

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea  
Local Development Framework  
Core Strategy Examination in Public

RBKC Proposed amendments in response to third party statements

**End of Hearing**

**Week One**

**Matter ONE**

**Proposals tabled by RBKC prior to matter hearing**

	10 am – 1 pm (Approx)		
<b>Week 1</b>			
<b>Day 1</b> Tuesday 20 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	<b><u>Matter 1 Vision &amp; Objectives C1, CV1, CV11</u></b>	<b><u>Proposed changes by RBKC in response to statements</u></b>	<b><u>Notes from the hearings</u></b>
	<i>RBKC</i>	None proposed through the hearing statements in addition to the changes already shown in the Submission CS.	None
	<i>178257 DP9 for Brookfield Developments</i>  <i>Did not attend hearing</i>	None The comments were considered and some changes made (although not the specific changes sought) in the submission document.	None
	<i>101812 The Chelsea Society</i>  <i>Did not attend hearing</i>	None: stemming population growth is not something we can address through planning. Over half the new homes are on large sites that will provide new infrastructure. C1 allows for the collection of contributions for social infrastructure from those and other sites.	None
	<i>139439 DP9 for Capital &amp; Counties</i>	CV1  Accept introduction of Earl's Court along with Kensal and Latimer, but as part of opportunity area not regeneration area: "... The deficiency in local shopping will have been addressed with <del>two</del> new town centres at Kensal and Latimer <u>and the Earl's Court Opportunity Area.</u> ..."  Suggest changing 'around' to 'at	Change likely to be acceptable to Capital and Counties: statement of common ground under discussion will confirm or amend.

		<p>least' in relation to 2000 houses [Note: this is based on summing Warwick Rd Strategic Site Allocation with Earl's Court, and is not derived from the Earl's Court Opportunity Area in Draft Replacement London Plan].</p> <p>"... Earl's Court will remain an important cultural destination, as well as providing offices and <u>at least around</u> 2000 new dwellings on surrounding sites. ..."</p>	<p>Capital and Counties sought further clarification that the 2000 are all in the Royal Borough. Council agreeable: statement of common ground under discussion will confirm wording.</p>
	<p><i>197185 Kensington &amp; Chelsea Social Council</i></p>	<p>Please note: statement of common ground has been agreed with the KCSC regarding public involvement in the LDF process.</p> <p>Regarding health: CV1, add after first bullet point 'aiding better health': "stimulate regeneration in North Kensington through the provision of better transport better housing and better facilities, <u>aiding better health</u>;"</p> <p>Also note: Health impact assessment was undertaken prior to the publication of the CS. This issue was not raised at publication stage.</p> <p>Regarding access – CO5 already includes the statement "inclusive for all", thus the statement that there are 'no proposals either in the vision or the SOs to address disability issues' is untrue.</p> <p>Regarding housing – incorrect to state that the policy is to 'place all affordable housing in the north of the borough' – policy CH2 specifically precludes this.</p> <p>Regarding transport, the place sections already include provisions to reduce the isolation of Kensal, Delgarno and Latimer. Access to hospitals in the south is also already noted in terms of the weak north-south bus routes.</p> <p>Regarding importance of social and</p>	<p>KCSC accepted.</p>

		community uses, the vision, in relation to residential quality of life refers to “facilitating local living”, and there is a whole strategic objective on keeping life local, at the heart of which is social and community uses.	
	<i>179625 DP9 for Chelsfield</i> <i>Did not attend hearing</i>	None. A statement of common ground has been offered. It is suggested that this matter might be better dealt with under Matter 7 in relation to CF5.	None
	<i>129913 The Golborne Forum</i>	None	None
	<i>372420 Knightsbridge Association</i>	None	None
	<i>175783 The Kensington Society</i>	None	None
	<i>335612 The Norland Conservation Society</i>	None This is addressed fully in Matter 8 Q 1	None
	<i>306971 Westway Development Trust</i> <i>Did not attend hearing</i>	None	None

### **Matter 1 cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<b><i>Chapter/Section</i></b>	<b>Change Sought</b>	<b>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</b>
	<i>General</i>	Better signposting of the document	13 <sup>th</sup> August (this is a detailed matter that needs careful consideration. It will not alter the content of the plan, and thus it is not considered essential for it to be tabled during the hearings)
		Council to consider writing in some reference to localism	The Council has considered this, but concluded that it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy.
	<i>Chapter 1</i>	New paragraph agreed needed to explain the Core Strategy may need an early review, subject to the result of the London Plan EiP	The Council agrees to the following wording; “1.2.8 The Consultation draft replacement <u>London Plan</u> , <u>was published in October 2009</u> . <u>The Examination in Public of</u>

			<p><u>the London Plan is taking place in the summer and autumn of 2010. It is likely that the adoption of the Core Strategy for the Royal Borough will precede the adoption of the revised London Plan. In the event that the revised London Plan when adopted differs to any large extent from the draft, such that the Royal Borough's Core Strategy would no longer be in 'general conformity', and early review of the relevant parts of the Royal Borough's Core Strategy would be undertaken.</u></p> <p><u>The revised London Plan proposes some changes that are particularly relevant to the Borough..."</u></p>
	CV1	Council to check regarding inclusion of Golborne with to Portobello in North Kensington section	Council agrees to this change: "... The unique character of <u>Golborne and Portobello Roads</u> will have flourished, including the antiques and street markets, adding to the vitality of the area..."
		Council to consider potential of including ref to social infrastructure provision	The Council agrees to insert text at the end of the third bullet point of the Vision: "uphold our residential quality of life so that we remain the best place in which to live in London, through cherishing quality in the built environment, acting on environmental issues and facilitating local living, including through strengthening neighbourhood centres and <u>maintaining and updating social infrastructure.</u> "
		Council to consider reference to neighbourhood centres in last section of Vision (see KS statement)	The Council agrees to the following change: "Our residential quality of life will be improved for everyone and we will remain the best place

			to live in London with <u>our network of local neighbourhood centres offering a wide range of everyday services within easy walking distance</u> , our glorious built heritage protected and improved etc etc...”
		Council asked to consider inclusion of equalities in the vision	The Council have considered this but concluded the matter is adequately dealt with elsewhere.
		Council agreed to clarify that 2,000 homes are to be delivered in the Earl’s Court ‘Place’, not the Opportunity Area. Council to refer to the new town centre (This is not a designation, but a generic reference to the centre).	<b>Earl’s Court</b> will remain an important cultural destination, as well as providing offices, <u>and at least around 2,000 new homes within the Borough and a new town centre to address local shopping deficiency within the Opportunity Area dwellings on surrounding sites.</u>
	<i>Section 4.3</i>	Council to include in this section reference to plan phasing	The Council agree to the following text changes  <b>“4.3 Broad Quanta of Development</b>  <b>4.3.1</b> This section sets out <b>geographically</b> how much housing, retail, employment and infrastructure is expected in different parts of the Borough, <u>and when it is likely to come forward.</u>  <b>4.3.2</b> The Borough has to provide a minimum of 3,500 homes between 2007/8 and 2016/7 - or 350 units a year. This <b>housing target</b> is set out in the London Plan. The revised London Plan, issued for public consultation in October 2009, raises this figure to 585. This is not yet an agreed target, and will not be until the <del>the</del> Examination in Public into the revised London Plan has concluded...”  And also

		<p><b>“4.3.4</b> In broad spatial terms, half of this housing will be located in the north of the Borough, and half in the Earl's Court area, on the western borough boundary. The housing in the north is expected to be spread evenly over the plan period. <u>The redevelopment of Wornington Green will take place up to about 2020, with the first phase being completed by 2015. Planning consent for this redevelopment was granted in March 2010. At Kensal, phase 1 is expected to be developed before 2017, with phase 2 following on to 2027. In the Earl's Court area, the vast majority is expected in the first half of the plan period. The Warwick Road sites are at an advanced stage of negotiation – some sites have Planning Permission, others are at the stage of pre-application discussion. It is therefore expected that these sites will be built out in the next 5-10 years. Likewise, it is expected that the redevelopment of the Earl's Court Exhibition Centre site will start in 2013. The whole development will take many years, but it expected that the part of the site within the Borough will be towards the beginning of the phasing programme.</u></p> <p><b>4.3.5</b> In terms of <b>business uses</b>, the Employment Land and Premises Study shows there is a forecast demand of just short of 70,000m<sup>2</sup> (750,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) of net additional space in the plan period. Of this, just over 45,000m<sup>2</sup> (484,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) is in the pipeline in existing permissions. <u>If office demand is phased evenly over the plan period,</u></p>
--	--	--

		<p><u>this level of building will meet office demand until 2017.</u> That leaves <u>leaving</u> approximately 20-25,000m<sup>2</sup> (269,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) of office floorspace to be provided for. Much of this is to be located at Kensal and Earl's Court. Further work may reveal that there is a greater capacity for office uses in these locations. <u>There is, however, no provision in the plan (nor does the Council wish there to be) to require office provision to be provided strictly in line with a periodic phasing: it is not desirable to close off opportunities for the provision of business uses early in the plan period simply because of a theoretical phasing approach.</u></p> <p><b>4.3.6</b> The Retail Needs Assessment identifies a need for just over 25,000m<sup>2</sup> (269,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) (gross) of comparison <b>retail floorspace</b> to 2015 for the south of the Borough. Very little of this is forecast to be required in the centre and north of the Borough. A proportion of this would be accommodated by making better use of existing premises and sites and filling vacant units. In terms of new sites, there are no large sites for retail development identified in the plan that could be regarded as 'strategic'. It is thus not appropriate for them to be allocated in the Core Strategy. However, in Knightsbridge, South Kensington, Brompton Cross and the King's Road a number of smaller sites have been identified (not allocated) with the potential for ground floor retail in the <i>Place Profiles</i> (see below). In total, the combined site area amounts</p>
--	--	--

			<p>to about 21,000m<sup>2</sup> (210,000 ft<sup>2</sup>). It is therefore envisaged that the identified demand can be accommodated within or immediately adjacent to existing centres. <u>Floor area forecasts are not included in the plan for the period beyond 2015, because of the uncertainty of such projections.</u></p> <p><b>4.3.7</b> Turning to <b>infrastructure</b>, the Council is planning for a Crossrail Station at Kensal, which would transform accessibility in the north of the Borough, as well as unlock significant development potential on the Kensal Gas Works Sites. <u>Crossrail is timetabled to open in 2017.</u> A new academy to serve the communities of North Kensington will also be built in the north of the Borough, <u>to open during 2014</u>. Thames Water is planning to undertake a major upgrade of the Counters Creek Sewer (which runs along the western Borough boundary), to resolve current flooding issues, <u>although this will not start construction until 2015, and is likely to be a 3 year construction programme.</u> However, much of the work is <u>taking place in neighbouring boroughs. In the interim Thames Water are fitting 'flip valves' to vulnerable properties.</u> In addition, work is planned to the Thames Tunnel to address London-wide infrastructure needs, <u>with construction taking place between 2013 and 2020, although there is insufficient detail at present to know when the work will be undertaken in the Royal Borough.</u> A new area of public open space is to be provided</p>
--	--	--	---



			in the Earl's Court area as part of the Warwick Road developments <u>which are likely to be built out in the next 5-10 years. The Council is also undertaking a radical redesign of Exhibition Road to be implemented before 2012.</u> A great deal of smaller infrastructure is required, and is set out elsewhere in Chapter 37."
--	--	--	---

**Matter TWO:**  
**Proposals tabled by RBKC prior to matter hearing**

	2pm – 5 pm (Approx)		
Week 1			
Day 1 Tuesday 20 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	<u>Matter 2 Quanta of Development Policies C1,CP1,CH1 &amp; Housing Trajectory</u>	<u>RBKC responses to statements submitted for the hearings</u>	<u>Notes from the hearings</u>
	- 134919 Greater London Authority (GLA)	None. The Council is in receipt of the letter of general conformity with the London Plan, dated 10 June 2010. The SHLAA, which is evidence for the Core Strategy has been prepared by the GLA in conjunction with London Boroughs.	None
	- 175783 The Kensington Society	None.	None
	- 179625 DP9 for Chelsfield <i>Not in attendance</i>	None. The matters are dealt with through answers to questions for Matter 2.	None
	- 178257 DP9 for Brookfield Developments <i>Not in attendance</i>	None. The matters are dealt with through answers to questions for Matter 2.	None
	- 139439 DP9 for Capital & Counties	None. The matters are dealt with through answers to questions for Matter 2.	None

**Matter two cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<b><i>Chapter/Section</i></b>	<b>Change Sought</b>	<b>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</b>
	<u>Policy CP1</u>	To align with CH1 and London Plan expectation to exceed target	CP1 to be amended for consistency with CH1, and London Plan.

