

Issues and Options (2005)

Box no.	Policies/options	Summary of response	If this is taken forward - where on the Interim Issues and Options?	Why has option not been taken forward? (NB only include if rejected at this stage. Reason for taking forward will be explained at the end of the process)
Issue 1	A better city life			
	<p>Objective 1: To preserve and enhance the residential and historic character of the borough and its amenities to ensure a high quality of life for all its residents</p> <p>Objective 2: To preserve or enhance the historic environment and to ensure that all new development reflects the special character and appearance of the local area through high quality design and materials, layout and landscaping</p> <p>Objective 3: To seek to improve the borough's streetscape, with more public art and more street improvement schemes (of the kind that have transformed Kensington High Street into the most talked about streetscape in the Capital)</p> <p>Objective 4: To provide a range of housing which meets the wide needs of the community, including affordable housing</p> <p>Objective 5: To secure the amenities necessary to provide a better city life for the whole community - health, education, leisure and recreation, arts and culture, local services and shops</p> <p>Objective 6: To protect and enhance the quality, attractiveness, vitality and viability of the borough's principal shopping centres and local shopping centres</p> <p>Objective 7: To support and encourage economic growth in the borough and to maintain a diversity of job opportunities for the benefit of local residents</p> <p>Objective 8: To protect the borough's trees, parks and open spaces and to ensure that they are well managed and attractive</p> <p>Objective 9: To minimise the impact that our community has on the environment through the facilitation and encouragement of recycling, waste minimisation and energy efficient construction</p> <p>Objective 10: To seek and encourage sustainable approaches to the maintenance and enhancement of buildings and the environment, including the improvement of air quality</p> <p>Objective 11: To ensure an appropriate balance between the borough's contribution to London as a 'World City' and its role as a place which people call home</p> <p>Objective 12: To enhance public transport and to encourage cycling and walking as attractive forms of travel</p>	<p>There was overwhelming support for nearly all aspects of the objectives to achieve the "better city living" vision. Only two objectives fell short of this overwhelming support; car free development and street improvements. There was some concern that car free development was contrary to the idea that parking is a "right".</p>	<p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), Box 4 (Keeping Life Local) , Box 5 (Fostering Vitality)</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), Box 7 (Renewing the Legacy.), Box 7.2 (High Quality Design)</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2,2 (Spatial Vision), Box 6a (Caring for the Public Realm), Box 6.4 (Public realm)</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), Box 8 (Diversity of Housing), Box 8.3 Balance of Housing), Box 8.4 (market housing and estate renewal)</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), Box 4 (Keeping Life Local), Box 4.2 (Investing in Social and Community Uses, Box 4,3 (Walkable neighbourhoods)</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), Box 5 (Fostering Vitality), Box 5.4a (Diversity within town centres),</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), Box 5 (Fostering Vitality), Box 5.7 a, b and c (Businesses).</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), (Caring for the Public Realm) Box 6.5 (Provision of public and private open space)</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), Box 9 (Securing Our Children's Future). 9.3 (Waste)</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), Box 9 (Securing Our Children's Future), Box 9.2 Protecting the local and global environment</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), Box 5 (Fostering Vitality)</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), 9.5 (Walking and Cycling), 5.3 (New Stations)</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>Objective 13: To seek new housing with neither parking attached nor a right to a resident's parking permit</p> <p>Objective 14: To concentrate land uses in appropriate locations to reduce the need to travel, especially high trip generating development - which should be in areas well served by public transport and accessible by foot and bicycle</p> <p>Objective 15: To allow everyone who lives, works or visits the borough to benefit from its reputation for public safety</p>		<p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), 8.9 (Car-free development)</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision), 9.7 (Air Quality)</p> <p>All aspects have been taken forward be this within spatial vision or in the appropriate strategic objective. Box 2.2 (Spatial Vision),</p>	
<p>Issue 2 Heritage and Environmental Quality</p>			
<p>Carry forward the objectives for Conservation and Development as described in the Issues and Options paper, allowing change in a sensitive manner</p> <p>Adopt a more restrictive approach where Conservation and Development issues are always the principal concern</p> <p>Be more focused on generally encouraging development, to meet needs in the Borough, for example more housing development</p>	<p>The written responses generally favour conservation over development, with the exception of housing or affordable housing, and the provision that conservation areas should not shift development pressure elsewhere. At the workshops, there was great support for mixed use to build vibrancy. Conflicts and difficulties between conservation demands and the need for sustainable design, especially in connection with renewable energy was raised. There were concerns that the LDF process is slow and may prevent timely local decision-making. Disability groups fear that conservation policies conflict with and dampen DDA policies resulting in poor access to key facilities such as GP surgeries, schools and shopping facilities.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 7.0 'Renewing the Legacy', Box 7.3 'Density of Development', Box 7.2 'High Quality Design'</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Issue 3 Large Scale, Landmark Buildings</p>			
<p>Identify areas of special character, where tall buildings would be inappropriate</p> <p>Identify are as where tall buildings may be appropriate</p> <p>Generally resist all tall buildings in the borough</p> <p>Assess each case on its own merits using specified criteria and have no designated areas</p>	<p>The written responses concentrate on tall buildings, their locations, design and impact on both built density and the Borough's population. At the workshops, the main concerns of attendees revolved around impacts on the already very high population density (highest in England). Striking the right balance between conservation and development was seen to be key. Young people felt that restricting 'tall buildings' could impact negatively on employment prospects for the Borough.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 7.4: Tall buildings</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Issue 4 Loss of front gardens</p>			
<p>Resist the loss of front gardens to vehicle parking in the borough</p> <p>Resist the loss of front gardens to vehicle parking in conservation areas and the curtilage of listed buildings</p> <p>Seek to maintain a balance by allowing sufficient space for a vehicle to park, but retain most of the front garden area for non parking uses - Where space permits allow most of the front garden to be utilised for parking</p>	<p>Responses are mostly against using front gardens for parking. A quarter suggest that car parking should be allowed on front gardens in special cases (the disabled, red routes). Around a fifth think that gardens and railings should be reinstated.</p>	<p>Not taken forward in the Interim Issues and Options Document. Considered in CR4 of Proposed Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>The Council accepts that residents have strong concerns surrounding this issue, which was clear in the responses received. However, this option was not taken forward to the next stage as it was considered more appropriate to be included in a Development Management document rather than a Core Strategy which deals with Strategic level issues. However, given the concern of residents on this issue the loss of front gardens has been included in Policy CR4 (Streetscape) part (g) which resist pavement crossovers and forecourt parking.</p>

