DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY SCENARIOS
Overview

1.1 This appendix sets out a number of potential scenarios for development in the OA. The intention of these scenarios is to broadly define the scope of the potential development capacity of the OA based on planning policy. Each scenario is accompanied by an illustrative masterplan that tests it against the Key Objectives set out in the SPD. They do not provide specific design solutions or set an overall cap or maximum limit on development, land use mix or quantum.

1.2 Scenario 1 investigates the capacity of the OA if comprehensive regeneration of the West Kensington and Gibbs Green estates were not to occur, whilst Scenarios 2 and 3 investigate development capacity on the basis that the estates are included within regeneration proposals.

1.3 All three of these scenarios were published in the first consultation draft of the SPD. Following consultation, in response to feedback received, revisions were made to the authorities’ aspirations for the OA. Therefore, this appendix concludes with an alternative scenario that meets the new Key Objectives. This is accompanied by an illustrative masterplan and series of diagrams analysing the design and land use strategy in the alternative scenario. The alternative scenario is treated as a layout testing exercise rather than a capacity testing exercise.

Setting

1.4 The notes that accompany Table 3.2 of the London Plan (2011) provide definition as to the three settings that are identified in the main Table 3.2. Further guidance is provided in Chapter 1.3 of the Mayor’s Housing SPG (2011). The guidance is clear that large sites, such as those at the centre of the OA, are capable of defining their own setting. This is not to say that any redevelopment should not have regard to the setting of surrounding areas, but simply acknowledges that the scope exists for consideration of other factors. The built environment within and surrounding the OA is mixed, as would be expected for an area of this size. It is clear though that in terms of the built environment characteristics described for each of the settings in the London Plan, those of the OA and much of the surroundings fit most closely with that of a ‘Central’ setting.

1.5 In terms of its relationship with surrounding town centres, the OA encompasses the northeast corner of Fulham Town Centre, which is classified as a major town centre in the London Plan (2011) retail hierarchy. All parts of the OA and much of the surrounds, would be within 800m of this town centre. This would put it in a ‘Central’ setting in terms of access to a major centre; however, because of the linear nature of the town centre and its physical characteristics it is considered that the application of this criterion is not wholly appropriate.
Overview

1•6 In summary, an initial analysis of the location and characteristics of the OA and immediate surrounds in terms of London Plan (2011) policy would place the majority of the OA within a 'Central' setting.

1•7 Table 3.2 in the Mayor’s London Plan (2011) indicates that schemes in areas with a 'central' setting and a PTAL 0r 4-6 would achieve densities of between 650-1,100 habitable rooms per hectare.

Indicative Residential Capacity

1•8 Scenario 1 includes land owned by TfL and Capital and Counties, shown in Figure 1.1. Scenarios 2 and 3 includes the TfL and Capital and Counties land as well as the West Kensington Estate, Gibbs Green Estate, Gibbs Green Primary School (owned by LBHF) and private land other than that owned by TfL and Capital and Counties, shown in Figure 1.2.

1•9 In total, the OA boundary covers an area of 37.2 hectares. For the purposes of calculating development capacity, land over the West London Line south of Lillie Road and the major thoroughfares within the OA boundary, such as the A4 and Lillie Road have been removed from the capacity calculation. This leaves a remaining area of 22.2 hectares for Scenario 1 and 32.6 hectares for Scenarios 2 and 3. It has been assumed that 70% of the floorspace will be developed for residential, with the other 30% providing other uses such as offices, retail, hotels, leisure, open space and other non-residential floorspace. This results in 15.54 hectares of land developable as residential in Scenario 1 and 22.82 hectares for Scenarios 2 and 3. These land areas have been used as the basis for residential density calculations.

1•10 Policy 3.4 of the Mayor’s London Plan (2011) sets out the mayor’s policy on optimising the potential of sites. The policy sets out that "development should optimise housing output for different types of location within the relevant density range shown in Table 3.2". Table 3.2 sets out the Mayor’s density matrix, which sets out appropriate density ranges by relating the accessibility of an area to appropriate development. In relation to this matrix, the OA is considered to have a 'central' setting, with a public transport accessibility level of 4-6. The density matrix shows that schemes within this level of accessibility should be capable of providing between 140 and 405 units per hectare.

Scenario 1

1•11 If a mixture of houses and flats were provided (providing an average of between 3.1 and 3.7 habitable rooms per unit), 15.54 hectares of land should generate a residential capacity of between 2,719 and 5,516 units across the OA. Scenario 1 tests the mid-point of this range.

Scenarios 2 and 3

1•12 If a mixture of houses and flats were provided (providing an average of between 3.1 and 3.7 habitable rooms per unit), 22.82 hectares of land should generate a residential capacity of between 3,990 and 8,094 units across the OA. Scenarios 2 and 3 test the mid-point and upper limits of this range.

Indicative Commercial Capacity

1•13 The indicative targets for new jobs have driven the initial floorspace requirements generated in Table 1.1. They are based on a figure of 18.5sqm per work space which includes an allowance for net to gross. The split in non-residential floorspace assumes that the majority of non-residential floorspace is likely to be office and retail.

1•14 Table 1.1 sets out indicative working development capacity figures including a potential break down of commercial / non-residential floorspace.
## Development Capacity Scenario Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Housing Capacity</th>
<th>Residential Floorspace</th>
<th>Residential Population</th>
<th>New Jobs</th>
<th>Total commercial / non-residential floorspace</th>
<th>Office Floorspace</th>
<th>Retail Floorspace</th>
<th>Hotel Floorspace</th>
<th>Leisure (inc. cultural) floorspace</th>
<th>Other non-residential floorspace</th>
<th>Total floorspace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>364,000 m²</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>129,500 m² (1,393,420 ft²)</td>
<td>90,650 m²</td>
<td>12,950 m²</td>
<td>12,950 m²</td>
<td>10,360 m²</td>
<td>2,590 m²</td>
<td>493,500 m² (5,310,060 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>546,000 m²</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>203,500 m² (2,189,660 ft²)</td>
<td>142,450 m²</td>
<td>20,350 m²</td>
<td>20,350 m²</td>
<td>16,280 m²</td>
<td>4,070 m²</td>
<td>749,500 m² (8,064,620 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>728,000 m²</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>277,500 m² (2,985,900 ft²)</td>
<td>194,250 m²</td>
<td>27,750 m²</td>
<td>27,750 m²</td>
<td>22,200 m²</td>
<td>5,550 m²</td>
<td>1,005,500 m² (10,819,180 ft²)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Development capacity figures

Notes:

* Housing capacity for Scenario 1 is new (net additional) homes. Scenarios 2-3 may include redevelopment and replacement of existing dwellings in the area, such as the 746 dwellings on the West Kensington & Gibbs Green estates that LBHF has indicated may be included.

** GEA based on 70 m² per dwelling plus 30% allowance for net to gross. The allowance for net to gross is intentionally generous and is expected to be revised down through master planning.