			<p>Add: “<u>A minimum of...</u>” In front of “350 additional homes a year until the London Plan is reviewed”</p> <p>And</p> <p>“and <u>a minimum of</u> 600 a year (of which 200 will be affordable) thereafter for a 10 year period.”</p>
	<u>Assumptions behind retail and office floor space quanta in CP1</u>	RBKC to draft papers in response to those of the Kensington Society on this subject	Separate paper being prepared
	<u>Chapter 1,</u>	Council agreed to include text on the nature of the infrastructure delivery plan and summary table, and that it will be updated	<p>The Council agree to the following changes:</p> <p>1.3.6 third bullet: “Infrastructure (Section 2c), presented as a schedule. This schedule will be regularly reviewed as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan <u>and changes recorded in the Annual Monitoring Report</u>, <del>and</del> <u>It is included here as an indicator of current known infrastructure requirements. The up-to-date table will be available on the Council’s website.</u>”</p>
	<u>Chapter 37</u>	Council to check wording to ensure that it refers to the fact that the infrastructure table will be updated through the AMR	<p>Ch37 Infrastructure explains the updating process, but this could be more clearly referenced to users to access updates.</p> <p>37.2.5</p> <p>The IDP and the associated Infrastructure Schedule will be monitored, and regularly reviewed and updated as necessary. It is included here as a snapshot of time, but will be updated as future editions of this document are published.</p> <p>The IDP and the associated Infrastructure Schedule will be</p>

			monitored, and regularly reviewed and updated as necessary. It is included here as a snapshot of time <u>and will be updated through the Council's Annual Monitoring Report, annually. To access the latest IDP, and the schedule, visit the Council's website at <a href="http://www.rbkc.gov.uk">www.rbkc.gov.uk</a></u>
--	--	--	--

**Matter THREE:**  
**Proposals tabled by RBKC prior to matter hearing**

	<u>10pm – 1 pm (Approx)</u>		
Week 1			
Day 2 Wednesday 21st July 2010	<u>Matter 3 Policies for Places</u> <u>CA7,CP1, CP11</u>		
	RBKC	<p>It is proposed that sections 4.4 Places and 4.5 North Kensington 'swap places', so that the section on Places immediately precedes the Place chapters. This is not reflected in the post-submission schedule of changes, although is included in RBKC response to Matter 3, Question 1.</p> <p>Note: changes proposed in Matter 3 Question 3 regarding the monitoring section in each Place are shown in the post-submission schedule of changes near to references to Chapter 38 (Monitoring) and not near Chapters 5-14 (Places).</p> <p>Likewise, changes in the same paper proposed regarding infrastructure and the places are shown adjacent to Chapter 37, Infrastructure, in the post submission schedule of changes.</p>	Agreed
	<i>178257 DP9 for Brookfield Developments (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	<i>306971 Westway Development Trust (did not attend)</i>	None	None

	<i>175783 The Kensington Society</i>	Regarding Earl's Court one-way system, see Capital and Counties below for a proposed modification to Earl's Court Vision (CV10)	Noted
	<i>129913 The Golborne Forum</i>	None	None
	<i>372420 The Knightsbridge Association</i>	None [change to remove 'alfresco dining' from Monpelier Street shown in the post-submission schedule of changes]	Noted
	<i>197185 Kensington &amp; Chelsea Social Council</i>	<p>Regarding the Vision for Latimer (Chapter 9): proposed change to first sentence is supported as the Council considers will add clarity. This change has already been included in the "post submission changes" document.</p> <p>Changes to the rest of the vision not considered necessary, as the Council considers these issues are addressed elsewhere. These changes are not included in the schedule of post submission changes. However, the Council would not object to making these changes were the inspector so minded. These changes are shown in italics below.</p> <p>Matter 3 – Policies for Place: Specific</p> <p>Qu. 7 (iv)</p> <p>Change Vision for Latimer CV9</p> <p>Latimer will have been rebuilt, in a phased way, to a new street pattern, <u>guaranteeing all existing tenants the opportunity of a new home as well as creating capacity for new residents to move to the area.</u> It will be a place that focuses on the provision of high-quality services through excellent urban design. It will provide accessible, <i>safe</i> and adaptable spaces that are valued and used by the local community. New development, including a new neighbourhood shopping centre, will be located around the Latimer Road Station.</p>	KCSC welcomed all the changes. All changes therefore to be included.

		<i>The area will be better served by public transport, and</i> there will be clear links to Ladbroke Grove and White City. A community sports centre with a swimming pool will be retained in the area and a new academy will be established.	
	233936 The Ladbroke Association	None	None
	134910 CB Richard Ellis for Kensington Housing Trust (did not attend)	None	None
	139439 DP9 for Capital & Counties	<p>Regarding the One way system, the Council offers the following modification to Earl's Court Vision (CV10) regarding the one way system</p> <p>Vision for Earl's Court in 2028 The western edge of the Borough will be reintegrated <del>with and</del> Earl's Court Neighbourhood Centre <del>will</del> <u>so that the centre is</u> be able to blossom, offering an attractive 'urban-village' environment which local residents can enjoy. <u>Crucial to this is reducing the impact of the one-way system on residential amenity, the pedestrian environment and public transport users, will be significantly improved by careful design and traffic measures, such as environmental improvements, reducing traffic and</u> <u>By preferably by</u> returning the one-way system to two-way working <u>or other environmental improvements that have a significant improvement to the pedestrian environment,;</u> <u>reducing the traffic flow, and improving the pedestrian environment, the western edge of the Borough will be reintegrated and Earl's Court Neighbourhood Centre will be able to blossom, offering an attractive 'urban-village' environment which local residents can enjoy.</u></p> <p>Regarding the Earl's Court Policy, the Council would like to offer the following wording:</p>	<p>DP9 for Capital and Counties confirmed this change was acceptable in principle. This text has been slightly revised following the discussion on Day 3, Matter 6.</p> <p>DP9 for Capital and Counties confirmed this change was acceptable in principle. This text has been slightly revised following the discussion on Day 3, Matter 6.</p>

		<p>Policy CP10 The Council will ensure an attractive 'urban-village' environment in Earl's Court by supporting improvements to the public realm, pedestrian environment and open space. <u>The Council will and resisting development proposals which prejudice the opportunities for wider regeneration of the area and compromise delivery of the vision realisation of the full potential of opportunities in the area.</u></p> <p>Regarding all other potential changes sought by CapCo regarding Earl's Court Place are those required of consistency depending on the outcome of discussion regarding the strategic site. It is therefore requested that these are dealt with alongside Matter 6 on Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> July.</p>	<p>DP9 for Capital and Counties confirmed this change was acceptable in principle. This text has been slightly revised following the discussion on Day 3, Matter 6.</p>
	<i>Also Transport for London (did not attend)</i>	Regarding Earl's Court one-way system, see Capital and Counties below for a proposed modification to Earl's Court Vision (CV10)	Noted

### **Matter 3 cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<b><i>Chapter/Section</i></b>	<b><i>Change Sought</i></b>	<b><i>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</i></b>
	<i>Policy replacement schedule</i>	Council asked to consider improving readability by having the full text of the remaining UDP policies in the policy replacement schedule	The Council believes this would make the schedule very cumbersome, and would separate the policy from its supporting text. Instead, the remaining policies of the UDP will be produced as an appendix when the Core Strategy is adopted.
	<i>Glossary – areas of metropolitan importance</i>	The Council agreed to check it includes the Thames	The definition in the glossary does include the Thames.
	<i>General</i>	The Council agreed to the need to better signpost where matters relating to the Thames are found in the document	Mid August (in conjunction with the general signposting item identified on day one)
	<i>Para 4.3.7 and map on following page</i>	The Council agreed to include reference to the Earl's Court One Way System, and put it on the	The Council agrees to the following sentence being inserted before the final

		map.	<p>sentence of paragraph 4.3.7:</p> <p><u>“... It is also the ambition of the Council to return the Earl’s Court one-way system to two-way working. However, further detailed work is required before it will be known the extent to which this can be achieved, or when it would take place.</u></p> <p>A great deal of smaller infrastructure is required, and is set out elsewhere in Chapter 37.”</p>
	<i>Para 4.4.2</i>	Include residents in the list of partners and stakeholders	<p>4.4.2 “Place shaping is at the centre of spatial planning. Place shaping requires that different plans and programmes from across the Council and its partners are integrated. It also requires a clear vision of how different places are to evolve in the future, to give a clear framework for future actions, both of the Local Planning Authority, other parts of the Council, and our partners <u>and which might also inform the actions of private land owners and residents.</u> This is the function of the <i>Place Profiles</i>”.</p>
	<i>Earl’s Court Place (paras 10.1.2 and 10.3.10 in particular)</i>	<p>Council agreed to review the way that the provision of social and community facilities is referenced in relation to the Earl’s Court Strategic Site</p> <p>Council also agreed to consider better reference to improved north south bus and cycle facilities.</p>	<p><b>Propose change:</b></p> <p>There are 5 sites along the west of Warwick Road and north of Cromwell Road where significant change is planned. This is likely to be in the form of a mixed use development, with increased provision of open space and <u>a new school education facilities that will also be used as a community facility.</u></p> <p>The sites are allocated as a Strategic Site, considered in Chapter 25.</p> <p><b>Propose change to 10.3.5</b></p>

			<p>The Council will also consider the potential for improved accessibility from the West London Line to the underground network <u>and work with TfL to improve north-south bus and cycle connections.</u></p> <p><b>Propose change to 10.3.10</b> Community facilities will be provided as part of the development <u>on the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area</u>, at 100 West Cromwell Road and the Warwick Road sites, including a new primary school at the northern end of Warwick Road.</p> <p><b>Propose change to 10.4.3</b> <u>Social and Community</u> facilities provided as part of <del>100 West Cromwell Road</del> development;</p>
	<i>Chapter 9, Latimer</i>	Council asked to consider requiring the continuous provision of swimming facilities in the north of the borough, in relation to the redevelopment of the sports centre	The Council have considered this and is of the view that it would not be reasonable of the Local Planning Authority to constrain service provision in this way.
	<i>Latimer Place (Chapter 9)</i>	Council agreed to include text at or near 9.3.8 to explain new housing for existing tenants would meet their housing needs, and to consider if it should be included in the vision for Latimer	<b>Proposed change to 9.3.9</b> One way of raising funds to provide good-quality homes for existing tenants is through the provision of additional private housing on existing Council-owned housing estates. <u>The new housing for the existing tenants will be of a type which would meet their housing needs.</u>
	<i>9.3.11</i>	Council agreed to change "new local shopping centre" to "new neighbourhood centre"	<b>Propose change to 9.3.11</b> There are few local shops in the area. A new <del>local</del> <u>neighbourhood</u> centre is needed to allow residents to have the shops and services they need within a short work.