<p>Seek to maintain a balance by allowing sufficient space for a vehicle to park, but retain most of the front garden area for non parking uses</p> <p>Where space permits allow most of the front garden to be utilised for parking</p>			
Issue 5 Telecommunication equipment			
<p>generally resist telecommunication equipment throughout the borough regardless of the impact on mobile phone coverage</p> <p>generally resist telecommunication equipment in conservation areas and on listed buildings where it would be harmful to the character or appearance of the building or the surrounding area</p> <p>adopt a flexible policy which generally permits telecommunication equipment on appropriate tall buildings outside of conservation areas where visual impact is minimised.</p> <p>generally permit the erection of telecommunication equipment through out the Borough subject to equipment sharing, visual impact being minimised, and the LDF being receptive to changes in technology.</p>	<p>Most responses seek to limit the unplanned proliferation of masts on the basis of their unsightliness and concerns over health.</p>	<p>Not taken forward in the Interim Issues and Options Document . Considered in CL6 (Small-scale Alterations and Additions) of Renewing the Legacy</p>	<p>The Council decided not to take this issue to the interim issues and options as telecommunications equipment was not considered to be an issue which merits its own policy within a core strategy. However, given the impact that telecommunication equipment can have upon visual amenity, CL6 (b) of the submission core strategy does specifically refer to telecommunication equipment and requires it to be sites where visual amenity will not be harmed.</p>
Issue 6 Subterranean development			
<p>Resist all subterranean development</p> <p>Resist subterranean development unless particular criteria can be satisfied</p> <p>Permit subterranean development as it assists people to adapt their homes to changing needs and remain in the borough</p>	<p>Most responses raised concerns with subterranean develop on structural and environmental grounds or call for criteria setting in approving such projects.</p>	<p>Not taken forward in the Interim Issues and Options Document. Considered in CI (i)of the draft plan.</p>	<p>The Council decided not to take this issue to the interim issues and options subterranean development was considered to be an issue which was best considered by its own SPD. However, a section on subterranean development was added to CL(i) in the draft plan (June 09) and carried forward to the submission plan (CL2(g)) in order to address the public concern on this issue. The council considers it essential that subterranean extensions do not endanger surrounding buildings or harm the visual amenity of an areas (including by loss of trees etc)</p>
Issue 7 Extensions to residential properties			
<p>Continue a similarly restrictive approach to the UDP</p> <p>Allow residents to extend their homes regardless of the appearance of the extension, but as long as daylighting and overlooking policies are not breached</p> <p>Be more flexible with regard to daylighting and overlooking but still have strict controls over the appearance of extensions</p> <p>Be more flexible with regard to daylighting, overlooking and appearance</p>	<p>Most expressed concerns around the appearance of extensions and impacts on daylighting and overlooking, and the need for effective enforcement.</p>	<p>Taken forward. 8.7 (House Extensions) of Interim Issues and Options</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Issue 8: Protecting the Existing Housing Stock			