*** Based on the London-wide average figure of 2.4 persons per dwelling. This represents an upper ‘worst case’ estimate given the LBHF figure of 2.22 and the RBKC figure of 2.0.

**** All jobs figures are new (net additional) jobs.

***** GEA based on a figure of 18.5 m² per work space which includes an allowance for net to gross. The subsequent break down of this figure into broad land use categories is based on the following proportions of this total: office (70%); retail (10%); hotel (10%); leisure (including cultural) (8%); and other non-residential uses (2%). All are indicative working figures and will need to be refined through master planning, transport capacity modelling and topic based studies on floorspace requirements and impact. This will include refinement of the area figure per workspace for each use category beyond the broad figure used at present.
Policy Context

Illustrative Masterplans

1.15 In the following section, each of the three Development Capacity Scenarios from the previous draft of the SPD are illustrated as Masterplan solutions in terms of layout, massing, land use and building heights (subject to ongoing townscape views analysis). It is important to note that none of these illustrative Masterplans present a conclusive or final solution for the development of the OA. Their sole function is to test the Key Objectives against the capacity of the site. Each illustrative Masterplan is analysed in line with the Key Objectives set out in the main body of the SPD.

1.16 As none of these scenarios meet all of the new Key Objectives in the revised SPD, they are followed by a new, alternative masterplan scenario that does meet the Key Objectives. The layout of this alternative scenario is tested through a series of diagrams.

1.17 In addition to the three Development Capacity Scenarios set out in Table 1.1, this chapter concludes with a masterplan for an ‘Alternative Scenario’. This Alternative Scenario is treated as a layout test used to ensure that all of the Key Objectives could be met. It is not treated as a capacity study.

1.18 As described above, the London Plan (2011) sets out the policy on development density. Policy 3.4 (Optimising Housing Potential) applies the density matrix (Table 3.2) taking account of local context (setting), the design principles set out elsewhere in the plan and public transport capacity. The Mayor’s Housing SPG (2011) provides guidance on density and the implementation of Policy 3.4 in conjunction with other London Plan policies.

Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL)

1.19 The current PTAL ratings for the OA reflect that, whereas the periphery of the site benefits from high levels of public transport accessibility, this falls away towards the centre of the site due to the lack of permeability.

1.20 Comprehensive redevelopment should, as a minimum, introduce and enhance east-west and north-south connections through the site for public transport, pedestrians and cyclists and should generally seek to create a permeable street network across the OA. There is sufficient confidence that development over the railway lines and associated infrastructure is technically feasible. This would have the affect of raising the PTAL across the OA such that it would broadly range from a level of at least four on the western side along North End Road to six in the east.

1.21 The current PTAL for the Seagrave Road Car Park site falls away from six at the northern end to two at the southern end. Redevelopment in this area may present opportunities for modest improvements in PTAL, most likely through enhancing existing public transport services and access to these.
Development Capacity Scenario 1: Illustrative Masterplan
As published in 1st draft of SPD

Figure 1.3: Illustrative Masterplan for Development Capacity Scenario 1
Development Capacity Scenario 1: Urban Form

1.22 Figure 1.3 shows the illustrative masterplan for Scenario 1, which delivers a total floorspace of 493,500m². The annotations on the plan and the following text indicate the ways in which it meets the Key Objectives in the revised draft of the SPD and the ways in which it does not.

Notes on the Masterplan

1. A number of existing streets cannot be extended into and through the OA, including most significantly Star Road.

2. At least one new east-west link across the OA can be created, but it has to go through the housing estates. It is therefore not be the visually and physically direct connection that the authorities are hoping for. In order to ensure that the gradient of this route was accessible for all, the lower floor(s) of the Empress State Building and the surrounding public realm would require significant remodelling.

3. There remains a significant change in site levels between the existing housing estates and the proposed new neighbourhood. This would continue to cause severance between the boroughs and as a result of it, most of the links between the estates and the new development would be unsuitable for vehicles. They would have to incorporate winding paths for pedestrians and cyclists in order to accommodate the level change.

4. The identified views of special existing landmarks can be retained. The views of St Cuthbert’s Church and St Luke’s Church could be improved.

Key Objective

Establish an urban grain within the OA that is inspired by the surrounding pattern of streets and open spaces.

1.23 A number of the existing streets, particularly in the south west corner of the main site cannot be extended into the OA in this scenario because the housing estates remain. Most significantly, Star Road cannot be extended. Therefore, connectivity to the west is not improved.

1.24 Furthermore, unlike the typical patterns of streets identified in the OA’s surroundings, the urban grain within this scenario does not form a strong orthogonal grid because it is broken up by the housing estates. The emphasis is on north-south connections rather than east-west.

1.25 The proposed streets do have the potential to establish a clear and well defined network, but there would be a limited choice of routes.

1.26 The existing pattern of garden squares found in the surrounding context is not replicated in this scenario.

1.27 Although an east-west connection is possible across the OA in this scenario, it is not direct and is unlikely to function well in way finding terms. It also requires the site levels to be engineered to allow an acceptable gradient.

1.28 This scenario includes a new north south link that might contribute to the alleviation of the Earl’s Court One Way System at some point in the future.

1.29 The railway lines are decked over in order to maximise the limited east-west connectivity that is possible. Pedestrian connectivity from the A4 into the OA is also improved.

Key Objective

Provide good quality public open space that offers a range of recreational and ecological opportunities and overcomes existing deficiencies in access to public open space and play facilities.

1.30 In this scenario a linear park is provided on top of the railway lines. This has the potential to provide the required 2 Ha offer of a local park. The width of much of this linear park is too narrow for it to function well and to accommodate a range of activities. This demonstrates that, if the local park is to be provided in a linear fashion, it might be necessary to take more than 2 ha of land in order to ensure the contiguous spaces functions well as a park, not just a route.

1.31 There is no additional public green open space provided over and above the 2 Ha linear park. However, this should be enough to ensure that the majority of residential units are within a 100m walk of a public green open space.
Development Capacity Scenario 1: 3-Dimensional Massing
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Figure 1.4: Illustrative massing model for Development Capacity Scenario 1
Development Capacity Scenario 1: Urban Form

1.32 Figure 1.4 shows the illustrative 3-dimensional form that Scenario 1 could take. The annotations on the plan and the following text indicate the ways in which it meets the Key Objectives in the revised draft of the SPD and the ways in which it does not.

Key Objective
Ensure that no new buildings visible on the skyline have a negative impact on the quality and character of the surrounding townscape.

1.33 In terms of building heights, this is the lowest of the scenarios and therefore has the least potential impact on the surrounding Conservation Areas. It would have little or no impact on any of the views analysed for the Townscape Analysis.

Key Objective
Ensure that new buildings on the edges of the OA are sensitively integrated into and enhance the existing context.

1.37 This Scenario proposes town houses along Seagrave Road in order to respond to the existing houses on the other side of the road. The buildings that back onto Philbeach Gardens and Eardley Crescent are capped at 4 storeys.

1.38 There are taller buildings proposed to front onto the A4 in order to create a Metropolitan Face. The other sensitive edges are not included in this scenario.