	9.4.6	Council agreed to take out the word 'shopping'	<b>Propose change to 9.4.6</b> Has a new <u>local neighbourhood shopping</u> centre been delivered in the Latimer area?
	<i>Knightsbridge (Chapter 14)</i>	Council agreed to remove reference to Alfresco Dining in relation to Montpelier St on the Knightsbridge plan	Prior to adoption
	<i>South Kensington (Chapter 12)</i>	Council to consider what changes could be made to the supporting text to include reference to the existing residents in this place	The Council would agree to the following text:  "12.3.12 The area surrounding the Exhibition Road institutions is residential in character. <u>There is also residential use over the shops in the area around the London Underground Station. Balancing residential amenity and the issues associated with the large volume of visitors is not straight forward [footnote to cross reference Policy CL5 Residential Amenity]. <del>But</del> Residential development (excluding student accommodation) between Queen's Gate and Exhibition Road north of Cromwell Road is not considered appropriate..."</u>
	<i>18.1.4 (Lots Road)</i>	Council agreed to include text clarifying that the Lots Road Power Station planning permission includes considerable development in Hammersmith and Fulham	18.1.4 A planning application was approved on appeal by the Secretary of State in 2006. This <u>cross-boundary mixed-used development will include retail, business and over 400 new dwellings in the Borough and over 380 new dwellings, car and cycle parking, children's playspace, and works to Chelsea Creek and Chelsea Basin in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.</u> Implementation of this permission has yet to commence.



**Matter FOUR:**  
**Proposals tabled by RBKC prior to matter hearing**

	2 pm – 5 pm (Approx)		
<b>Week 1</b>			
<b>Day 2</b> Wednesday 2st July 2010	<b><u>Matter 4 Keeping Life Local</u></b>	<b><u>RBKC responses to statements submitted for the hearings</u></b>	
	- 101812 <i>The Chelsea Society (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	- 179625 <i>DP9 for Chelsfield (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	- 178257 <i>DP9 for Brookfield Developments (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	- 337749 <i>Gerald Eve for Martins Properties (Chelsea) Ltd</i>	None	None
	- 175783 <i>The Kensington Society</i>	<p>- Regarding “local open spaces” in 30.3.4: No change. The Council considers that this matter is addressed in Chapter 33: “An Engaging Public Realm”</p> <p>- Regarding public house data: No change</p> <p>- Regarding Change Walkable Neighbourhood distances: No Change. The distances are set as part in line with those preferred by corporate partners</p> <p>- Regarding references to shared entrances in Policy CK1(b): No Change. The Council considers the risk of facilities establishing within residential blocks is sufficient to warrant this statement.</p> <p>- Regarding change to line 3 of 30.3.13: No change. For monitoring and policy effectiveness, no change is considered necessary by the Council.</p> <p>- Regarding walking speed data source in 30.3.17: - No change. 80m/minute and 4.8km/hour still equate to 800m walk. TFL’s walking</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

		<p>speeds have also never been used as a direct reference to Walkable Neighbourhoods and are instead used to compare walking to other modes of transport. For this reason, the reference to the “Walkable Neighbourhood” chapter of “Manual for Streets” will remain.</p> <p>- Regarding Policy CK3 Line 1: after “maintain” add “and improve”: No change. Improving accessibility is detailed within the policy</p> <p>-The Council agreed to change wording of Corporate Action1</p> <p>- Point 1: Line 2: after retailers” add “, landlords, residents, and other stakeholders” (cf p185 Action 1)</p> <p>- Point 10: last line: change “in” to “throughout”</p>	<p>None</p> <p><b>Proposed change to Corporate Action 1:</b> The Town Centre Initiatives Manager will work in partnership with <u>retailers, landlords, residents and other stakeholders</u> to support and strengthen the viability of local shopping centres.</p>
	- 197185 Kensington & Chelsea Social Council	The Council agreed to add a new Corporate Action	<b>Proposed change:</b> <u>“The Directorate of Planning and Borough Development will work with Kensington and Chelsea Social Council to ensure there is effective consultation with hard to reach groups on the ongoing production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.”</u>
	- 233936 The Ladbroke Association	None	None
	- 198604 LPP for clients ( to be confirmed) (did not attend)	None	None
	- 139439 DP9 for Capital & Counties	The Council agreed to add a new Corporate Action	<b>Proposed change:</b> <u>“The Directorate of Planning and Borough Development will work with LBHF and the GLA to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document/Opportunity Area Framework to bring forward the redevelopment of the Earls Court, including social and community uses as required to sustain a</u>

			<u>balanced community</u> "
	-284 Melyssa Stokes	None	None

#### **Matter 4 cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<i>Chapter/Section</i>	<i>Change Sought</i>	<i>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</i>
	<i>Chapter 7, Portobello</i>	Council to consider how the chapter could better emphasise the local (neighbourhood) function of the centre	13 <sup>th</sup> August (CT/JH)
	<i>Chapter 7 (Portobello)</i>	Council to consider if the plan could better reflect the street network around Portobello Road	Prior to adoption
	<i>Glossary</i>	Council agreed to check the definition of social and community uses in the Glossary	<b>Proposed change to Glossary:</b> "For the purposes of the Core Strategy, Social and Community uses are defined as including: care homes/care facilities <u>and elderly people's homes</u> ; community/meeting halls and rooms; doctors, dentists, hospitals and other health facilities; <del>elderly peoples' homes</del> ; hostels; laundrettes; libraries; <u>Metropolitan Police and other emergency service facilities</u> ; petrol filling stations; places of worship; <u>bespoke premises for the voluntary sector</u> ; schools and other educational establishments; sport facilities; and youth facilities."
	30.2.4	Council agreed to standardise phrasing to neighbourhood from local	The Council consider that this change is appropriate and proposes the following wording for paragraph 30.2.4:  " <del>Local</del> <u>Neighbourhood Centre</u> "
	<i>Policy CK1c (protecting social and community uses)</i>	Council agreed to remove 'successfully' before demonstrate	The Council consider that this change is appropriate and proposes the following wording for Policy CK1c:  "CK1ii permit the change of use of land and/or buildings where the current or last use was a social or community use from one social and community use to another

			social and community use which predominantly serves, or which provides significant benefits to Borough residents and where it is <del>successfully</del> demonstrated that there is a greater benefit to the Borough resulting from this change of use”
	<i>Policy CK1 (protecting social and community uses)</i>	Council to consider the representation tabled on the day by Gerald Eve, and prepare a written response for the Inspector to consider	The Council does not consider that changes are required as a result of this representation and have tabled a paper to this effect.
	<i>Throughout plan, but particularly in Chapter 9</i>	Council to update text regarding Building Schools for the Future if necessary, and to forward the revised text to the inspector.	13 <sup>th</sup> August (JMas)
	<i>30.3.13 – 1-.3.17 (walkable neighbourhoods)</i>	Council to consider modifying wording to allow for monitoring on 600m in the future should that be found to be a more useful indicator of accessibility.	Following a review of the Council’s evidence, it is proposed that the 800m walk should be retained for this plan period.
	<i>30.3.4 (post offices)</i>	Council to reconsider the ‘red text’ following the paragraph, and whether the text could not record that there are ‘two types’ of social and community uses, those able to be controlled through planning, and others – so that if the use classes order is changed, the plan is transparent in its wish to extend planning controls	<p>The Council consider that this change is appropriate and proposes the following wording after paragraph 30.3.4:</p> <p>The Council also acknowledges that there are also social and community uses which are <u>considered valuable community assets</u>, such as post offices and pharmacies, where change to another use in the same use class, such as a shop, does not require planning consent. The Council cannot therefore control these uses through its planning powers <u>and cannot be considered under Policy CK1 at present.</u> <u>These facilities respond to supply and demand, which has</u> have tended to result in them being available within 'walkable neighbourhoods'. <del>However,</del> especially regarding post offices, <del>this is no longer guaranteed.</del> The Council will, therefore, in partnership with others, strive to achieve this through other means<b>(270)</b>.</p> <p><u>Should any of these uses change to a different use class (for</u></p>

			<p><u>example, to Sui Generis), they would be considered under Policy CK1.</u></p> <p><i>**relocated from 30.3.6**</i> Public Houses are also considered a social and community use in the Borough, and recent concern over their loss to residential use has been noted. However, the Borough has only lost 6 public houses to residential units in the last decade. This is not to say that their loss is anything but regrettable. However, the Royal Borough is fortunate to have 173 bars (113 of which are traditional public houses) and the entire Borough (<del>bar</del>-excluding open spaces) is served by one or more of these facilities being within a 10 minute walk. Therefore, the Council considers that there is too little evidence to resist their loss at the present time. This will be kept under review. <u>The Borough has also experienced a number of traditional public houses changing into other drinking establishments which do not provide the same community function to residents. However, these changes do not represent a change under the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 and cannot presently be controlled by the Council.</u></p>
	<i>Policy CK1</i>	Council asked to consider the needs of the voluntary and community sector as a policy.	The Council consider this is covered by premises used by the Voluntary and Community sector being included in the definition of Social and Community uses.
	<i>Corporate Actions</i>	The Council was asked to consider an additional corporate action to assist KCSC's production of a register of social and community space	<p>The Council consider that this change is appropriate and proposes the following wording:</p> <p><u>"The Directorate of Planning and Borough Development will work with the Kensington and Chelsea Social Council to establish a register of social and community uses to assess where potential new facilities could be located."</u></p>





**Matter FIVE:**  
**Proposals tabled by RBKC prior to matter hearing**

	<i>10 pm – 1 pm (Approx)</i>		
<b>Week 1</b>			
<b>Day 3</b> Thursday 22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2010	<b><u>Matter 5 Strategic Sites</u></b> <b><u>Allocations Kensal Gasworks</u></b> <b><u>and Wornington Green</u></b>	<b><u>RBKC responses to statements</u></b> <b><u>submitted for the hearings</u></b>	
	RBKC	Chapter 39, Strategic sites 1, changes to column 14 (Delivery Implications) to update to the most current information.	13 <sup>th</sup> August (JM)
	- 129913 The Golborne Forum	None	None
	- 175783 The Kensington Society	None	None
	- 197185 Kensington & Chelsea Social Council	None	None

**Matter 5 cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<b><i>Chapter/Section</i></b>	<b><i>Change Sought</i></b>	<b><i>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</i></b>
	<i>Strategic Sites Plan (opposite page 131)</i>	Council agreed to clarify the status of Lots Road Power Station on this map	Before adoption (DN)
	<i>Quantum of Development plan (opposite page 45)</i>	Show the possible new town centre at Earl's Court	Before adoption (DN)
	<i>Wornington Green (both in Golborne Trellick Place, Chapter 6, and Strategic Allocation Chapter 21)</i>	Council agreed to review these sections to ensure up to date in the light of the recent planning consent, including diagrams showing the masterplan and basic phasing	Chapter 21: Wornington Green <u>Add:</u>  Para 21.1.4  <u>Outline Planning permission was granted 30<sup>th</sup> March 2010 with all details submitted for Phase One and all details reserved for Phases 2-5</u>

**Matter SIX:**  
**Proposals tabled by RBCK prior to matter hearing**

	<i>2 pm – 5 pm (Approx)</i>		
<b>Week 1</b>			
<b>Day 3</b> Thursday 22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2010	<b><u>Matter 6 Strategic Sites</u></b> <b><u>Allocations: Earl's Court and</u></b> <b><u>Warwick Road</u></b>	<b><u>RBKC responses to statements</u></b> <b><u>submitted for the hearings</u></b>	
	- 139439 DP9 for Capital and	See RBKC Position Statement	See notes from the hearings

	<i>Counties</i>		below
	- 175783 <i>The Kensington Society</i>	See RBKC Position Statement	See notes from the hearings below
	- 197185 <i>Kensington &amp; Chelsea Social Council</i>	See RBKC Position Statement	See notes from the hearings below
	- 178257 <i>DP9 for Brookfield (did not attend)</i>	See RBKC Position Statement	See notes from the hearings below

