on the SPD would also provide a site for the Farmers Market, a much valued existing feature of Notting Hill Gate. The current draft SPD says there is no viable means of providing a public square via S106 contributions, albeit that there is scope for privately managed open space such as the north/south through route proposed by the developers of Newcombe House. While the currently proposed scheme for this site has many potential benefits (including a solution to the change of levels between Notting Hill Gate and the unattractive rear areas of Newcombe House) it does not provide the genuinely public area that the Gate badly needs as focus. Nor does it fully exploit the potential of the adjacent northern part of Kensington Church Street. A new public square would obviously carry a cost to the developer of Newcombe House, which would</p>		

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>need to come from S106 contributions (albeit with the potential of a RBKC contribution to a new part of the public realm). A public square and wide access route from Kensington Church Street would provide a larger element (compared with current proposals) of ground floor active frontage for retail or commercial use with resultant increased rental value to the developer. We share the view that such a square would provide a benefit to visitors as well as locals and would help to ensure the long-term viability of Notting Hill Gate as something more than a busy transport interchange and entry route to the West End.</p>		
Site 1. 20: Newcombe House sites	Alan and Diane Goslar		<p>1. We strongly object to the proposal to create direct pedestrian access from Jameson Street to Notting Hill Gate. There does not seem to be any worthwhile advantage to doing so, yet there is a very significant disadvantage in that it would create a substantial increase in noise for the residents in Jameson Street and Uxbridge Street, as the Notting Hill Gate noise would funnel through the gap (as it does in Farmer Street and to a greater extent in Hillgate Street). It would also provide another path for revellers to disturb what is still a quiet residential area.</p>	Newcombe House Option 2: comprehensive approach has been removed from the SPD.	Newcombe House Option 2: comprehensive approach has been removed from the SPD.
Site 1. 21: Newcombe House	Diana Lennard		<p>Love the idea of a high rise cafe ... Hope you come to some solution</p>	Support for a redevelopment option at Newcombe House site	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
sites			<p>about Newcombe House and the whole area in front of it - in which I have just learnt there is a raised public area...interesting I thought if I went up the stairs that meant I was somehow connected with Newcombe House (i.e. I had to work there or be visiting)...a cafe there might be nice - enclosed... with good views of the street good luck with it all</p>	noted.	
Site 1. 22: Newcombe House sites	David Marshall		<p>In the document that we organised with Sauerbruch Hutton you will see that they identified that Newcombe House does not need to be pulled down but could be enhanced, refurbished and enlarged northwards - see their comments. The fact that it is presently looking shabby is by the way normal practice when someone is keen to pull something down. Referring again to my letter of November 2006, I spoke only last night to James Owens FRICS, who is a Town Planner, originally with King Sturge advising Land Securities some years ago and now with Jones Lang. He confirmed my belief that there was no need to redevelop Newcombe House with a new build. He astonished me when he said that the plans by Thomas Heatherwick for Newcombe House improvements done in the early 2000s were brilliant and of course we now know who Thomas Heatherwick and those plans should be looked at and passed onto the new owners of</p>	Support for refurbishment over redevelopment noted.	The SPD has been altered to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			Newcombe House. I can see no reason why the plans and ideas produced by Sauerbruch Hutton in October 1997 should not be implemented.		
Site 1. 23: Newcombe House sites	David Marshall		Not only would it be possible to develop at least one level underground with car parking, if not two, but also the shop and restaurant ideas as well as a Piazza that could cover the whole of the new Newcombe Place as well as on top of the Kensington Church Street buildings as is, it would then run straight through to the North, right through the heart of the existing Newcombe House and could be cantilevered out over the pavement at the front and also design it so that in due course the extended cantilevered Piazza could then be clover-leaf in design to extend towards the potential development of the Book Warehouse in Pembridge Gardens who in turn could do some canopy extension with a clover-leaf Piazza just as could the developers of Astley House, so they all meet in a series of sloping clover-leaves higher than Notting Hill Gate. These large Piazza type leaves will be natural for Thomas Heatherwick who will understand that we need a Marble Arch, a Piccadilly Circus, and a Hyde Park Corner. We need a central triumphal design that can turn the efforts of these three developers into a summit top Piazza with our own	Design solutions for the Newcombe House site noted. The Notting Hill Gate SPD aims to set the parameters and broad principles to guide and shape future development. Detailed design will be the subject of planning applications.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>"Notting Hill Gate Statue of Liberty". The basis of this idea could be worked out so that we reach the Piazzas on foot, but probably by lift in due course from the underground station and also on bicycles with ramps flowing up both for prams and bicycles on both sides of the road. There are plenty of people who will say that high level Piazzas will not work. The type of Piazza we are now conceiving with broken clover-leaves set at different levels, linked up with ramps and stairs to start 15 feet above the ground, would be space for access from and to shops at high levels as well as being developed from the three points mentioned would run along David Game house and who knows someone with design inspiration might then bridge across to land on the roof beside Campden Hill Towers and then do something similar at high level along the North side of Pear's group properties.</p>		
Site 1. 24: Newcombe House sites	David Marshall		<p>(Piazza comment - previous) The above is not so far-fetched. There should be inspirational thinking and some bold ideas put forward. We should encourage these three developers and their advisers and architects to show their real worth. By doing this the Borough could give to these developers the rights to ownership of these Piazza spaces and access at high levels and thereby creating many thousand square feet of</p>	<p>Design solutions for the Newcombe House site noted. The Notting Hill Gate SPD aims to set the parameters and broad principles to guide and shape future development. Detailed design will be the subject of planning applications.</p>	No change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			additional space.		