Key Objective
Design well proportioned streets that respond to those in the surrounding area and encourage walking and cycling

1.39 As the buildings in this scenario are, in general, lower than those in the others, there is no significant potential for the streets to be over enclosed.

Notes on the Masterplan

1. There remains a significant change in levels between the housing estates and the new development that any east-west connection across the OA would have to overcome.

2. However, there are locations where masterplan testing suggests the site levels could be appropriately remodelled in order to create an acceptable gradient for all road users.

3. The Empress State Building is retained in this scenario, but the scale of new buildings proposed does not rise in response to it.

4. There is a gap in the proposed frontage onto Brompton Cemetery, which prevents the enclosure of the cemetery from being improved.

5. New town houses are proposed on Seagrave Road to respond to those that already exist on the other side of the road.

6. The crescent buildings backing onto Philbeach Gardens and Eardley Crescent are capped at 4 storeys in height.

7. A Metropolitan Face can be created, fronting onto the A4.
Development Capacity Scenario 1: 3-Dimensional Massing
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum height AGL*</th>
<th>Maximum number of storeys** AGL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105m</td>
<td>35 residential, 29 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80m</td>
<td>26 residential, 22 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50m</td>
<td>16 residential, 13 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40m</td>
<td>13 residential, 11 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30m</td>
<td>10 residential, 8 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25m</td>
<td>8 residential, 6 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15m</td>
<td>5 residential, 4 office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* AGL stands for ‘Above Ground Level’

It is important to note that there are significant changes in the ground levels across the site, ranging from 5m to 12m above ordnance datum.

** Residential storeys are assumed to be 3m floor to floor and office storeys are assumed to be 3.6m floor to floor.

Figure 1.5: Illustrative acceptable building heights diagram for Development Capacity Scenario 1
Development Capacity Scenario 1: Land Use

As published in 1st draft of SPD

Figure 1.6: Illustrative ground floor land use strategy for Scenario 1

Figure 1.7: Illustrative upper floor land use strategy for Scenario 1
Development Capacity Scenario 1: Land Use

1.40 Figures 1.6 and 1.7 show an illustrative land use strategy for Scenario 1 as previously published. The following text indicates the ways in which it meets the revised Key Objectives and the ways in which it does not.

Key Objective
Ensure that new housing and estate regeneration creates mixed and diverse residential neighbourhoods.

1.41 Scenario 1 is residential led. However, because the housing estates have been left as they are currently, estate regeneration cannot contribute to the creation of mixed and diverse residential neighbourhoods. Furthermore, because of the changes in site levels between the estates and the proposed development, the estate residents would not be fully integrated into the new neighbourhood.

Key Objective
Retail to meet the day to day needs of the new resident and worker population, in addition to the extended Fulham Town Centre, should be clustered around underground stations and in a new local centre within the OA which will also complement the new cultural and visitor facilities.

1.42 There is no opportunity in Scenario 1 to repair and revitalise the retail offer on the eastern side of North End Road, which is the primary focus of the authorities’ retail strategy. However, there is the opportunity to enhance the other retail centres around the OA, particularly North End Road (West Kensington) Key Local Shopping Centre and Earl’s Court Neighbourhood Centre. There is also a cluster of retail and other ‘A’ class uses proposed around West Brompton Station.

1.43 A new neighbourhood centre is proposed within the vicinity of the Empress State Building, but because of the poor east west connections in this scenario, this is unlikely to receive the levels of activity that would make it vibrant and successful. The impact on Fulham Town Centre of creating this new centre without enhancing the offer on North End Road would be likely to be negative.

1.44 In this scenario, the Empress State Building is retained and it remains in use as an office building. The rest of the offices proposed are focused on the northern edge of the masterplan. The only way in which this scenario could meet the requirement set out in the Employment Strategy to introduce small to medium sized businesses in the earlier phases of development would be to integrate them in mixed use buildings among the residential uses. As set out in the Employment Strategy, such an approach would need to take care to avoid conflict between business and residential uses.

1.45 The land use strategy for this scenario proposes the installation of a new cultural facility in the base of the Empress State Building. This could be enhanced by the open space at the centre of the site and the proposed A class uses to create a ‘cultural destination’. However, because the connection into this destination from the west of the OA would be weak, it cannot be guaranteed that it would become a lively cultural destination.

1.46 A cultural facility is also indicated on Warwick Road. This would have the potential to continue the presence of the Earl’s Court ‘brand’ in this location. Locating a cultural destination in this location also achieves the authorities’ aspirations to provide a cultural facility in the earliest phases of development.
Development Capacity Scenario 1: Social and Community Facilities

Key Objective
Provide social and community facilities to support the new residential and worker population.

Education

147 Both LBHF and RBKC use child yield formulas in order to estimate possible educational needs resulting from any development. In the first draft of this SPD, it was calculated that Scenario 1 would generate a child yield of 1,600 children. This was deemed unlikely to give rise to the need for a new secondary school, but would generate the need to secure funding to increase the number of form entries at existing secondary schools in the area. Table 1.2 shows the requisite requirements in terms of secondary school capacity financing for Scenario 1.

148 It was calculated that Scenario 1 would give rise to the need for a new primary school/nursery within the development. Table 1.2 shows the requirements for primary school capacity financing for Scenario 1. One of these form entries could be provided by expanding Normand Croft Primary School (located on Bramber Road to the west of North End Road) by one form entry. This would cater for the child yield arising from the earlier phases of development. An on site primary school/nursery should be provided in the early/middle phases of development at the point at which calculations demonstrate that the capacity limit created at Normand Croft Primary School is being reached.

Open Space and Play Space

151 The Mayor’s SPG on Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (2008) sets out standards for access to play. Standard B.2 within this SPG states that “a minimum of 10sqm of dedicated playspace per child (existing and new provision) is recommended as a basis for assessing existing and future provision”. It is considered that this provides a useful aggregation for the calculation of the overall quantity of public open space provision. The child yield of 1,600 calculated for Scenario 1 would lead to a requirement for 1.6 hectares of public open space that could be used for play. This could be accommodated as part of the 2 Ha local park that must be included regardless of the child yield figures in order to address the identified local open space deficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary School need</th>
<th>Form Entries Required</th>
<th>Requisite funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary School need</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£16m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Child Yield and Education Need calculated for Scenario 1

Health

149 The calculation for the size of health facilities is based on the following methodology:
• Health Centre based on up to six GP Cluster: an assumption of one GP per 1,800 residents and 150sqm per GP.
• Integrated Primary Care Centre based on seven or more GP Cluster plus health and wellbeing services: an assumption of one GP per 1,800 residents and 225sqm per GP.

150 Table 1.3 sets out the health facility floorspace demands in relation to Scenario 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Need</th>
<th>GPs</th>
<th>Floorspace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,000 units (9,600 people)</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>800sqm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3: Health Facility Floorspace Calculation for Scenario 1
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Development Capacity Scenario 2: Urban Form

1.53 Figure 1.8 shows the illustrative masterplan for Scenario 2, which delivers a total floorspace of 749,500m². The annotations on the plan and the following text indicate the ways in which it meets the Key Objectives in the revised draft of the SPD and the ways in which it does not.