### **Matter 6 cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<b><i>Chapter/Section</i></b>	<b>Change Sought</b>	<b>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</b>
	<i>General</i>	Council agreed to rename Earl's Court Strategic Site as Earl's Court Exhibition Centre throughout the plan to distinguish it from Earl's Court Place	Before adoption
	<i>General</i>	Council agreed to check paragraph and policy numbering throughout document	Before adoption
	<i>CV1, Chapter 10 (Earl's Court Place) and Chapter 26 (Earls Court Exhibition Centre), and Chapter 31 (Fostering Vitality) (see Council's Position Statement).</i>	Changes were sought to the Council's position statement in relation to: - 'small scale retail' in relation to the nature of the town centre to be established as part of the redevelopment of Earl's Court Exhibition Centre - Minimum 500 residential unit - 10,000m2 office accommodation	The Council confirmed at the hearing that it was not in a position to alter these aspects of the policy, as set out in the position statement.
	26.2.1	Council agreed to consider modified wording tabled by Capital and Counties. Council has agreed the wording as set out in following column, which also reflects the exact wording in the London Plan as discussed during the debate.	It is clear that the site has considerable potential. The draft London Plan <u>indicates</u> <del>states</del> that the Earl's Court & West Kensington Opportunity Area has <u>the potential to provide</u> <del>the capacity to accommodate</del> over 2,000 dwellings and <u>approximately 7,000 jobs</u> . The draft London Plan <u>further states that "the potential for a strategic leisure, cultural and visitor attraction and strategically significant offices should be explored together with retail, hotels and supporting social infrastructure"</u> . <del>along with leisure, cultural and visitor attraction uses.</del>

			<p>Within the Royal Borough it is anticipated the scheme will be residential-led, <u>as the Strategic Site can comfortably accommodate over 500 new homes.</u> <del>although</del> The full development capacity and exact disposition of uses across the Opportunity Area should be considered as part of the spatial planning for the Opportunity Area, through the joint Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). <u>This SPD will be prepared and adopted by both boroughs, and be capable of being adopted by, in consultation with the GLA as an Opportunity Area Planning Framework.</u></p>
	<i>Chapter 37 (Infrastructure)</i>	Council agreed to update the infrastructure table to clarify the infrastructure requirements for the Earl's Court Exhibition Centre Strategic Site.	<p>The infrastructure requirements set out in Chapter 37 are identified due to a known need in the area. These requirements are also listed in each of the Places, Strategic Sites and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The latter will be continually updated through the AMR. Chapter 37 identifies that some of the infrastructure requirements for Earl's Court would be required through the strategic sites and others through the 'place' in the area of Earl's Court. However, the Council considers that development in the area of the Earl's Court Place should contribute to delivering the infrastructure in this area. The Infrastructure Schedule in Chapter 37 will therefore be amended to refer to the Earl's Court 'Place' and not specific sites.</p>
	<i>Chapter 10 (Earl's Court Place)</i>	Council agreed to add to the list of monitoring items text referring to	10.4.6 (new bullet) <u>6. Has development</u>

		the delivery of the social and community infrastructure set out in the SPD	<u>delivered the social and community facilities identified through the SPD?</u>
	<i>After para 10.3.10</i>	Change as tabled through the Council's Key Issues Position Statement. Changes relate to not specifying the size and function of the centre.	The area of Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area is currently deficient of access to neighbourhood or higher shopping facilities. The Council will therefore support a new <del>neighbourhood</del> centre in this location, <u>which includes small scale retail provision supporting the day to day needs of the development and other acceptable town centre uses identified in Policy CA7. However, this new centre must not compete with other existing centres. The size and function of the centre will be confirmed through the joint planning brief, having regard to the up-to-date evidence. The extent to which there is scope for a larger centre within the Opportunity Area will depend on a detailed analysis of retail and leisure need, taking account of the vitality and viability of existing centres (both in this and within neighbouring Boroughs) both at the time of the development and in the longer term.</u>
	<i>Para 10.4.2</i>	Change as tabled through the Council's Key Issues Position Statement. Changes relate to not specifying the size and function of the centre.	The Council will also support a new <del>neighbourhood</del> centre in the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, <u>with small scale retail provision to serve the day-to-day needs of the development.</u>
	<i>Para 26.2.2</i>	Change as tabled through the Council's Key Issues Position Statement. Changes relate to not specifying the size and function of the centre.	The area of the Strategic Site is <u>outside 400m or 5mins walk of a deficient in access</u> <del>to</del> neighbourhood or higher order centre <del>facilities</del> . The Council will therefore support the <u>establishment</u>

			<p><del>designation of a new neighbourhood centre within the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, with small scale retail provision to serve the day-to-day needs of the development and of a scale that does not have an unacceptable impact on short and longer term vitality and viability of existing centres in RBKC and LBHF.</del></p>
	<i>Chapter 26, policy CA7(e)</i>	Council agreed to delete 'social and community' from part (e) of the policy, and insert another part of the policy to relate solely to social and community uses, to be distributed across the site	<p>Policy CA7 e. other non-residential uses required to deliver a sustainable and balanced mixed-use development, such as hotel, <del>and</del> leisure <del>and social and community uses</del>; new f. <u>social and community uses</u>;</p> <p><u>Amend monitoring in Chapter 38 to reflect change.</u></p>
	<i>Chapter 26, policy CA7(j)</i>	Council agreed to insert 'social and' at item (j)	<p>Policy CA7 j. <u>social and community and health</u> facilities;</p> <p>Health facilities are included within Social and Communities as defined in para 30.3.4</p> <p><u>Amend monitoring in Chapter 38 to reflect change.</u></p>
	<i>26.2.1</i>	Council agreed to check the text of the opening sentence to see if it is an exact quote from the draft London Plan. If it is not, to insert reference to social and community uses	See above
	<i>Policy CA7(a)</i>	Change as tabled through the Council's Key Issues Position Statement. Changes clarify that the residential component might exceed 500 for various reasons, of which only one is if (a) to (e) where provided in LBHF.	<p>Policy CA7 a. a minimum of 500 homes within the Royal Borough, which could be increased, <u>in particular</u> if (b) to (e) below are provided within LBHF as part of the masterplanning process conduction in the preparation of the SPD</p>

	<i>Policy CA7(d)</i>	Change as tabled through the Council's Key Issues Position Statement. Changes clarify that the Cultural facility is of national identity rather than national significance.	Policy CA7 d. a cultural facility, of at least national <u>identity significance</u> , to retain Earl's Court's long standing brand as an important cultural destination, located on the area of the Opportunity Area nearest to public transport accessibility;
	<i>Para 26.2.3</i>	Change as tabled through the Council's Key Issues Position Statement. Changes remove reference to an International Convention Centre.	A cultural facility that is a national or international destination is required. <del>This may be in the form of an International Convention Centre. The preferred location for the International Convention Centre is as part of a major refurbishment and/or development within the existing Earl's Court and Olympia complexes.</del> However, if that facility is located at Olympia ( <u>in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham</u> ) <del>which is</del> <u>in the same ownership as Earl's Court Exhibition Centre, and is likely to be refurbished and extended to accommodate some of the cultural, conference and exhibition uses at Earl's Court</u> then a significant cultural use that is <u>of at least a national identity destination</u> <del>should also be retained</del> <u>provided</u> in the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area to continue the long standing <u>Earl's Court</u> brand. It is expected this will be located within the most public transport accessible part of the Opportunity Area. The exact location of any cultural or destination uses or attractions will be determined through the Supplementary Planning Document to be prepared jointly by the Royal Borough, the London Borough of

			Hammersmith and Fulham and the Greater London Authority.
	<i>Policy CP10</i>	Change as tabled through the Council's Key Issues Position Statement. Changes to ensure that piecemeal development does not compromise delivery of the wider vision for Earl's Court.	The Council will ensure an attractive 'urban-village' environment in Earl's Court by supporting improvements to the public realm, pedestrian environment and open space. <u>The Council will and resisting development proposals which prejudice the opportunities for wider regeneration of the area and compromise delivery of the vision -realisation of the full potential of opportunities in the area.</u>
	26.3.1	Change as tabled through the Council's Key Issues Position Statement. Change to clarify the risk that a planning application is submitted before the SPD is adopted.	<p><u>There is also a risk that the SPD is not adopted in advance of a planning application being submitted for the Strategic Site. If this risk is realised, the planning application will be considered in accordance with Policy CA7 and any material planning considerations, which may include up to date evidence and viability being prepared for the SPD and a planning application.</u></p> <p>Propose change to risk 7(b) Risk (ii) in Chapter 39 to become Risk 7(c) to the following:  Column 3: Dependency – <u>n/a</u>  Column 4: Central to the delivery – <u>yes</u>  Column 5: Risk – Risk (ii) The different sites are not developed comprehensively but come forward in a piecemeal manner  Column 6: Likelihood – <del>low</del> <u>med</u>  Column 7: Impact on strategy – med  Column 8: Plan B – yes  Column 9: Alternatives – <u>Strategic Site comes forward</u></p>

			on its own. The policy and supporting text in chapter 26 takes this in to account.
	<i>Chapter 26, policy CA7(h)</i>	<p>Council agreed to look at the wording of item (h) regarding 'traffic impact'.</p> <p>Change also to reflect wording in the Key Issues Position Statement, as revised following the discussion at the EiP.</p>	<p>a design of the <del>on-site</del> road <del>pattern</del> <u>network</u> and connections <u>with the surrounding area that</u> which significantly improves <u>residential amenity, the pedestrian environment and public transport access in the area of the one-way system, and does not have an unacceptable impact on traffic congestion-circulation in the surrounding area, and on primary routes in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham and the Royal Borough, providing a key component in returning the one-way system to two-way working;</u></p>
	<i>Chapter 26, policy CA7(l)</i>	<p>Change to reflect wording in the Key Issues Position Statement, as revised following the discussion at the EiP.</p>	<p>securing highway contributions including the investigation, <u>in consultation with TfL and the Boroughs, into returning the Earl's Court one-way system to two way working; and implementation of those measures identified during the investigation commensurate to the development proposal; to return the Earl's Court one-way system to two way working and significant improvements to quality of residential amenity, the pedestrian environment and public transport access in the area of the Earl's Court one-way system;</u></p>
	<i>Chapter 10, Vision for Earl's Court 'Place'</i>	<p>Change to reflect wording in the Key Issues Position Statement, as revised following the discussion at the EiP.</p>	<p><del>By returning the one-way system to two-way working, reducing the traffic flow, and improving the pedestrian environment, t</del><u>The western edge of the Borough will be</u></p>



			reintegrated <u>with the and</u> Earl's Court Neighbourhood Centre <u>so that the centre is</u> <del>will be</del> able to blossom, offering an attractive 'urban-village' environment which local residents can enjoy. <u>Crucial to this is reducing the impact of the one-way system on residential amenity, the pedestrian environment and public transport users, preferably by returning the one-way system to two-way working or other significant environmental improvements.</u>
	<i>Chapter 25, Policy CA6</i>	Council agreed to insert 'swimming pool' alongside 'sports hall' in this policy	Policy CA 6  (i) Community sports hall and <u>swimming pool</u>

**WEEK TWO****Matter SEVEN:****Proposals tabled by RBKC prior to matter hearing**

	10am – 1.00pm (Approx)		
Week 2			
Day 4 Tuesday 27 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	<b><u>Matter 7 Fostering Vitality CF1, CF2, CF3, CF5, CF8</u></b>	<u>RBKC responses to statements submitted for the hearings</u>	<u>Notes from the hearings</u>
	<i>RBKC</i>	None proposed through the hearing statements in addition to the changes already shown in the Submission CS.	None
	<i>-179625 DP9 for Chelsfield</i>	Regarding the Policy CF5 Council would like to offer the following wording: Policy CF5 (a) Protect very small and small offices (whether stand alone or as part of a larger business premises) throughout the Borough; medium sized offices within the Employment Zones, Higher Order Town Centres, other accessible areas and primarily commercial	This wording is reflected in a statement of common ground between RBKC and DP9 for Chelsfield. The Kensington Society objected to this change.