<p>The demand for housing in the borough is high. The LDF should:</p> <p>Continue to protect homes from loss to other uses</p> <p>Allow limited loss of residential use so long as any exceptions are justified in the LDF (e.g. to doctors' surgeries)</p> <p>Prevent small flats being converted or developed into fewer, but larger, flats or single family houses.</p> <p>Prevent small flats being converted or developed into fewer, but larger, flats or single family houses unless it is for affordable housing.</p> <p>Allow small flats to be converted to create</p>	<p>Issue 8 - Protecting the existing housing stock. A third believe homes should continue to be protected from loss to other uses. Over a quarter think loss appropriate if justified - (conversion to doctor's surgeries.) Roughly a fifth consider that small flats should be converted to larger family dwellings where possible though around 10% think this should only apply to affordable housing. Overview of written responses on Issue 8: The responses widely support the provision of larger houses and family homes, even at the loss of smaller flats. Existing stock is to be protected, except where conversion to health-care or GP surgery is required. Three areas come to the fore: Family homes. Measures to 'retain' and attract 'families' to the borough are widely supported, though currently there is a 'shortage of 3-5 bed houses'.</p> <p>Protection and loss. Most agree that the council should 'continue to prevent loss of housing stock' except to very 'specific uses such as doctor's surgeries', echoing the London Plan. A few wish to 'reduce residential density'. There was mention of the need to protect 'commercial building sites'.</p> <p>Conversions. Most support conversion of small flats to larger homes to 'retain families', though smaller units are needed by 'the elderly and single mothers'.</p>	<p>Not specifically covered, but see draft CS, July 2009 . The de-conversion issue is covered in Towards Preferred Options in Box 9.11.</p>	<p>Reference to protection of housing, unless it is replaced, is in the draft CS. A number of options are too restrictive. The prevention of small flats being converted into single family houses has also been rejected because although there would be likely to be a net loss of units, there is also a strong demand for family housing, and there would also be less parking pressure. The options to prevent conversions into larger homes, unless for affordable housing has been rejected because the Council is of the view that anyone should be able to do this.</p>
--	--	---	--