Key Objective
Establish an urban grain within the OA that is inspired by the surrounding pattern of streets and open spaces.

1.54 This scenario is based around two new axial streets; a new east-west street and a new north-south street. A great deal of emphasis is given to these streets, and as a result they are likely to become new Primary Streets. This does not reflect the street hierarchy found in the surrounding area. As set out in the SPD, the authorities do not consider it necessary to introduce new primary streets into the OA. Instead, the aspiration is to use the existing Primary Streets around the edges of the OA to define the new neighbourhood and then divide it with a number of new Secondary and Tertiary Streets.

Key Objective
Maximise connectivity.

1.55 This Scenario introduces a number of new east-west connections directly across the OA. It also introduces a new north-south link that could play some part in alleviating the Earl’s Court One Way System at some point in the future. This scenario decks over the railway lines where necessary in order to maximise east-west connectivity. It also improves pedestrian and cyclist connectivity from the A4 into the OA.

Key Objective
Provide good quality public open space that offers a range of recreational and ecological opportunities and overcomes existing deficiencies in access to public open space and play facilities.

1.56 In this scenario, a linear park is created on the deck over the top of the railway lines. It has the potential to provide the required 2 Ha offer of a local park. It also has the potential to introduce continuous north-south ecological habitats, thus mitigating against the loss of a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) and improving biodiversity. Much of it is too narrow to function well as a park that accommodates a range of activities, thus demonstrating that a linear park may need to take more than 2 ha of land.

Notes on the Masterplan
① In this scenario, most of the existing streets identified in the SPD, including Star Road, can be extended into the OA. The connection with Star Road ensures excellent connectivity to the west.

② There are a number of east-west connections created across the site including, one main east-west street. During consultation on the first draft of the SPD, concerns were raised that this would focus too much movement/activity on this street and potentially threaten the vitality of the existing local centres.

③ There is a new, direct north-south street.

④ The identified views of special existing landmarks can be retained and potentially improved.

⑤ The majority of the masterplan is within a 100m walk of the proposed publicly accessible open spaces.

⑥ There is a ‘Station Square’ outside each existing underground station.

⑦ There is a new civic space in the vicinity of the Empress State Building.

1.57 The design in this scenario also has four publicly accessible garden squares. Along with the linear park, they ensure that about 90% of the potential residential units can be within a 100m walk of a publicly accessible green open space.

1.58 In this scenario a new civic space, referred to as a ‘Station Square’ is introduced at each of the existing Underground Stations and at the junction of Lillie Road and North End Road. There is also a generous public space at the base of the Empress State Building which compliments the cultural facility proposed in this location ensures that the existing and proposed tall buildings have ‘breathing space’.
Development Capacity Scenario 2: 3-Dimensional Massing

As published in 1st draft of SPD

Figure 1.9: Illustrative massing model for Development Capacity Scenario 2
Development Capacity Scenario 2: Urban Form

1.59 Figure 1.9 shows the illustrative 3 dimensional form that Scenario 2 could take. The annotations on the plan and the following text indicate the ways in which it meets the Key Objectives in the revised draft of the SPD and the ways in which it does not.

Notes on the Masterplan

1. In this scenario, the Empress State Building is retained and an ‘inviting composition’ of taller buildings is created around it.

2. There is a gap in the proposed frontage onto Brompton Cemetery, which prevents the enclosure of the cemetery from being improved.

3. New town houses are proposed on Seagrave Road to respond to those that already exist on the other side of the road.

4. The crescent buildings backing onto Philbeach Gardens and Eardley Crescent are capped at 4 storeys in height.

5. The terrace made up of listed buildings and buildings of merit on Lillie Road is sensitively incorporated into a new urban block.

6. A Metropolitan Face can be created, fronting onto the A4.

7. North End Road becomes a two sided retail street.

Key Objective

Ensure that no new buildings visible on the skyline have a negative impact on the quality and character of the surrounding townscape.

1.60 This Scenario retains the Empress State Building and attempts to create an attractive composition of tall buildings around it in order to improve its impact on the skyline whilst respecting its landmark status. The cultural facility proposed for the podium around the lower storeys of the Empress State Building gives meaning to the height and presence on the skyline of this and the other proposed tall buildings.

1.61 This scenario has a number of tall buildings that will be visible on the skyline. In terms of the views in the Townscape Analysis, the most detrimental impact of this Scenario is on the Conservation Area and setting of listed buildings of Brompton Cemetery. From these views, the tall buildings in the vicinity of the Empress State Building do not enhance the setting or improve the current skyline.

1.62 The garden square on Seagrave Road compromises the ability of this scenario to improve enclosure along the western edge of Brompton Cemetery.

Key Objective

Ensure that new buildings on the edges of the OA sensitively integrated into and enhance the existing context.

1.63 This scenario proposes town houses along Seagrave Road that respond to the existing houses in the other side of the road. The buildings that back onto Philbeach Gardens and Eardley Crescent are capped at 4 storeys.

1.64 The listed terrace on Lillie Road is sensitively incorporated into a new urban block made up of town houses and apartment buildings capped at 4 storeys.

1.65 Taller buildings are proposed to front onto the A4 in order to create a Metropolitan Face. This scenario also proposes that North End Road becomes a two sided retail street with new buildings on the east side of a scale that respects those on the west side of the street.

Key Objective

Design well proportioned streets that respond to those in the surrounding area and encourage walking and cycling.

1.66 In general, this scenario has the potential to ensure that no street has an enclosure ratio of less than 1:1.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum height AGL*</th>
<th>Maximum number of storeys** AGL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105m</td>
<td>35 residential 29 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80m</td>
<td>26 residential 22 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50m</td>
<td>16 residential 13 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40m</td>
<td>13 residential 11 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30m</td>
<td>10 residential 8 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25m</td>
<td>8 residential 6 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15m</td>
<td>5 residential 4 office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* AGL stands for ‘Above Ground Level’

It is important to note that there are significant changes in the ground levels across the site, ranging from 5m to 12m above ordnance datum.

** Residential storeys are assumed to be 3m floor to floor and office storeys are assumed to be 3.6m floor to floor.

Figure 1.10: Illustrative acceptable building heights diagram for Development Capacity Scenario 2
Development Capacity Scenario 2: Land Use

As published in 1st draft of SPD
Development Capacity Scenario 2: Land Use

1.67 Figures 1.11 and 1.12 show an illustrative land use strategy for Scenario 2, as previously published. The text below indicates the ways in which it meets the revised Key Objectives and the ways in which it does not.

Key Objective
Ensure that new housing and estate regeneration creates mixed and diverse residential neighbourhoods.

1.68 Scenario 2 is residential led. It has the potential to create mixed and diverse communities with a mixture of housing types and tenures.