		<p>mews; large offices in <del>Higher Order Town Centres and other within</del> accessible areas, <u>that lie within, or close to, Town Centres</u>, except where:</p> <p>No changes to parts (i) or (ii) which relate to this issue.</p> <p>Para 31.3.33 The continued concentration of large (greater than 1000 sq m (GEA)) and medium sized (300 sq m to 1000 sq m) business <del>developments premises</del> on the upper floors of sites within town centres, <u>on sites in town centres and in accessible areas close to town centres is</u> important as it <u>assists in the provision in the range of premises needed</u>, supports the continued viability of the Borough's town centres, and ensures that as many people as possible can reach these areas without having to rely on the private car. This is a central tenet of a sustainable pattern of development. <u>The relationship is symbiotic, with offices benefitting from, as well as contributing to, the range of facilities which may be available from a town centre location.</u></p> <p><u>Whilst medium-sized offices do benefit from proximity to a town centre their wider distribution across the Borough shows that they can also thrive in other locations. They are an integral part of the mix of premises available to those who wish to locate, or expand, their businesses within the Borough.</u> <u>As such, they will also be supported in all accessible locations, within the employment zones and within primarily commercial mews.</u></p> <p>New paragraph after 31.3.33 <u>In the delineation of its town centres, the Borough has taken a</u></p>	<p>This wording is reflected in a statement of common ground between RBKC and DP9 for Chelsfield. The Kensington Society objected to this change.</p> <p>This wording is reflected in a statement of common ground between RBKC and DP9 for Chelsfield. The Kensington Society objected to this change.</p> <p>This wording is reflected in a statement of common ground between RBKC and DP9 for Chelsfield. The Kensington Society objected to this change – in particular the specific nature of 160m, as a</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p><u>'shopping frontage' approach. This reflects the linear nature of our centres. A number of offices are functionally linked to the centres, but lie close to the identified frontages rather than within them. The protection of all offices in such locations is essential. For the sake of Policy CF5, a office lying 'close to' a town centre is one which lies within a two minute walk, approximately 160 m of the boundary of the defined frontages. The presence of major barriers to movement, barriers such as major roads, will also be taken into account. The 'two minute walk' is not the same as the Council's definition of an "edge of centre" location in para 31.3.3.</u></p>	<p>definition of 'close to'.</p>
	<p><i>175783 The Kensington Society</i></p>	<p>Para 31.3.18 Where an affordable unit cannot be provided, the Council will seek financial contributions (where appropriate, feasible and viable), to provide the mitigation necessary to support retail diversity within the centre or <del>an adjoining centre</del> <u>the rest of the Borough.</u></p> <p>Para 31.3.31 There is a forecast demand for 15% growth of office jobs between 2004 and 2026. This equates to a net increase of <del>69,000</del> 60,000 sq m of office floorspace <u>between 2008 and the end of the plan period.</u></p> <p>Para 31.3.32 On the supply side, office floorspace under construction, <u>and outstanding permissions</u> <del>and floorspace that has been built out between 2004 and 2008, (as of March 2008),</del> provide a net addition of <del>46,000 sq m,</del> <u>37,000 sq m.</u> This level of building will meet office demand until 2017.</p> <p>Note: all other references to future office 'need' throughout the Core Strategy will be amended to ensure</p>	<p>The Kensington Society accepted this change.</p> <p>These were not specifically discussed at the hearing. As they are for consistency, it is unlikely a representor will have an objection</p> <p>As above</p>

		<p>that the document is consistent and refers to the 'start date' of 2008.</p> <p>Para 31.3.37 The Council recognises that business centres make an important contribution to the function of the Employment Zones, as they assist in providing the flexible workspace which is in particular demand from the Borough's creative and cultural industry. <u>New business centres, or other large office developments with a total floor area greater than 1,000 sq m may, therefore, be supported, where these are made up entirely of very small, small or medium-sized units. The Council does, however, recognise that any large scale business developments may have the potential to cause a material increase in traffic congestion and, therefore, will be carefully assessed against the requirements of Policy CT1.</u></p>	<p>This change was not accepted by the Kensington Society, because of the inclusion of medium sized offices.</p>
	- 376178 <i>Lionsgate Properties (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	- 134910 <i>CB Richard Ellis for Kensington Housing Trust (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	127142 <i>Cluttons for the Welcome Trust (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	- 197185 <i>Kensington &amp; Chelsea Social Council</i>	See RBKC Position Statement prepared for <i>DP9 for Capital and Counties</i> for Earl's Court Strategic Site.	None
	- 199484 <i>CB Richard Ellis John Lewis Partnership (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	- 134760 <i>Gerald Eve for Cadogan Estates</i>	None	None
	139439 <i>DP9 for Capital &amp; Counties</i>	See RBKC Position Statement prepared for <i>DP9 for Capital and Counties</i> for Earl's Court Strategic Site.	DP9 for Capital and Counties restated their objection to the inclusion of the phrase 'small scale' in relation to the retail component of any town

			centre.
	134919 Greater London Authority	None	None

### **Matter 7 cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<b>Chapter/Section</b>	<b>Change Sought</b>	<b>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</b>
	CF1 (e)	Council agreed to add 'and existing population' to item (e) of CF1	Friday 30 <sup>th</sup> July (CT) – CF1(e) is now consumed into CF1(d)
	CF1(d)	Council agreed to consume CF1(e) into CF1(d) during the discussion on the Earl's Court Strategic Site. Propose change to supporting text to reflect this.	<p>(d) require the establishment of new centres in the Latimer and Kensal areas to address identified retail deficiency, and support the establishment of a new <u>neighbourhood centre in the Earl's Court &amp; West Kensington Opportunity Area, with small scale retail provision to serve the day-to-day needs of the development and existing population. Any new centre must comply with the requirements of PPS4, and be of a scale that does not have an unacceptable impact on existing centres.</u></p> <p><del>(e) support the establishment of a new neighbourhood centre in the Earl's Court Opportunity Area, to serve the day to day needs of the development.</del></p> <p><b>Para 31.3.5</b> The <i>Keeping Life Local</i> Strategic Objective (Chapter 30) introduces the concept of walkable neighbourhoods, and includes a map which shows those parts of the Borough that are not within five minutes walk of a centre. The main areas of deficiency are in the Kensal and Latimer areas <u>and the area of the Earl's Court Exhibition Centre Strategic Site. New centres in these areas will meet this deficiency, with the scale of</u></p>

			<p>development within these new centres reflecting the nature of the the proposed development in the wider area.</p> <p>In addition, A significant amount of development is expected within the plan period in the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area. This site, designated within the draft London Plan as an Opportunity Area, straddles the boundary with Hammersmith and Fulham. Both the quantum of development, and <u>the distribution of land uses across the Opportunity Area</u> <del>its detailed nature (including whether the constituent parts lie in this Borough or within Hammersmith and Fulham)</del> will be established within a future planning brief. <u>This brief will be prepared jointly by LBHF, this Borough and the GLA.</u> <del>However,</del> It is likely that the wider area <u>Opportunity Area</u> will include a significant amount of housing, as well as business uses, leisure and hotel floorspace, and a <del>destination</del> <u>destination</u> cultural facility. This development is likely to generate some retail need <u>in its own right.</u></p> <p><u>The new centres at Kensal, Latimer and Earl's Court will serve a localised retail catchment, providing the convenience goods and services required by the local communities. The extent to which, from a retail perspective, there is scope for a larger centre on any of these sites, will depend on a detailed analysis of retail need, taking account of the vitality and viability of existing centres</u></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><u>(both in this and within neighbouring Boroughs) both at the time of the development and in the longer term.</u></p> <p><del>A neighbourhood centre in this area will, therefore, be appropriate, as long it is of a scale which does not harm the vitality of nearby centres.</del> A new centre is 'supported' rather than 'required' <u>within the Earl's Court wider area</u> as it is possible that its eventual location may be in Hammersmith and Fulham.</p>
	<i>CF1</i>	Council asked to consider including social and community uses in this policy	Council explained at the hearing that this is addressed elsewhere in the plan in Keeping Life Local chapter 30
	<i>General</i>	Council agreed to change 'core' and 'non-core' to 'primary' and 'secondary' respectively, in relation to retail frontage, throughout the plan	All instances will not be listed in this table, but will be changed prior to adoption
	<i>Fostering Vitality Chapter</i>	Council agreed to update the references to the UDP with regard to shopping frontages.	30 <sup>th</sup> July – deadline extended to Friday 13 <sup>th</sup> August (CT)
	<i>CF7</i>	The Council agreed to including a suitable reference to local arts in the policy 'chapeau' (the policy at present only refers to 'world class') and to review supporting text as necessary.	<p>Additional RJ in a new paragraph after paragraph 31.3.42</p> <p><u>Arts and cultural uses at local level can help underpin and secure communities which are central to the residential character of the Borough.</u></p> <p><u>They can be a means of retaining and enhancing familiar landmarks and can increase stability by reinforcing neighbourhood identity. In short, they add variety and richness to the life of the Borough.</u></p> <p>Amend Policy CF7 to read:</p> <p>Policy CF7</p> <p>Arts and <del>Culture</del> Cultural Uses</p>

			<p>The Council supports the Borough's role in <u>both local and world class arts and culture</u>. The Council will welcome new cultural institutions <u>and facilities</u> across the Borough and protect, nurture and encourage those which already exist. In particular the Council will support proposals which enhance the cultural draw of South Kensington, King's Road/Sloane Square, the Notting Hill Gate area and Kensington High Street.</p>
	<p><i>Hotels Section of Fostering Vitality</i></p>	<p>The Council are to include the text agreed with the GLA in their statement of common ground, regarding holding in reserve a review of the plan in relation to hotels in Earl's Court</p>	<p>Add to paragraph 32.3.48</p> <p>Whilst hotels contribute greatly to both the Borough's economy and to its reputation, they are not always good neighbours. Poorly run hotels can cause problems, and a concentration of hotels in a residential area can change the area's character. This has been the case in the Earl's Court ward. The Council does however, recognise that the benefits of hotels can be maximised , and their negative impact minimised, when hotels are located in the Borough's international or major centres; when they lie close to major tourist attractions ; or when they lie in areas which enjoy excellent links to London. <u>The Council considers that there is likely to be a significant net increase of hotel bedrooms through the Borough (and the wider area) and is not therefore expecting the policy approach taken in Earl's Court to result in significant or strategic loss in hotel capacity in the Borough. Should evidence show this not to be the case as part of Annual Monitoring, the Council will review the policy in the light of the evidence.</u></p>



	<i>Fostering Vitality Chapter</i>	The Council was requested to include a specific policy on artists' studios	The Council explained at the hearing that artists' studios are included in the 'B' use classes, and are thus protected by the plan.
	<i>CF5 (a)</i>	The Council to consider if there is a better way of expressing 'close' to town centre than the proposed 160m as contained in the statement of common ground with DP9 for Chelsfield	Friday 30 <sup>th</sup> July – deadline extended to Friday 13 <sup>th</sup> August to allow for further consideration. (CT)
	<i>31.3.27</i>	The Council was asked to include reference to voluntary sector offices in this paragraph.	The Council explained at the hearing that this is a definition of 'B' class uses in the Use Classes Order, and thus including offices for the voluntary sector is inappropriate and potentially misleading in that context.
	<i>C1 (Chapter 29) (s.106)</i>	The Council was asked to make it clear what funds are raised for what aspects under s.106	The Council responded at the hearing that this information is already in the public domain, but is not appropriate for inclusion in the Core Strategy
	<i>CF5</i>	The Council was asked to make specific reference to offices for the voluntary sector in this policy	The Council responded at the hearing that this was addressed by Policy CK1 in Keeping Life Local Chapter 30.
	<i>CF5</i>	The Council to consider and check the extent to which the policy should be modified to better reflect the agreed aim – of not allowing large offices in employment zones 'through the back door', and to discuss the matter with the Kensington Society in the light of their proposed redrafted policy.	August 13 <sup>th</sup> 2010 (PT/CT)
	<i>Plan 'Fostering Vitality' on page 174</i>	The Council agreed to review the accuracy of the representation of the 'concentrations of offices', and to ensure the key is very clear – that this plan represents the current facts regarding the Borough, and is not a reflection of policy.	For adoption.