Site 1. 25: Newcombe House sites	David Marshall		<p>Notting Hill Gate needs more than just a yellow brick road to Portobello Market. Notting Hill Piazza could become the London international centre for tourism on this side of London - there should be a tourist centre anyway - so far not even mentioned by anybody. The gentle ramping up and over Newcombe Place up to the Newcombe Piazza would be designed for the Farmer's Market vans, etc., on Saturdays and such an inspirational design as suggested could mean that this large (very large) Piazza, running north and south, well beyond the existing Newcombe House, will provide a huge amount of exciting and interesting space, not just for the market but for concerts, skateboarders, jazz bands providing a really exciting centre at Notting Hill Gate. In my letter of November 2006 you will see that Land Securities were looking seriously in those early years at all the points we had to make, i.e. Notting Hill Gate Improvement Group, and did reach the point when Robert Heskett wanted to come to Berlin to look at the major redevelopments with a view to reflecting these at Notting Hill Gate. Alas this trip did not take place. However referring again to the 2006 letter, I do know that Sauerbruch Hutton would be fully prepared to sit down with some master planner and</p>	As above	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			share ideas with the three main owners of Notting Hill Gate to see what really could be done collectively in design terms to make a major contribution and provide a real active centre to Notting Hill Gate.		
Site 1. 26: Newcombe House sites	Johnston		Regarding proposed redevelopment of Newcombe House. I am a resident of Jameson Street and I have lived here for 10 years. I support and encourage redeveloping Notting hill Gate as there are some exciting plans proposed. However, I am adamantly opposed to the additional set back storeys that would result in the detriment of my family home. We have designed and lived in this house to encourage as much natural light as possible and have restored an outdoor back terrace as well. The proposed building would not only limit natural light but would also eliminate any privacy in my home. We have a glass conservatory in the kitchen, and any additional storeys would affect my family and private life would be drastically impeded. In addition, as I work from the guest bedroom upstairs, I would essentially lose all natural light and the enclosure of the adjacent building would be intrusive as you can see from the attached pictures of ground floor conservatory, first floor family bathroom and second floor study/guest bedroom. It is one thing to endure the construction process and	Objection to set back storeys noted, this is only proposed for David Game House and careful consideration of impact on residential amenity would be required.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			all of the disturbances that will undoubtedly arise, but there would be no positive outcome for residents of Jameson Street at the end of the project with the design in its current form. I urge you to take this into consideration. Sincerely, Christine Johnston		
Site 1. 27: Newcombe House sites	C Pinder		Newcombe House is correctly identified as an 'eyesore'. I am sitting five streets away from The Gate as I write this and the ugly tower looms over the lovely Georgian buildings opposite my window, spoiling the view and atmosphere of the area. If it were possible to knock it down, I would support that. If it has to stay, I am vehemently opposed to any increase in its height.	Support for a redevelopment option over a refurbishment option noted, but it would not be viable to replace tall buildings with lower ones. The 'eyesore' policy may be removed from the Core Strategy as part of the current review.	The SPD has been altered to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.
Site 1. 28: Newcombe House sites	Architects Appraisal Panel AAP (Paul Williams)	Architects Appraisal Panel AAP	The Panel does not regard the existing building stock as a barrier to change, and suggests considering refurbishment André-cladding as a positive option. This could prove a viable alternative to significant increases in general scale, or could be in addition to more localised increases. It is not against the replacement of the tall building on the Newcombe House site, but questions whether Netting Hill Gate needs a landmark tower and the sense of being tall for tallness sake. Whatever its new height, ultimately it is the quality of the architecture that will matter. The Panel could also see a	Council notes the panel's suggestion of a refurbishment alternative and the issues raised in relation to a redeveloped slender tower, this option has been removed from the SPD.	The SPD has been altered to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			case for more variety in building heights within Notting Hill Gate that could add to the townscape interest, rather than focussing on one single tall building. The junction with Pembridge Road appears an obvious nodal point, where it is not adverse to some increase in height. It doubts however, whether the outcome would be tall, slender buildings, given the need for large cores.		
Site 1. 29: Newcombe House sites	Mary-Lu Bakker		Think this really ugly and so would be good to enhance this building.	Support for enhancement noted.	No change
Site 1. 30: Newcombe House sites	Guy Mayers		In response to the DRAFT SPD Para 6.2 I suspect that you will be proved wrong over the light constraints re the sub-station which puts in question your strategy of either Option 1 or 2. Para 6.31 66-74 NHG. You are breaking your own rules by allowing a change from office to residential on the upper parts of this block - why? Nowhere in the whole report do you mention employment so you publish no yardstick as to why you propose to REDUCE opportunities for local employment. Guy Mayers	The SPD proposes retention or increase of office floor space.	No change
Site 1. 31: Newcombe House sites	Jeffrey Manton		Consultation shows this building is unpopular due to its height and not necessarily its use. Yet, all the options offer a higher tower. This will add to the existing eyesore and not improve it especially when looking up Kensington Church Street to the north. The term	Opposition to increase in height noted. The SPD has been amended to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings. The Winter garden was	The SPD has been altered to remove references to the opportunity for taller buildings.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>'Winter Garden' is disingenuous as this signals a glassed in retail development that will be like those of Hammersmith on a miniature version of West way. This is not what residents envisage and will be no improvement. Consultation points to a desire for lower build and attraction to small retail akin to Marylebone High Street. It is hard to see how the 'Winter Garden' and a higher tower improve the area. The feel of Kensington Church Street will be more boxed in and not open.</p>	<p>envisaged as a glazed space not a retail development.</p>	