Key Objective
Retail to meet the day to day needs of the new resident and worker population, in addition to the extended Fulham Town Centre, should be clustered around underground stations and in a new local centre within the OA which will also complement the new cultural and visitor facilities.

1.69 The retail strategy applied in this scenario introduces new clusters of retail around each of the new ‘station squares’ at the existing Underground Stations. It also introduces a consistent strip of new retail along the eastern edge of North End Road, thus creating a revitalised, two sided shopping street.

1.70 This scenario also introduces new retail in a cluster around the base of the Empress State Building. This is intended to create a new neighbourhood centre as required in the Key Objective, compliment the cultural uses and serve the civic space found in this location.

1.71 To deliver the diagonal link shown in this scenario between the junction of Lillie Road and North End Road and the civic space in the vicinity of the Empress State Building would require the purchase of third party land. On review, it is considered that it is not essential for a satisfactory scheme to be delivered and that it could divert footfall away from North End Road.

1.72 In this scenario, the Empress State Building is retained and it remains in use as an office building.

1.73 There are other office buildings indicated around the Empress State Building which have the potential to provide accommodation for smaller enterprises. However, office buildings in this location do not comprise half of the business offer, as required in the Employment Strategy.

1.74 There are also businesses on the main north-south street that could be treated as discrete office buildings, or could be organised as ‘incubator units’.

1.75 The remainder of the business offer is located in the Metropolitan Face which offers large footprint, discrete office blocks and certainly has the potential to become a very appealing location for larger commercial enterprises.

Key Objective
Create a lively cultural destination with a variety of culture, arts and creative facilities that continues the Earl’s Court’s ‘brand’.

1.76 The land use strategy for this scenario proposes a new cultural facility in a new podium wrapped around the base of the Empress State Building. This is complimented by a large civic space adjacent to it, into which cultural uses could spill, or that could accommodate outdoor exhibitions or events. It is also supported by a number of retail and other ‘A’ class units, all of which could come together to create a ‘cultural destination’. As a result of being at the ‘cross roads’ of the proposed north-south and east-west links it is anticipated that this will become the most lively spot in the masterplan with the highest amounts of activity.

1.77 A cultural facility is also indicated on the ‘Station Square’ outside Earl’s Court Station. This would have the potential to continue the presence of the Earl’s Court ‘brand’ in this location and to achieve the authorities’ aspiration to provide a cultural facility in the earliest phases of development.
Development Capacity Scenario 2: Social and Community Facilities

**Key Objective**
Provide social and community facilities to support the new residential and worker population.

**Education**

1.78 Both LBHF and RBKC use child yield formulas in order to estimate possible educational needs resulting from any development. In the first draft of the SPD, it was calculated that Scenario 2 would generate a child yield of 2,100 children. This was deemed unlikely to give rise to the need for a new secondary school, but would generate the need to secure funding to increase the number of form entries at existing secondary schools in the area. Table 1.4 shows the requisite requirements in terms of secondary school capacity financing for Scenario 2 that were published in the first draft of the SPD. The second draft of the SPD identifies a need for on site provision.

1.79 It was calculated that Scenario 2 would give rise to the need for a new primary school/nursery within the development. Table 1.4 shows the requirements for primary school capacity financing for Scenario 2. One of these form entries should be provided by expanding Normand Croft Primary School (located on Bramber Road to the west of North End Road) by one form entry. This will cater for the child yield arising from the earlier phases of development. An on site primary school/nursery should be provided in the early/middle phases of development at the point at which calculations demonstrate that the capacity limit created at Normand Croft Primary School is being reached.

### Table 1.4: Child Yield and Education Need calculated for Scenario 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Need</th>
<th>Form Entries Required</th>
<th>Requisite funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School need</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£15m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School need</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£22m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health**

1.80 The calculation for the size of health facilities is based on the following methodology:

- Health Centre based on up to six GP Cluster: an assumption of one GP per 1,800 residents and 150sqm per GP.
- Integrated Primary Care Centre based on seven or more GP Cluster plus health and wellbeing services: an assumption of one GP per 1,800 residents and 225sqm per GP.

1.81 Table 1.5 sets out the health facility floorspace demands in relation to Scenario 2.

### Table 1.5: Health FacilityFloorspace Calculation for Scenario 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Need</th>
<th>GPs</th>
<th>Floorspace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,000 units (14,400 people)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,200sqm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Open Space and Play Space**

1.82 The Mayor’s SPG on Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (2008) sets out standards for access to play. Standard B.2 within this SPG states that “a minimum of 10sqm of dedicated playspace per child (existing and new provision) is recommended as a basis for assessing existing and future provision”. It is considered that this provides a useful aggregation for the calculation of the overall quantity of public open space provision. The child yield of 2,500 calculated for Scenario 2 would lead to a requirement for 2.5 hectares of public open space that could be used for play.

1.83 In the first draft of the SPD, this was tested using the illustrative masterplan and it was concluded that 3.7 hectares was a suitable level of overall public open space provision for Scenario 2. In the illustrative masterplan, 90% of the residential properties are within 100 metres of a publicly accessible green space. This satisfies the standards within the Mayor’s SPG on Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (2008).
Development Capacity Scenario 3: Illustrative Masterplan

As published in 1st draft of SPD

Figure 1.13: Illustrative Masterplan for Development Capacity Scenario 3
Development Capacity Scenario 3: Urban Form

1.84 Figure 1.13 shows the illustrative masterplan for Scenario 3, which delivers a total floorspace of 1,005,500m². The layout for Scenarios 2 and 3 is largely the same, but the 3-d massing varies in order to accommodate greater floorspace in Scenario 3. The annotations on the plan and the following text indicate the ways in which it meets the Key Objectives in the revised draft of the SPD and the ways in which it does not.

Notes on the Masterplan

1 In this scenario, most of the existing streets identified in the SPD, including Star Road, can be extended into the OA. The connection with Star Road ensures excellent connectivity to the west.

2 There are a number of east-west connections created across the site including, one main east-west street. During consultation on the first draft of the SPD, concerns were raised that this would focus too much movement/activity on this street and potentially threaten the vitality of the existing local centres.

3 There is a new, direct north-south street.

4 The identified views of special existing landmarks can be retained and potentially improved.

5 The majority of the masterplan is within a 100m walk of the proposed publicly accessible open spaces.

6 There is a ‘Station Square’ outside each existing underground station.

7 There is a new civic space in the vicinity of the Empress State Building.

1.85 This scenario is based around two new axial streets; a new east-west street and a new north-south street. A great deal of emphasis is given to these streets, and as a result they are likely to become new Primary Streets. This does not reflect the street hierarchy found in the surrounding area. As set out in the SPD, the authorities do not consider it necessary to introduce new primary streets into the OA. Instead, the aspiration is to use the existing Primary Streets around the edges of the OA to define the new neighbourhood and then divide it with a number of new Secondary and Tertiary Streets.