### **Matter EIGHT:**

#### **Proposals tabled by RBKC prior to matter hearing**

	<i>2pm – 5 pm (Approx)</i>		
Week 2			
Day 4 Tuesday 27th	<b><u>Matter 8 Better Travel Choices CT1, CT2</u></b>	RBKC responses to statements submitted for the hearings	Notes from the hearings

July 2010			
	- 179625 DP9 for Chelsfield	Did not attend hearing on this matter. Inspector to consider written reps.	None
	- 335612 The Norland Conservation Society	None	None
	- 122932 Bobbie Vincent Emery	<p><b>Agree</b> that an additional point should be included in CT1. This would link to para 32.3.10. It should be more general than just the west of the borough however:</p> <p>CT1...</p> <p>f. <del>require improvements to the walking and cycling environment</del> and require cycle parking, showering and changing facilities in new development;</p> <p><u>g. require improvements to the walking and cycling environment, including securing pedestrian and cycle links through new developments;</u></p> <p>all subsequent CT1 criterion amended so that h becomes i, i becomes j and so on.</p> <p>Various minor amendments proposed to places in response to points raised:</p> <p>Add 'Holland Walk' to map in chapter 11</p> <p>Add '...and cycles' in key for map in chapter 18 and add reference to 'pedestrian only' through site between the King's Road and Fulham Road.</p> <p>Move 'north-south cycle link' on to Beaufort Street / Drayton Gardens (this is LCN and links north) on map in chapter 17.</p>	Ms Vincent Emery accepted the changes.
	- 175783 The Kensington Society	Regarding cycle links see above otherwise no comments on their initial submission.	KS agreed additional point re cycle links.

	- 197185 Kensington & Chelsea Social Council	No changes proposed to BTC.  Remove references to step-free in the infrastructure table on pages 246 and 253 and the reference to a bus tunnel on page 246.	KCSC agreed to these changes.
	- 139439 DP9 for Capital & Counties	An amendment to CT1n is suggested to address the representation made by DP9 for C&C:  n. work with TfL to improve the streets within the Earl's Court One-Way System by: i. investigating the return of the streets to two-way operation, and by implementing the <u>recommended improvements findings of the investigation, should TfL and the Council deem them feasible.</u>	None  Note – changes to chapters on Earl's Court place (Chapter 10) and Earl's Court Exhibition Centre Site (Chapter 26) may also need to be made for consistency.
	Kensington Society	Accessibility Map (Source: Space Syntax)  Para 33.3.15 .....Event Management Plans and Management Strategies for temporary and occasional uses can ensure that matters such as public health, pedestrian and traffic safety and waste management <u>are all taken into account.</u>  Policy CR3  <b>Street and Outdoor Life</b>  The Council will require opportunities to be taken within the street environment to create 'places' that support outdoor life, inclusive to all, adding to their attractiveness and vitality.  To deliver this the Council will:  <b><u>Markets</u></b>  a.b.....	These were not specifically discussed at the hearing.

		<p><b><u>Pavements</u></b> c.d.....</p> <p><b><u>Temporary Use of Open Spaces</u></b> e.f.....</p>	
--	--	--	--

### **Matter 8 cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<b><i>Chapter/Section</i></b>	<b>Change Sought</b>	<b>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</b>
	<i>Better Travel Choices chapter</i>	The Council to check scope for including in Corporate and Partner Actions an item regarding the provision of accessible transport provision, including but not exclusively regarding dial-a-ride.	Additional action proposed: <u>The Council will work with providers of door-to-door transport services such as Transport for London for Dial-a-Ride, Westway Community Transport and London Councils for the Taxicard scheme to improve transport options for those within the Borough who have reduced mobility.</u>
	<i>Better Travel Choices chapter</i>	The Council agreed to include an item in Corporate and Partner Actions regarding the role the Council can plan in lobbying for more accessible transport	The Council has reviewed the Corporate and Partner Actions and action one under 32.4.6 already includes accessibility. No further changes proposed.
	<i>Better Travel Choices chapter 34.4.6</i>	The Council agreed to update the section under Corporate and Partner Actions regarding the Mayor's Transport Strategy	Proposed changes: Mayor's Transport Strategy <del>2001</del> <u>2010</u>  32.4.5 The Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) was published in <del>2001</del> <u>2010</u> and sets out the Mayor's proposals for managing and improving transport in London. It contains a package of measures and policies to improve transport, enhance the environment and foster London's economic development. It deals with improving public transport, including bus, Underground and the overground railways.

			<del>32.4.6 The Mayor has announced that he is replacing the existing MTS. Public consultation is taking place in 2009 and the new document will be adopted in 2010.</del>
	<i>Better Travel Choices Chapter</i>	The Council were asked to include references, as appropriate, to the relevant proposals from the Mayor's transport plan. The Social Council agreed to provide potential references to the Council for consideration as soon as possible.	13 <sup>th</sup> August (GB) – more info required from the K&C Social Council.
	<i>CT1 (j)</i>	The Council were asked to make the text regarding the provision of step free access stronger	The Council explained at the hearings that, because the actual provision of step free access is beyond Council control, this was not something that could be offered.
	<i>Strategic Objective CO3</i>	The Council to check if the inclusion of 'accessibility' (in the disability access meaning of the term) could be included in this Objective	13 <sup>th</sup> August (PT)
	<i>Sections 32.2</i>	The Council agreed to review the text to ensure appropriate references to the importance of accessibility of public transport is included, in the light of the change to the Strategic Objective.	Proposed changes: 32.2.1 The provision of new public transport services, and improvements to existing services, <u>including inclusive access to them</u> , will make it easier for all Borough residents to choose to use public transport over the private car. In some areas, such as Kensal, new rail infrastructure would transform access to the public transport network and facilitate significant regeneration.
	<i>Sections 32.3</i>	The Council agreed to review the text to ensure appropriate references to the importance of accessibility of public transport is included in the light of the change to the Strategic Objective.	Proposed changes: 32.3.9 North-south links across the Borough are weak, and improvements to these would improve access for residents and encourage more use of public transport. <u>Inclusive access to the public transport network needs to be improved. In particular most of the Underground and rail</u>

			stations in the Borough do not have step-free access and remain inaccessible to passengers with reduced mobility, and to people with children especially those with prams and pushchairs.
	<i>Glossary</i>	Council agreed to review the definition of 'accessible' in the glossary, to make it clear it is used in two senses in the plan – in terms of the extent to which the Borough has provision of good public transport, and in terms of universal access to remove access discrimination.	<p>Proposed additional text:  <u>Accessible / accessibility This term is used in two distinct ways, its definition depending on the accompanying text (see below).</u></p> <p><u>Accessible / accessibility (of the Borough) This refers to the extent to which employment, goods and services are made available to people, either through close proximity, or through providing the required physical links to enable people to be transported to locations where they are available. The latter can refer to the ease of access to the public transport network, often measured by a location's Public Transport Accessibility Level (see below).</u></p> <p><u>Accessible / accessibility (of the physical environment) This refers to the extent of barriers to movement for users who may experience problems getting about, including disabled people.</u></p>
	<i>29.2.4 item 5 (in relation to s.106)</i>	The Council agreed to include the word 'accessible' in this item	<p>29.2.4.....</p> <p>1. Environmental improvements – to buildings, the street (including townscape enhancements), <u>improvements for inclusive design</u>, utility provision, nature conservation measures and mitigating the effects of a development proposal;</p>

			The consideration of inclusive Transport facilities is addressed elsewhere.
	<i>Better Travel Choices Corporate Action 3</i>	The Council to consider the appropriateness of including accessibility in this action	The Council has reviewed the text and the introduction of accessibility is not considered appropriate in this context.
	<i>Better Travel Choices Corporate Action 8</i>	The Council to consider the appropriateness of including accessibility in this action	The Council has reviewed the text and the introduction of accessibility is not considered necessary given the changes to the vision and elsewhere. It will be clear that public transport improvements include accessibility improvements.
	<i>CT1, in particular (g), (i) and (j)</i>	The Council agreed to include reference to the role of developments in delivering these policy objectives	<p>Changes to CT1g set out above – these were referred to on the day of the hearing.</p> <p>CT1ij: <del>work to</del> ensure that <u>new developments provide or contribute toward improvements to public transport services, and access to them, giving priority to north-south bus links and areas that currently have lower levels of accessibility;</u></p> <p>CT1 j k: work with partners to ensure that step-free access is delivered at all underground and rail stations by 2028, <del>and</del> require <u>new developments to contribute toward that step-free access and ensure it is delivered at underground and rail stations in the Borough where there is a re-development opportunity;</u></p> <p>CT1oP: ensure that <u>development does not reduce access to, or the attractiveness of, protect existing footways and footpaths used by the public, or land over which the public have a right of way;</u></p>
	<i>South Kensington (Chapter</i>	The Council agreed to review the	Add "...that links with the

	12)	text at 12.3.9 – 12.3.10, and the plan, to ensure that the needs of cyclists are appropriately included	cycle route in Hyde Park” after “Improve Imperial College Road as a pedestrian and cycling route” in map in chapter 12.
	<i>Notting Hill Gate (Chapter 16)</i>	The Council agreed to review the text at 16.3.13 – 15, and the plan, to ensure that the needs of cyclists are appropriately included	This change is not accepted. There is a particular issue of very high pedestrian footfall between the tube and Portobello Road which the text in chapter 16 seeks to address. There is not the same issue for cyclists.
	<i>Better Travel Choices</i>	The Council agreed at an appropriate place to clarify that purple badge holders are excluded from the ‘permit free’ policy	Proposed change to 32.3.4: The whole Borough is subject to one Controlled Parking Zone and therefore demand for parking from new development will not necessarily be focused in the area surrounding it. Permit-free agreements will be required for all new additional residential development. <u>The Royal Borough operates a Purple Badge scheme for people with disabilities living or working in the borough. Purple Badge holders are exempt from the permit-free requirements.</u>
	<i>CT1 (m)</i>	The Council agreed to add ‘access to water for recreation’ to this policy	Proposed change: <del>CT1(m):</del> require that new development adjacent to the River Thames or Grand Union Canal takes full advantage of, and improves the opportunities for, public transport and freight on the water, <u>access to the water for recreation</u> and walking and cycling alongside it;
	<i>32.3.16</i>	The Council agreed to add a new point to Corporate and Partner Actions regarding London freight to relieve the West London Line	Additional action proposed: <u>The Council will support the Mayor of London in promoting a rail freight bypass for London to relieve pressure on the West London Line.</u>



**Matter NINE (A):**  
**Proposals tabled by RBKC prior to matter hearing**

	<i>10am – 1.00pm (Approx)</i>		
Week 2			
Day 5 Wednesday 28th July 2010	<b>Matter 9a Renewing the Legacy CL1, CL2, CL5, CR1, CR2, CR5, CR7</b>	<b>RBKC responses to statements submitted for the hearings</b>	<b>Notes from the hearings</b>
	<i>RBKC</i>	Policy CL2 Require an assessment of the zone of visual influence of a proposed district landmark within or visible from the Borough, to demonstrate that the building has a wholly positive visual impact on the quality and character of the Borough's <del>or neighbouring boroughs'</del> townscape when viewed from the Royal Borough.	Change accepted by Kensington Society
	<i>101812 The Chelsea Society</i>	None	None
	<i>175783 The Kensington Society</i>	Proposal regarding the Thames being a separate 'place' dealt with under Matter 3 earlier in the hearings  Subterranean – ask to deal with under 9b  Shopfronts – the Council disagree with the proposed change, but offer an alternative change to para 34.2.2: There is inevitable pressure for change, as the existing, often historic, building stock is updated, renewed or replaced to meet today's needs and changing lifestyles. Maintaining and improving the character, quality, inclusivity and setting of the Royal Borough's exceptional built environment is vital. <u>Past approaches, where no worsening was good enough, are no longer acceptable. The prevailing philosophy will be to drive up the quality of design to improve the quality of the Borough's built environment.</u> The local context is of primary importance in achieving	Change accepted by Kensington Society.  RBKC also agreed to include similar wording in the Shopfront SPD