Issue 9 Housing Provision and Location

<p>New homes in Kensington and Chelsea should be located:</p> <p>In primarily residential areas</p> <p>In shopping centres above the ground floor commercial uses</p> <p>On surplus industrial and employment land</p> <p>As part of mixed use development anywhere in the Borough</p> <p>Anywhere in the borough, so long as a good standard of residential amenity and design can be achieved</p> <p>Elsewhere within the borough (please state; if you also know of any potential housing development sites, please give the addresses)</p>	<p>Around 25% of respondents believe that housing should be provided anywhere in the borough, if good standards of amenity and design can be achieved. A further 17.5% support this in mixed-use developments. Roughly a fifth think the use of surplus industrial or employment land to be appropriate. A similar proportion (19%) suggest housing should be provided above shops or commercial premises and 13%, located in primarily residential areas. Overview of written responses on Issue 9: 'Housing provision and location' Responses flag up concerns over density and sustainability and with the already highly residential character of the borough. Use of derelict land for the provision of housing is preferred. Three topics emerged: Density. Many worry that increases in an highly populated borough could be 'deleterious socially'. However, others consider that 'there is scope to increase density, as in 'Paris or Vienna', as long as this is 'set according to character of localities'; an approach that aligns with the London Plan. Sustainability and limits. Many feel that the 'borough is near saturation point' and 'highly residential already' or that 'housing takes up a disproportionate amount of land'. There is a clear 'preference for mixed use' and 'imaginative approaches such as building over supermarkets, car parks and rail lines'. Location. 'Underutilised and vacant land' should be targeted. Conversion 'from industrial use' is supported and opposed in equal measures.</p>	<p>Not covered. See Draft Core Strategy.</p>	<p>In practice, housing is suitable in a number of locations and therefore several options are applicable. The option on anywhere in the borough, as long as there is good design, is rejected because there are some limited locations, such as employment zones, where residential is not permitted, or only in a limited way.</p>
--	---	--	--

Issue 9b New Homes

<p>9b) New homes in Kensington and Chelsea should come from:</p> <p>Building at higher densities (see Option 9)</p> <p>Building more, smaller sized dwellings</p> <p>Allowing changes of use from other uses, even though this may undermine other policy objectives</p>	<p>28% supported building at higher densities; 30% supported building more, smaller sized properties; 29% supported allowing changes from other uses, even though this may undermine other policy objectives and 13% had no views or didn't know.</p>	<p>Not covered.</p>	<p>The option 'allowing changes of use from other uses, even though this may undermine other policy objectives' is rejected because whilst housing provision is important there are other uses, such as social and community uses which may need protection. Therefore change of use to housing shouldn't be permitted where it would undermine other policy objectives. In practice, none of the options reflect the range of circumstances affecting provision of new housing. Sometimes new housing is built at higher densities, but this is not always the case.</p>
<p>Issue 10 Local Needs Housing</p>			
<p>How can the Council help local people to stay within the borough? The LDF should:</p> <p>Encourage as much new housing in the private sector as possible, but available to anyone</p> <p>Encourage as much new housing in the public sector as possible, but available to all who are eligible</p> <p>Allow for as much new public and private sector housing as possible, but subject to the preservation of the environment and achieving high standards of design</p> <p>Develop a 'local needs housing' policy to seek to restrict the occupation of all new dwellings to local people or to people with connections to the borough</p>	<p>Issue 10 - Local needs housing. The majority (44%) believe as much private or public sector housing as possible should be allowed subject to preservation of the environment and high design standards. Just under a quarter feel that policy in this area should favour local people or people with connections to the borough. Similar response levels (13 and 12%) support private and public sector developments if available to anyone, or those who are eligible, respectively. Overview of written responses on Issue 10: 'Local needs housing': Most responses focus on the option that applies exclusively to the borough's residents and those with connections to it, and raise severe concerns with the outcomes and practicability of such an approach. It is widely considered untenable in market terms, and could run the risk of stagnating housing development, achieving the opposite of its objective.</p> <p>As a model, it was thought unlikely to secure funding from the Housing Corporation, and would present the council with severe management difficulties. Many also considered the local focus of this option to be opposed to diversity, mix and the borough's wider role within a 'world city'. Beyond this, views on procurement options and allocation approaches were fairly evenly balanced. Three key areas emerged - Local people, needs and affordable housing. Most felt that the 'objective of keeping people in the borough should not be a planning matter' and that in policy terms a borough focused local needs housing approach would be 'neither realistic nor beneficial'. To work, 'ownership would need to be retained by the Council or Housing Associations' and this 'would be difficult to frame and administer', 'unreasonable and unimplementable' and a 'wholly unnecessary and unjustifiable piece of social engineering'. Though a majority are 'strongly against the idea', some 'absolutely agreed with the suggestion' as otherwise, 'young families would move out'.</p>	<p>Not covered.</p>	<p>The option to "Develop a 'local needs housing' policy to seek to restrict the occupation of all new dwellings to local people or to people with connections to the borough" has been rejected. This was not supported in the consultation responses and would be very difficult to administer.</p>