1.86 This scenario introduces a number of new east-west connections directly across the OA. It also introduces a new north-south link that could alleviate the Earl’s Court One Way System at some point in the future. This scenario decks over the railway line where necessary in order to maximise east-west connectivity. It also improves pedestrian and cyclist connectivity from the A4 into the OA.

1.87 In this scenario, a linear park is created on the deck over the top of the railway lines. It has the potential to provide the required 2 Ha offer of a local park. It also has the potential to introduce continuous north-south ecological habitats, thus mitigating against the loss of a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCl) and improving biodiversity. Much of it is too narrow to function well as a park that accommodates a range of activities, thus demonstrating that a linear park may need to take more than 2 ha of land.

1.88 The design in this scenario also has four publicly accessible garden squares. Along with the linear park, they ensure that about 90% of the potential residential units can be within a 100m walk of a publicly accessible green open space.

1.89 In this scenario a new civic space, referred to as a ‘Station Square’ is introduced at each of the existing Underground Stations and at the junction of Lillie Road and North End Road. There is also a generous public space at the base of the Empress State Building which compliments the cultural facility proposed in this location ensures that the existing and proposed tall buildings have ‘breathing space’.
Development Capacity Scenario 3: 3-Dimensional Massing

As published in 1st draft of SPD

Notes on the Masterplan

1. In this scenario, the Empress State Building is retained and an ‘inviting composition’ of taller buildings is created around it.
2. There is a gap in the proposed frontage onto Brompton Cemetery, which prevents the enclosure of the cemetery from being improved.
3. Some of the buildings fronting onto Brompton Cemetery are significantly taller than they are in the other scenarios.
4. New town houses are proposed on Seagrave Road to respond to those that already exist on the other side of the road.
5. The crescent buildings backing onto Philbeach Gardens and Eardley Crescent are capped at 4 storeys in height.
6. The terrace made up of listed buildings and buildings of merit on Lillie Road is sensitively incorporated into a new urban block.
7. A Metropolitan Face can be created, fronting onto the A4.
8. North End Road becomes a two sided retail street.

Figure 1.14: Illustrative massing model for Development Capacity Scenario 3
Development Capacity Scenario 3: Urban Form

1.90 Figure 1.14 shows the illustrative 3 dimensional form that Scenario 3 could take. The annotations on the plan and the following text indicate the ways in which it meets the Key Objectives in the revised draft of the SPD and the ways in which it does not.

Key Objective
Ensures that no new buildings visible on the skyline have a negative impact on the quality and character of the surrounding townscape.

1.91 This Scenario retains the Empress State Building and attempts to create an attractive composition of tall buildings around it in order to improve its impact on the skyline whilst respecting its landmark status. The cultural facility proposed for the podium around the lower storeys of the Empress State Building gives meaning to the height and presence on the skyline of this and the other proposed tall buildings.

1.92 This is the tallest of the scenarios and therefore has the most significant potential impact on the surrounding Conservation Areas and the settings of listed buildings. The impact on Brompton Cemetery is even greater than Scenario 2 because there are a number of taller buildings proposed along the eastern edge of the Seagrave Road site.

1.93 As a result of the higher number of taller buildings in the composition around the Empress State Building, this scenario not only impacts on views from Brompton Cemetery, but also from the following Conservation Areas; Earl’s Court Square, Earls Court Village, The Boltons and Queens Club. The most significant impacts are caused by the new tall buildings appearing above the existing parapet lines thus compromising the roofscape and the new buildings causing the loss of existing ‘glimpses of sky’.

1.94 The proposed development along the A4 edge is also taller in this scenario. This impacts on views from the following Conservation Areas: Barons Court, Philbeach and Nevern Square. The most significant impact is the wall of development that is created by the Metropolitan Face. This also impacts on the setting of the listed St Cuthbert’s Church and in many views is visible above the parapet line thus impacting on the existing roofscape.

1.95 The garden square on Seagrave Road compromises the ability of this scenario to improve enclosure along the western edge of Brompton Cemetery.

1.96 This Scenario proposes town houses along Seagrave Road that respond to the existing houses in the other side of the road. The buildings that back onto Philbeach Gardens and Eardley Crescent are capped at 4 storeys.

1.97 The listed terrace on Lillie Road is sensitively incorporated into a new urban block made up of town houses and apartment buildings capped at 4 storeys.

1.98 North End Road becomes a two sided retail street with buildings of a scale that respect those on the other side of the street.

Key Objective
Design well proportioned streets that respond those in the surrounding area and encourage walking and cycling.

1.99 In general, the buildings in this scenario are taller and therefore the chances of streets exceeding the 1:1 minimum ratio are greater. In order to avoid this, the streets would need to be wider than they are in scenario 2. However, this would reduce the footprint available to development and may result in increased building heights to accommodate the same capacity.
### Development Capacity Scenario 3: Building Heights

As published in 1st draft of SPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum height AGL*</th>
<th>Maximum number of storeys** AGL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105m</td>
<td>35 residential 29 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80m</td>
<td>25 residential 22 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50m</td>
<td>16 residential 13 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40m</td>
<td>13 residential 11 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30m</td>
<td>10 residential 8 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25m</td>
<td>8 residential 6 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15m</td>
<td>5 residential 4 office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* AGL stands for ‘Above Ground Level’

It is important to note that there are significant changes in the ground levels across the site, ranging from 5m to 12m above ordnance datum.

** Residential storeys are assumed to be 3m floor to floor and office storeys are assumed to be 3.6m floor to floor.

![Illustrative acceptable building heights diagram for Development Capacity Scenario 3](image)
Development Capacity Scenario 3: Building Heights

As published in 1st draft of SPD

Figure 1.16: Illustrative ground floor land use strategy for Scenario 3

Figure 1.17: Illustrative upper floor land use strategy for Scenario 3
Development Capacity Scenario 3: Land Use

1.100 Figures 1.16 and 1.17 show an illustrative land use strategy for Scenario 3, as previously published. The text below indicates the ways in which it meets the revised Key Objectives and Key Principles and the ways in which it does not.

1.101 Scenario 3 is residential led. It has the potential to create mixed and diverse communities with a mixture of housing types and tenures.

1.102 The retail strategy applied in this Scenario introduces new clusters of retail around each of the new ‘station squares’ at the existing Underground Stations. It also introduces a consistent strip of new retail along the eastern edge of North End Road, thus creating a revitalised, two sided shopping street.

1.103 This scenario also introduces new retail in a cluster around the base of the Empress State Building. This is intended to create a new neighbourhood centre as required in the Key Objective, compliment the cultural uses and serve the civic space found in this location.

1.104 In this scenario, the Empress State Building is retained and it remains in use as an office building.

1.105 There are other office buildings indicated around the Empress State Building which have the potential to provide accommodation for smaller enterprises. However, office buildings in this location do not comprise half of the business offer, as required in the Employment Strategy.

1.106 There are also offices on the main north-south street that could be treated as discrete office buildings, or could be organised as ‘incubator units’.

1.107 The remainder of the business offer is located in the Metropolitan Face which offers large footprint, discrete office blocks and certainly has the potential to become a very appealing location for larger commercial enterprises.