		<p>this.</p> <p>Views and Vistas – the Council is of the view that views and vistas are dealt with sufficiently in the submission core strategy, with proposed SPD.</p> <p>Tall Buildings/Building Heights – proposed changes superseded by RBKC proposed post submission changes – see Council’s response to Inspector’s Matter 9a Question 4</p> <p>Para 34.3.38 .....The Council also considers that local historic features such as memorials (particularly war memorials, including those on private land or within buildings), plaques, coal plates, horse and cattle troughs and <u>historic</u> bollards are historic assets worthy of protection, whether listed or not.</p> <p>Para 34.3.39 Listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments can be negatively affected not only by inappropriate additions, internal and external alterations, <u>subterranean development</u>, and demolition, but also by inappropriate use and unsympathetic neighbouring development. Such changes can diminish the architectural and historic value and detract from their setting.</p> <p>Para 34.3.43a In considering development proposals the Council will not be seeking to ensure that they meet any particular minimum or maximum standard. Where proposals affect light conditions in and around adjoining property, the extent to which it involves significant and unreasonable worsening of light conditions for those properties will be assessed, taking account of the prevailing</p>	<p>The Kensington Society disagree with this position.</p> <p>Kensington Society strongly support the proposed changes</p> <p>Matter not specifically discussed at the hearing.</p> <p>Matter not specifically discussed at the hearing.</p> <p>Change accepted by the Kensington Society, although they noted that they did not wish to see the word ‘material’ in the policy</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>general standard of light in the local environment. <u>Where existing buildings or spaces have poor light conditions, any worsening of light would only be justified on exceptional grounds. In some situations it would be appropriate to take the opportunity offered by development to achieve an improvement in light conditions where these presently fall below the standard generally prevailing in the area, or where it would be otherwise appropriate to do so.</u> The 'good neighbourliness' of an existing property will also be relevant. For example, some buildings are situated very close to the property boundary and would impose significant and unreasonable constraints on adjoining properties if standards were rigidly applied.</p> <p>Policy CL5</p> <p>Add at the end: <u>NOTE: Refer to Policy CE6 in relation to noise and vibration.</u></p> <p>Para 34.3.45 Small- scale alterations and additions are often necessary to modernise, adapt and extend the life of a building. Such works include improving accessibility; balustrades; alarms, cameras, grilles, shutters and other security equipment; servicing, plant and telecommunications equipment; front walls, railings and forecourt parking; signs which are not advertisements; <u>flagpoles</u>, and balconies and terraces.</p> <p>Policy CL6 Delete note at end of Policy: <u>NOTE: Refer to Policy CE6 in relation to noise and vibration.</u></p> <p>Corporate or Partnership Actions for Renewing the Legacy</p> <p>11. The Planning and Borough</p>	<p>Matter not specifically discussed at the hearing.</p> <p>Matter not specifically discussed at the hearing.</p> <p>Matter not specifically</p>
--	--	---	--

		Development Directorate will continue to run and up-date its Environment Awards Scheme.	discussed at the hearing.  Matter not specifically discussed at the hearing.
	<i>233936 The Ladbroke Association</i>	None	None
	<i>178257 DP9 for Brookfield Developments (did not attend)</i>	Density Matrix – see RBKC response to Matter 9a Question 2  Tall buildings/building heights – see Council’s response to Inspector’s Question Matter 9a Question 4  Subterranean – ask to discuss under 9b  Updating in line with PPS5 – see RBKC response to Matter 9a Question 1.  Amenity addressed by post submission changes.	None
	<i>188572 The Kensington &amp; Chelsea Environmental Round Table (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	<i>139439 DP9 for Capital &amp; Counties (did not attend)</i>	Updating in line with PPS5 – see RBKC response to Matter 9a Question 1.  Density Matrix – see RBKC response to Matter 9a Question 2  Tall buildings/building heights – see Council’s response to Inspector’s Question Matter 9a Question 4  Amenity addressed by post submission changes.	None
	<i>134919 Greater London Authority (did not attend)</i>	None	None

**Matter 9a cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<i>Chapter/Section</i>	<b>Change Sought</b>	<b>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</b>
	<i>CL2 (h, i, j, k, l and m)</i>	The Council offered to supply the	30 <sup>th</sup> July 2010 (PT)

		text of the revised reasoned justification and policy, annotated to show where it came from in the reasoned justification and policy as originally drafted, to demonstrate that the changes do not trigger a 'soundness' issue.	See separate paper.
	34.3.43	The Council to consider including microclimate in the issues to be taken into account in relation to amenity	30 <sup>th</sup> July 2010 – deadline extended to 13 <sup>th</sup> August 2010 to allow further consideration. (JW)
	<i>Glossary</i>	Council to include in the glossary a reference to microclimate, linked to point above	13 <sup>th</sup> August 2010 (PC)
	<i>CL2(g)</i>	The Council was asked to consider if the wording in CL2(g) could be clearer regarding which parts related to listed buildings and which do not.	The Council have reviewed the policy and believe it is sufficiently clear
	<i>CL2(g)</i>	The Council was asked to consider whether incremental (or cumulative) should be included in the policy in terms of structural stability	The Council explained at the hearing that the policy already includes for this – through the provision 'safeguard' – if any fine tuning was needed it was in relation to the SPD not the Core Strategy Policy.
	<i>CL2(g)</i>	It was noted in the debate that the policy refers to 'neighbouring' and the SPD to 'surrounding'. The Council to consider if any clarification is needed in the reasoned justification to policy CL2(g) regarding this	<b>Propose change to 34.3.20</b> Subterranean development may have minimal structural impact on the existing or adjoining buildings as long as they are designed and constructed with great care. <u>The Council requires Construction Method Statements, signed by a Chartered Engineer or Chartered Structure Engineer, to be submitted with all planning applications for subterranean development. These statements must set out clearly the potential impact, including cumulative impact, of the development on the existing, neighbouring or surrounding buildings, and the measures taken to mitigate these impacts having specific regard to ground conditions.</u>
	<i>Renewing the Legacy</i>	The Council was asked to include a policy limiting the plot coverage that any building could occupy to	The Council explained at the hearings that other policies in the plan (CL1, CL2 in

		60%	particular) provide specific control to ensure extensions are not overbearing, and that the 60% would be counterproductive because applicants would assume they could built up to that amount.
	<i>C1 (s.106)</i>	The Council agreed to include reference to the impact of the construction of development in relation to traffic, air quality and noise, on the amenity of residents, to allow for s.106 agreements to include controls related to these matters	<p>Amend Para 29.2.4 to refer to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, and item number 5 to read:</p> <p>29.2.4 Planning Obligations are intended to make acceptable development which would not otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. They might be used to prescribe the nature of a development; to secure a contribution from a developer to compensate for loss or damage created by a development; or to mitigate a development's impact. They must comply with the provisions of Circular 05/2005 "Planning Obligations", <u>and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010</u> and such measures may include:</p> <p>5. provision of transportation facilities – including facilities for walking and cycling, <u>inclusive</u> public transport and highways improvements to cater for the impact of the development <u>and impact of the construction of development</u> in relation to traffic, air quality and noise on the amenity of residents, and towards Crossrail where development within the CAZ or in other circumstances, would require this as a result of London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and permit-free development;</p>
	<i>Renewing the Legacy, section on Amenity</i>	In relation to the point above, the Council are of the view that reference should be made in this section to this matter also.	13th August 2010 (JW)

	<i>Note, subterranean dealt with under 9b</i>		
--	---	--	--

**Matter NINE (B):**  
**Proposals tabled by RBKC prior to matter hearing**

	<i>10am – 1.00pm (Approx)</i>		
Week 2			
Day 5 Wednesday 28th July 2010	<b>Matter 9b Respecting Environmental Limits CE1, CE2, CE3, CE6</b>	<b>RBKC responses to statements submitted for the hearings</b>	<b>Notes from the hearings</b>
	- 175783 <i>The Kensington Society</i>	None	None
	- 233963 <i>The Ladbroke Association</i>	None	None
	- 176315 <i>Peacock and Smith for Wm Morrison Supermarkets (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	- 134910 <i>CB Richard Ellis for Kensington Housing Trust (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	- 178257 <i>DP9 for Brookfield Developments (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	- 188572 <i>The Kensington and Chelsea Environmental Round Table (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	- 139439 <i>DP9 for Capital and Counties (did not attend)</i>	None	None
	- 134919 <i>Greater London Authority (did not attend)</i>	None	None

**Matter 9B cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<b><i>Chapter/Section</i></b>	<b><i>Change Sought</i></b>	<b><i>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</i></b>
	36.3.15	The Council agreed to include text that the flooding section of the plan would be subject to early review in the light of further evidence in relation to surface water and sewer flooding that gave the Council evidence of sufficient quality on which to base policies.	New Paragraph after 36.3.18 <u>As the evidence for surface and sewer water flooding is evolving rapidly, the Council will undertake an early review to policy CE2, if necessary, once areas with critical drainage problems, as defined in PPS 25, have been identified</u>

			accurately, as agreed with the Environment Agency.
	34.3.20	The Council agreed to amend the wording (second to last sentence) to make specific reference to SUDs	In addition, to ensure subterranean developments do not add to the impermeable surfacing of the Borough, <u>Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) or other measures will be required, sufficient soil depth to absorb water and slow its entry into the drainage system is needed.</u>
	CE2 (b), (c) and (d)	The Council agreed to include wording in the policy to allow those policies to be applied to other areas that are agreed with the Environment Agency	b) (...) as defined in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, <u>for sites in areas with critical drainage problems</u> and for all sites greater than 1 hectare. c) (...) <u>and for sites in areas with critical drainage problems</u>  d) require development at risk from flooding in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, <u>in areas with critical drainage problems, or</u> sites greater than 1 ha to incorporate suitable flood defence or flood mitigation measures (...)
	CE2 (e) and Glossary (and associated reasoned justification)	Include the acronym 'SUDs' alongside the full text Sustainable urban drainage for clarity	30 <sup>th</sup> July 2010 (PC) Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs). (...). According to the Mayor's <u>drainage hierarchy, SUDs could include the storage of rainwater for later use, the use of infiltration techniques, such as porous surfaces in non-clay areas, the attenuation of rainwater in ponds or open water features for gradual release and the attenuation of rainwater by storing in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release.</u>

**Matter TEN:**

**Proposals tabled by RBKC prior to matter hearing**

	2.00pm –5.00pm (Approx)		
Week 2			



Day 5 Wednesday 28th July 2010	Matter 10 Diversity of Housing CH2, CH3, CH4	RBKC responses to statements submitted for the hearings	Notes from the hearings
	RBKC	<p>Updating Criterion (p) of CH2 Criterion (p) requires a viability assessment where scheme fail to provide 50% affordable housing on floorspace in excess of 800 m2.</p> <p>As a result of earlier criteria (i) to (k), the paragraph should be clarified so that a viability assessment is required where schemes fail to contribute affordable housing in excess of the threshold, irrespective of the 50% target. This brings the criterion in line with the policy direction to achieve the 'maximum reasonable amount' of affordable housing:</p> <p>(p) require a viability assessment, using the GLA toolkit or an agreed alternative, to be submitted where schemes fail to provide 50% affordable housing on floorspace in excess of 800m2;</p>	This change was superseded by debate at the hearing
	- 224894 Bell Cornwell (did not attend)	<p>None. Proposed amendments have been suggested which should overcome the concerns. These changes relate to Policy CH2 criterion (b), concerning various standards that are listed. Initially, a change was inserted into the Submission Core Strategy, with a slight amendment for the post-submission schedule through the further insertion of "<i>because of other policy requirements,</i>".</p> <p>The final suggested amendment therefore, following CH2 (b) iii, reads as follows:</p> <p><b><u>"Where compliance with the above standards is not possible because of other policy requirements, to require new residential developments to demonstrate that all reasonable measures to meet them have been taken"</u></b></p>	This amendment was already within the schedule of changes