Others suggested a compromise, whereby 'public sector allocations (would) prioritise local people', but not exclude others. There were suggestions that 'demand could be eased by increasing supply', and by permitting 'well designed, well managed, high density schemes as part of an SPG'. The 'overriding focus should be on the need for a significant increase in affordable housing' though it was claimed that '21% of the borough is already "public rented tenure".' Market concerns. There was near unanimous opinion that a borough-only policy would 'sterilise the development market', act as 'a significant disincentive for residential development', and result in 'less housing coming forward'. World city. A borough-only policy was considered to detract from the 'mix of people, nationalities and talents' that is 'one (of the borough's) pleasures'. It was generally felt that an openness and London-wide role should be maintained. There were 42 written responses addressed 'local needs housing'. The greatest proportion of these are from residents (26). y.

Two came from local councillors, two from companies, one from a Resident's Association, one from the NHS Trust, one from Notting Hill Police, three from planning consultants, and one each from the CPRE, the Home Builders Federation, a Tenant Management Organisation, the Kensington Society, the Chelsea Society and the Greater London Authority.

Issue 11 Housing Density

- Higher density housing should be located:
- In any location where the quality of design of the new development is high and the proposal reflects the character of the local area
- Nowhere in the borough
- Anywhere in the borough
- Nowhere in conservation areas
- Anywhere outside of conservation areas
- In principal shopping centres such as Knightsbridge and Kensington High Street
- In areas of existing high density housing
- In any locations which are well served by public transport

Issue 11 - Housing density. 27% think that housing density should be targeted outside of conservation areas. Higher density across the borough, subject to quality design and respect for local character, is favoured by 24%. 12% support shopping centres, and 9.5%, areas well served by public transport. 8.5% think that nowhere in the borough is appropriate, but 7% consider anywhere to be appropriate.

Overview of written responses on Issue 11:
 'Housing Density'
 Opposing views were expressed, but on balance, higher density development anywhere is supported, given sufficient infrastructure, service, open space and high quality, contextually sympathetic design. Three areas of concern emerged: High density development. Most believe the borough should 'seek to maximise higher densities' and resist 'unduly restrictive ceilings', though many consider the borough 'already saturated', and in 'need of more open space' as it is 'the highest density district in the UK'. One states that 'high density' does not directly equate to 'tall buildings', though 'identifying locations for tall buildings will assist (in defining) higher density areas'.

Location and transport. 'Public transport is (seen as) a key driver' with a bearing on the suitability of locations, though many support such development 'anywhere in the borough', given suitable infrastructure, amenity and sympathetic, high quality design. There are concerns that 'non conservation areas accommodate most of the borough's population growth' and that 'anywhere' is not an option. Quality and design. There is general agreement that design must be of 'high quality, fitting local character' and able to 'enhance the area' though there are questions as to 'who controls quality'.