1.108 The land use strategy for this scenario proposes a new cultural facility in a podium building wrapped around the base of the Empress State Building. This is complimented by a large civic space adjacent to it, into which cultural uses could spill, or that could accommodate outdoor exhibitions or events. It is also supported by a number of retail and other ‘A’ class units, all of which could come together to create a ‘cultural destination’. As a result of being at the ‘cross roads’ of the proposed north-south and east-west links it is anticipated that this will become the most lively spot in the masterplan with the highest amounts of activity.

1.109 A cultural facility is also indicated on the ‘Station Square’ outside Earl’s Court Station. This would have the potential to continue the presence of the Earl’s Court ‘brand’ in this location and to achieve the authorities’ aspiration to provide a cultural facility in the earliest phases of development.
Development Capacity Scenario 3: Social Infrastructure

Key Objective
Provide social and community facilities to support the new residential and worker population.

Education

Both LBHF and RBKC use child yield formulas in order to estimate possible educational needs resulting from any development. In the first draft of the SPD, it was calculated that Scenario 3 would generate a child yield of 2,940 children. This was deemed unlikely to give rise to the need for a new secondary school, but would generate the need to secure funding to increase the number of form entries at existing secondary schools in the area. Table 1.6 shows the requisite requirements in terms of secondary school capacity financing for Scenario 3. The second draft of the SPD identifies a need for on site provision.

It was calculated that Scenario 3 would give rise to the need for a new primary school/nursery within the development. Table 1.6 shows the requirements for primary school capacity financing for Scenario 2. One of these form entries should be provided by expanding Normand Croft Primary School (located on Bramber Road to the west of North End Road) by one form entry. This will cater for the child yield arising from the earlier phases of development. An on site primary school/nursery should be provided in the early/middle phases of development at the point at which calculations demonstrate that the capacity limit created at Normand Croft Primary School is being reached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Need</th>
<th>Form Entries Required</th>
<th>Requisite funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School need (generated by 8,000 homes, 7,300 of which are net additional)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School need</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>£33m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.6: Child Yield and Education Need calculated for Scenario 3

Health

The calculation for the size of health facilities is based on the following methodology:

- Health Centre based on up to six GP Cluster: an assumption of one GP per 1,800 residents and 150sqm per GP.
- Integrated Primary Care Centre based on seven or more GP Cluster plus health and wellbeing services: an assumption of one GP per 1,800 residents and 225sqm per GP.

Table 1.7 sets out the health facility floorspace demands in relation to Scenario 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Need</th>
<th>GPs</th>
<th>Floorspace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,000 units (19,200 people)</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>1,600sqm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.7: Health Facility Floorspace Calculation for Scenario 3

Open Space and Play Space

The Mayor’s SPG on Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (2008) sets out standards for access to play. Standard B.2 within this SPG states that “a minimum of 10sqm of dedicated playspace per child (existing and new provision) is recommended as a basis for assessing existing and future provision”. It is considered that this provides a useful aggregation for the calculation of the overall quantity of public open space provision. The child yield of 3,400 calculated for Scenario 3 would lead to a requirement for 3.4 hectares of public open space that could be used for play.

In the first draft of the SPD, this was tested using the illustrative masterplan and it was concluded that 3.7 hectares was a suitable level of overall public open space provision for Scenario 3. In the illustrative masterplan, 90% of the residential properties are within 100 metres of a publicly accessible green space. This satisfies the standards within the Mayor’s SPG on Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (2008).
Figure 1.18: Alternative Illustrative Masterplan that has the potential to meet the revised Key Principles and Key Objectives

1.116 Figure 1.18 shows an alternative masterplan solution that meets all of the Key Objectives set out in the revised draft of the SPD.

1.117 It is included here as a layout test rather than a development capacity exercise. There is therefore no 3 dimensional representation of this masterplan.
Alternative Scenario: Illustrative Masterplan

**Key Objective**
Establish an urban grain within the OA that is inspired by the surrounding pattern of streets and open spaces.

118 In the alternative scenario, produced in response to the feedback received after consultation on the first draft of the SPD, the existing streets with the potential to be extended into the OA have been. This includes Star Road which significantly improves connectivity to the west.

119 The street hierarchy in this scenario is inspired by the street pattern noted in the OA's existing context. The existing Primary Streets on the edges of the OA are used to define the new neighbourhood which is subdivided by a number of generally orthogonal Secondary Streets. The latter create strong east-west connections and more broken up north-south connections. Tertiary streets subdivide the neighbourhood further into a very fine urban grain. The crescent street forms found in the surroundings are replicated.
Alternative Scenario: Illustrative Masterplan

In the alternative scenario the existing pattern of garden squares found around the OA is extended into the new neighbourhood through a network of new publicly accessible open spaces.

The garden squares in the alternative scenario have the potential to use the most successful design attributes of the existing garden squares as precedent. For example, they have active streets around four of their edges, they are framed by residential buildings and they have the potential to contain games courts.

They also have the potential to meet contemporary demands by being publicly accessible and by having no private rear gardens backing onto them.

The alternative scenario preserves, and has the potential to maintain existing views of special landmarks around the OA and to introduce new view compositions and landmark buildings in a manner that reflects those found in the character area analysis. For suggestions of where these might be located, please see Figure 1.21.

The potential view compositions include:

1. Deflected views; and
2. Well enclosed views

The potential locations for landmark buildings include:

3. Where the main entrance to Earl’s Court Exhibition Centre 1 can be found today;
4. The Empress State Building;
5. Corner on North End Road; and
6. Metropolitan Gateway to OA.

As noted in the Urban Design Guidelines accompanying this SPD landmark buildings DO NOT have to be tall buildings. In fact, in a number of locations, for example North End Road, a tall building would be completely unacceptable.
**Alternative Scenario: Illustrative Masterplan**

1.127 In the alternative scenario, connectivity is maximised through the multiple north-south and east-west connections created. The railway line is decked over in order to maximise connectivity. This enables the creation of a linear park which includes new direct north-south connections and has the potential to create a new habitat corridor, thus improving biodiversity.

1.128 The alternative scenario also introduces a number of new connections from the A4 into the OA, including one vehicular connection and a number of pedestrian only connections. The buildings that front onto the A4 are broken up, not only in order to introduce these connections, but also to ensure that the elevation does not appear monolithic.

![Illustrative plan demonstrating how views of existing special landmarks can be maintained and how potential new view compositions and landmark buildings](image1)

![Illustrative plan demonstrating connectivity within the OA](image2)
**Alternative Scenario: Illustrative Masterplan**

**Key Objective**

Provide good quality public open space that offers a range of recreational and ecological opportunities and overcomes existing deficiencies in access to public open space and play facilities.

1.129 This Scenario provides a range of public open spaces including the offer of a local park that is over 2ha in area and a number of residential garden squares.

1.130 The linear park is made up of a series of contiguous green public open spaces, with roads running adjacent to them to ensure that connectivity and permeability are not compromised even if the public green open spaces themselves are shut. It includes a number of different spaces with different proportions in order to ensure that it is capable of accommodating a range of different activities.