		In addition to the above, further signposting to the standards is suggested in response to a number of representors concerns elsewhere.	
	- 337760 DP9 for Treasury Invest	None	None
	- 179625 DP9 for Chelsfield	None	None
	- 178257 DP9 for Brookfield Developments	None	None
	- 175783 The Kensington Society	<p>Agree to a change at 35.3.12 to refer to the London Plan and the London Housing Design Guide:</p> <p>Paragraph 35.3.12 should be amended to read</p> <p>“Size of dwellings is not just a matter of their habitable rooms or bedrooms. The absolute size of the dwelling matters, both in terms of floorspace, and floor to ceiling heights. Increasingly it is being realised that planning has a legitimate role to play in setting standards not only for affordable housing, but for private housing as well, to ensure the dwellings we build today are flexible and provide quality accommodation in the long term.</p> <p><u>The Mayor has proposed the introduction of minimum housing standards in the draft replacement London Plan (Policy 3.5 and table 3.3), and space standards which must be met as a minimum for new developments are contained within the London Housing Design Guide (draft for Consultation July 2009). The Housing Design Guide also sets minimum floor to ceiling heights within habitable rooms. These standards will inform requirements within the Borough.”</u></p> <p>The following paragraph should be separated from the above, with consequent renumbering of paragraphs commencing at</p>	These changes were not specifically discussed at the hearing

		<p>“The cost of intermediate housing should be set at the usefully affordable point,....”</p> <p>However, reference to the Council’s forthcoming SPD is not made, because no SPDs are referenced in the Core Strategy, because as SPDs are introduced, the CS becomes out of date. An index of current documents in the LDF will be available on the website.</p>	
	- 337749 Gerald Eve for Martins Properties (Chelsea) Ltd	None	None
	- 134760 Gerald Eve for Cadogan Estates	None	None
	- 197185 Kensington & Chelsea Social Council	See Kensington Society above	See above
	- 134910 CB Richard Ellis for Kensington Housing Trust (did not attend)	None	None
	- 127142 Cluttons for the Welcome Trust (did not attend)	None	None
	- 199484 CB Richard Ellis for The John Lewis Partnership (did not attend)	See Kensington Society above	See above
	- 139439 DP9 for Capital & Counties	None	None

### **Matter 10 cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<b>Chapter/Section</b>	<b>Change Sought</b>	<b>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</b>
	CH2	The Council was asked to consider including reference to the needs of tenants in relation to provision of affordable housing in this policy	The Council explained at the hearing that this was covered in CH4 in relation to estate renewal
	CH2	The Council was asked to include a specific affordable housing size mix in the policy	The Council explained at the hearing that this was not considered appropriate for the Core Strategy and would be the subject of a forthcoming SPD
	35.3.10	The Council agreed to add ‘or larger’ after ‘four and five bed houses’ in this paragraph	Change 35.3.10 to read:  “There is an overall shortage of all sizes of affordable

			homes in the Royal Borough. The greatest shortage relative to supply of social rented housing is for properties with four or more bedrooms: 45% of homes are recommended to include one and two bedrooms and 55% three <del>or</del> <u>and four or more</u> bedrooms. The main identified shortfalls in terms of market housing are for three and four <u>or more</u> bedroom homes. Over the next 20 years, the size of new market housing likely to be required in the Borough is 20% one and two bedroom units and 80% three and four <u>or more</u> bedroom units. ...”
	35.3.23	The Council agreed to include text to explain the type of flexibility it has in mind in relation to CH2(b)	After Para 35.3.23 insert:  “ <u>Where compliance with the various standards is not possible due to other policy requirements, for example in the case of development involving historic buildings, the development should demonstrate that all reasonable measures have been taken to meet them.</u> ”
	CH2(b)	The Council agreed to include ‘as a minimum’ or similar text in relation to ‘meeting the following targets’ in this policy	In order to ensure that standards can be exceeded if they are superseded or revised in the future, amend criterion CH2(b) to read:  Require new residential developments, including conversions, amalgamations and changes of use, to be designed to <u>as a minimum achieve meet</u> all the following standards”:
	CH1(b)	The Council agreed to insert ‘minimum’ before the target of 200 affordable homes in the plan period	Amend Policy CH1(b) to read:  “(b) make provision for the maximum amount of affordable housing with a target of <u>a minimum of 200</u> units per annum from 2011/2012 until...”
	35.3.18	The Council agreed to include some	30 <sup>th</sup> July 2010 – deadline

		of the text from para 3.8 of the RBKC paper submitted in response to Inspector's Matter 10 Question 3, that is referencing the criteria the London Plan cites in relation to assessing maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing.	extended to 13 <sup>th</sup> August to allow for further consideration
	<i>CH2(i) and (p)</i>	The Council agreed to redraft these policies with a simple 50% target, for the inspector to consider as an alternative to the text of the Submitted plan	30 <sup>th</sup> July 2010 – deadline extended to 13 <sup>th</sup> August to allow for further consideration
re	<i>CH2(i)</i>	The Council was asked to include 'in the vicinity of the principle site' in this policy, instead of the wider borough approach	The Council explained at the hearing that this was not considered an effective means to deliver the affordable housing – it was the present policy and hard to implement.
	<i>CH3(b)</i>	The Council agreed to reconsider the wording in relation to affordable housing, and whether this should specify social rented and intermediate housing	Amend CH3(b) to read:  b) resist the loss of <u>both social rented and intermediate</u> affordable housing floorspace and units throughout the Borough;
	<i>CH4(b)</i>	The Council to consider including 'meeting tenants needs' into this policy	CH4 (b): guarantee all existing tenants an opportunity of a home <u>that meets their needs</u> , with those wishing to stay in the area <u>neighbourhood</u> being able to do so;
	<i>CH4(b)</i>	The Council to consider replacing 'area' with neighbourhood	See above
	<i>Glossary</i>	Council to check if this definition is based on the London Plan and thus on the social model of inclusiveness	Glossary definition is already based on social model, building on London Plan definition.
	<i>General</i>	The Council was asked to consider reference to the Access Design Guide SPD	The Council explained at the hearing that no reference was made to any SPD in the document, to avoid the printed document getting out of date with the adoption of later SPDs not being referenced. A list of SPD is available on the website, and will be addressed through the 'signposting' identified at on the first day of the hearings.
	<i>CH2c</i>	The Council to consider whether the specific reference to the south of the borough was correct, as there	The Council have reviewed the wording, and do not believe it is necessary to change it – it is

		was a shortage across the borough	clear extra care housing is encouraged throughout the borough, but the evidence indicates that although there is a shortage across the borough, it is in the south where the deficiency is greatest.
	<i>35.4.4 and pp447 – evidence base under housing</i>	The Council was asked to standardise reference to the report in these two locations of the plan	Amend Paragraph 35.4.4 to update for consistency with evidence base, and finalised report:  35.4.4 The institute of Public Care was commissioned by the Council in October 2007, to assist in the development of an older people’s housing strategy: “ <u>RBKC Older People’s Housing Needs – Research Paper May 2008</u> ”. The report is based on an analysis of local information and statistics about older people and housing, and indicates the strategic direction that the Council could follow over the next decade in relation to this topic...”

**Matter ELEVEN:**  
**Proposals tabled by RBKC prior to matter hearing**

	<i>10.00am –1.00pm (Approx)</i>		
Week 2			
<b>Day 6 Thursday 29th July 2010</b>	<b><i>Matter 11 Infrastructure/Monitoring, Risks &amp; Contingencies/Proposals Map</i></b>	<b>RBKC responses to statements submitted for the hearings</b>	<b>Notes from the hearings</b>
	<i>RBKC</i>	<i>Chapter 38 – Various minor wording changes</i>	Mid August
	<i>- 175783 The Kensington Society</i>	<i>None</i>	None
	<i>- 398154 The Health &amp; Safety Executive (HSE) (did not attend)</i>	<i>None</i>	None
	<i>- 139439 DP9 for Capital &amp; Counties</i>	<i>None</i>	None

	<i>(did not attend)</i>		
	- 372420 The Knightsbridge Association <i>(did not attend)</i>	None	None

### **Matter 11 cont: Changes sought during the hearing**

	<b><i>Chapter/Section</i></b>	<b>Change Sought</b>	<b>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</b>
	<i>Chapter 37 Infrastructure</i>	Council agreed to put the infrastructure table in an appendix, rather than in a chapter of the plan. Chapter 37 will remain, albeit it will be a short chapter.	Prior to adoption (JMed)
	<i>Infrastructure, Monitoring and Contingencies and Risks (Chapters 37, 38 and 39)</i>	Council to ensure that any changes offered to the policies regarding Earl's Court during the hearings are followed through into chapters 37, 38 and 39.	13 <sup>th</sup> August 2010 (BR)
	<i>Infrastructure table, pp261, row relating to Counters Creek</i>	Council agreed to change the dates in the 'when' column, and insert a new row to deal with the short-term fitting of 'flips' to properties by Thames Water	30 <sup>th</sup> July 2010 – deadline extended to 13 <sup>th</sup> August to allow for further consideration
	<i>Infrastructure table in general</i>	Council agreed to check the table for factual inaccuracies and to correct them	13 <sup>th</sup> August 2010 (JMed)
	<i>Infrastructure table</i>	Council agreed to put row numbers on the table for ease of reference	Prior to adoption (JMed)
	<i>Monitoring</i>	Council agreed that on all matters relating to the amount of floorspace permitted for different uses, monitoring would also take place on the basis of completions on site, as well as planning consents.	13 <sup>th</sup> August 2010 (JW)
	<i>Risks and Contingencies</i>	The Council was asked to include Counters Creek as a row within the contingencies and risks table	The Council explained at the hearing that the contingencies and risks related to planning policies, and the Counters Creek upgrade was not the subject of a planning policy. It was not therefore appropriate to include it.
	<i>Chapter 18 Lots Road</i>	The Council was asked to include reference in this chapter to the creation of a new neighbourhood centre as a result of the new development, to reflect the annotation on the key diagram	Reference to new neighbourhood centre in the text of paragraph 18.1.4 A planning application was approved on appeal by the Secretary of State in 2006. This <u>cross-boundary</u> mixed-used development will include

			<p>retail, <u>providing a new neighbourhood centre</u>, business and over 400 new dwellings <u>in the Borough and over 380 new dwellings</u>, car and cycle parking, children's playspace, and works to <u>Chelsea Creek and Chelsea Basin in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham</u>. Implementation of this permission has yet to commence.</p> <p>Also change to the Vision, 18.2 (...) The Lots Road Power Station site development will play a vital role in improving the vitality of the area by providing a mixture of uses including housing, new neighbourhood <del>shops</del> <u>centre</u>, offices and social and community facilities including mooring facilities.</p>
	<i>Borough Vision CV1</i>	Council agreed that for consistency they would consider including Lots Road Neighbourhood Centre in the Vision, CV1	<p>Having considered this, the Council have concluded that it is very difficult to include this in the Vision in a way that reads well. Lots Road can only be included in the final paragraph (as it is not in North Kensington, nor part of the Borough with a national or international reputation). However referencing a single place in this last paragraph is 'out of place'. An alternative would be to group all the town centres together, but that loses the connection of the other centres to the relevant parts of the Vision. The conclusion therefore is not to change the Vision. However, a change has been made to Chapter 18, including to the Lot's Road Vision, see above</p>

### MISCELLANEOUS

	<i>Chapter/Section</i>	<i>Change Sought</i>	<i>Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)</i>
--	------------------------	----------------------	--



	<i>RBKC</i>	Change all references from 'North Kensington Sports Centre' to 'Kensington Leisure Centre' throughout document	Prior to adoption (BR)
	<i>General</i>	Page numbers to be added to the pages with plans on	Prior to adoption (DN)
	<i>RBKC</i>	Add New station roundel by Imperial Wharf Station to denote future Crossrail 2 station	Prior to adoption (JMas/DN)
	<i>Proposals Map</i>	To include reference on the key in relation to flood zones 1 and 2 that the Environment Agency website should be consulted as the areas are subject to change	Prior to adoption (JMas)
	<i>Respecting Environmental Limits Plan</i>	As above	Prior to adoption (BR)
	<i>Housing Trajectory</i>	To ensure that the trajectory is up to date and accurate	Prior to adoption (JMed)