1.131 In the alternative scenario, many of the contiguous open spaces that make up the linear park are wider than those in the previous scenarios. However, some are still relatively narrow. In design terms it may be pleasing to have some relatively narrow spaces in order to cultivate a sense of 'reveal'. However, any application for a linear park will be subject to a qualitative assessment of the potential functionality of the park. Relatively narrow spaces will only be deemed acceptable where they link wide, functional spaces.

1.132 The distribution of public, green, open spaces within the alternative scenario means that they are within 100m walking distance of the majority of the potential residential units.

1.133 Figure 1.27 shows this graphically.

---

Figure 1.26: Illustrative plan of a linear park

Figure 1.27: Illustrative plan demonstrating how much of this Scenario is within 100m walking distance of a public green open space
**Alternative Scenario: Illustrative Masterplan**

1.134 The alternative scenario also includes the potential for a number of civic spaces, particularly at the existing underground stations and within the cultural destination at the centre of the site.

1.135 The proposed buildings on the edge of the Seagrave Road car park site in this Scenario have the potential to improve the enclosure of the western edge of Brompton Cemetery.

Key Objective

Ensure that no new buildings visible on the skyline have negative impact on the quality and character of the surrounding townscape.

1.136 The alternative scenario also retains the Empress State Building as a local landmark and introduces new buildings within its vicinity that could be tall enough to create an inviting composition and thus enhance its appearance on the skyline. However, exact heights and impact on the skyline are not assessed as part of this layout exercise. A cultural use is proposed for the podium around the base of the Empress State Building which would form the central attractor of the new cultural destination. Therefore, the proposed tall buildings have the potential to enhance legibility by marking the presence of a significant, London-wide public function/destination.
**Key Objective**

Ensure that new buildings on the edges of the OA are sensitively integrated into and enhance the existing context.

1.137 The alternative scenario lays out and orientates buildings on all its edges to respond to the existing conditions as described in the SPD.

1.138 For example, all existing buildings that are to remain on the edges of the OA are sensitively incorporated into new urban blocks. Where new urban blocks knit into an existing terrace, like the listed terrace on Lillie Road, they follow the same building line in order to maintain consistency. This is show graphically in Figure 1.31.

Figure 1.31: Illustrative plan showing how the terrace made up of listed buildings and buildings of merit on Lillie Road could be sensitively incorporated into a new urban lock. This includes maintaining the existing building line.

Figure 1.32: The edge conditions of this Scenario

1. Communal gardens behind Kensington Hall Gardens;
2. Communal Gardens behind Beaumont Crescent
3. Communal gardens behind the terrace of listed buildings and buildings of merit on Lillie Road
4. Communal gardens behind Empress Place
5. Private Gardens behind Eardley Crescent and Philbeach Gardens

Edge to respond to openness of views from Brompton Cemetery

Edge to respond to 3-6 storey town houses on Seagrave Road

Edge to respond to North End Road and Conservation Areas to west

'Metropolitan Face'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communal gardens behind Kensington Hall Gardens;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communal Gardens behind Beaumont Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communal gardens behind the terrace of listed buildings and buildings of merit on Lillie Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communal gardens behind Empress Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Private Gardens behind Eardley Crescent and Philbeach Gardens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Key Objective**
Design well proportioned streets that respond to those in the surrounding area and encourage walking and cycling

1.139 The street sections in the SPD are taken from this illustrative Scenario and demonstrate that, with buildings of appropriate height and the use of step backs at shoulder height, the desired street enclosures can be achieved. The same is applicable to the proposed open spaces.

1.140 The alternative scenario has the potential to enclose open spaces with buildings of appropriate heights to ensure that their enclosure ratios respond to those found in the surrounding context.

1.141 The ‘perimeter block’ based approach taken in the alternative scenario means that in general, there are clear distinctions between public fronts and private backs. In general, the public fronts front onto streets and public realm. The private backs tend to define private or communal spaces in the centre of the block.

1.142 This approach also ensures that all streets and open spaces in the alternative scenario are fronted onto by frequent windows and doors providing good natural surveillance of the public realm.
Alternative Scenario: Land Use

Figure 1.37: Illustrative Ground Floor Land Uses for this Scenario

Figure 1.38: Upper Floor Land Uses for this Scenario
Alternative Scenario: Land Use

1.143 Figures 1.37 and 1.38 show an illustrative land use strategy for the alternative scenario.

Key Objective
Ensure that new housing and estate regeneration creates mixed and diverse residential neighbourhoods.

1.144 The alternative scenario is residential led. It has the potential to create mixed and diverse communities with a mixture of housing types and tenures.

Key Objective
Retail to meet the day to day needs of the new resident and worker population, in addition to the extended Fulham Town Centre, should be clustered around underground stations and in a new local centre within the OA which will also complement the new cultural and visitor facilities.

1.145 The retail strategy applied in the alternative scenario focuses very much on introducing new mixed use clusters in line with existing retail centres and underground stations. North End Road was treated as the first priority, extending Fulham Town Centre further north and turning it into a revitalised, two sided shopping street. The second priority was new clusters of retail and other A class uses within the vicinity of the existing underground stations. These are intended to ensure that the development grows form the outside in, and therefore does not compromise existing centres in the surrounding context. The final priority was the creation of a new neighbourhood centre in the vicinity of the Empress State Building. This part of the retail offer will allow limited retail to compliment the cultural destination and provide for local day to day needs.

1.146 In the alternative scenario, the Empress State Building is retained and it remains in use as an office building. Around its base is a podium used to provide the large cultural facility.

1.147 There are further office buildings proposed for the lower floors of other buildings in the vicinity of the Empress State Building. These businesses have the potential to accommodate very small, small and medium sized enterprises. They could also be divided into incubator units. As required in the Employment Strategy, over half of the businesses are provided in this form. There is also an office building on one of the north-south streets. Although it has a large footprint, it could be used as incubator units.

1.148 The remainder of the business offer is located in the Metropolitan Face which offers large footprint, discrete office buildings.

Key Objective
Create a lively cultural destination with a variety of culture, arts and creative facilities that continues the Earl’s Court’s ‘brand’.

1.149 The land use strategy for the alternative scenario proposes the installation of a new cultural facility in a podium wrapped around the base of the Empress State Building. This is complimented by a civic space created by a shared surface street adjacent to it. This space has the potential to accommodate cultural uses, outdoor exhibitions or temporary events, although this may require closing the road to traffic occasionally. The cultural use is also supported by retail and other ‘A’ class units, all of which come together to create a ‘cultural destination’. The tall buildings proposed to create an attractive cluster around the Empress State Building signify the important London wide destination of the cultural destination at their base.

1.150 A cultural facility is also proposed in the current location of EC1. This has the potential to continue the influence of the Earl’s Court ‘brand’ in this area. Locating a cultural facility in this area also addresses the authorities’ desire to ensure that there is a cultural facility provided in the earliest phases of development.