Taken forward. Box 7.3 (moved to Renewing the Legacy chapter)

N/A

Issue 12 Estate Renewal

<p>If the Council determines that one of its estates needs to be renewed during the plan period, the LDF should:</p> <p>Encourage mixed and balanced communities by seeking a mix of tenures, Ensure that there is no net loss of affordable housing, allow increased densities on the site, if the quality of the design is high, to enable the provision of market housing to fund renewal.</p>	<p>Issue 12 - Estate renewal. 36% believe that there should be no net loss of affordable housing, 35% wish to encourage mixed and balanced communities by seeking a mix of tenures and just over a fifth (21%) think that increased densities should be allowed to enable market housing-funded stock renewal if the quality of design is high.</p> <p>Overview of written responses on Issue 12: 'Estate renewal' As 'the options are not exclusive' comments focus mostly on mix, sustainability and density: Mix, sustainability and density. There is agreement that 'estates should be mixed and balanced' in terms of 'tenures and uses' to 'achieve sustainable communities' linked to suggestions that ground floors should be made 'more active'. 'Mono-tenure should be broken up', reflecting the London Plan's 'strong support (for) a policy of a mix of tenures to achieve balanced communities'. It is agreed that cross subsidy from private development' is needed though one respondent asked if this would simply promote 'more luxury flats'.</p> <p>Affordable housing should be 'maintained' or increased in terms of 'access and spread'. There were calls not to 'allow increased densities' as the borough is 'already saturated' and its services stretched.</p>	<p>Take forward Box. 8.4</p>	<p>N/A</p>
---	---	------------------------------	------------

Issue 13 Housing Mix

<p>The UDP seeks a mix of both small and large sized dwellings. The LDF should:</p> <p>Continue to seek a range of house and flat types (one, two and three or more bedroom houses) in all housing proposals</p> <p>Try to increase the provision of family dwellings by placing an emphasis on two, three or more bedroom homes in new schemes</p> <p>Only apply any housing mix policy to large schemes (10 or more dwellings)</p> <p>Leave the choice of size of homes built for the market to decide</p> <p>Enable the local authority to determine the mix in new affordable housing, to best meet local needs</p>	<p>Issue 13 - Housing mix. 30.5% wish to continue seeking a range of house and flat types in all housing proposals. 24% think that the council should determine the mix to best meet local needs and 14% would leave it to market forces. 14% want to improve family dwelling provision and 13% consider that housing mix policy should only apply to larger schemes (10 dwellings plus). Overview of written responses on Issue 13: 'Housing mix' - A range of views were expressed on how to best determine mix. Section 11 of the Mayor's Housing SPG indicates that local policy should include guidance on housing mix in all sectors. Written responses address 'market', 'mix' and 'affordability', intertwined in a single area of interest: Market, mix and affordability. Many feel that 'a mix of residential types across the borough should be encouraged' and that the council should 'encourage larger properties not just from private developers but also Housing Associations'. Others suggest that 'mix should have due regard to the character of the site and market demand' and that 'planning authorities should not have a significant influence, as this erodes the ability of the private sector to appropriately assess market demand'. Most agree that 'flexibility is needed to address changing markets' and that mix should be determined by market demands and 'housing needs', the latter through providing 'affordable housing stock, particularly, family sized units', without ignoring other types, such as could be met by 'town centre properties over shops'.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 8.</p>	<p>The CS will take forward the option to 'Continue to seek a range of house and flat types (one, two and three or more bedroom houses) in all housing'. The options rejected are not felt to adequately satisfy demand for housing and provide a sufficient mix of housing. The options rejected are: to increase the provision of family dwellings by placing an emphasis on two, three or more bedroom homes in new schemes; Only apply any housing mix policy to large schemes (10 or more dwellings); Leave the choice of size of homes built for the market to decide.</p>
---	--	------------------------------	--

Issue 14 Affordable Housing - Various Issues

<p>Issue 14a) : Affordable Housing Proportions Under current policy, housing developments with a capacity for 15 units or more are required to provide affordable housing as part of the same development. The normal proportion of affordable housing sought is a third, with higher proportions sought on major development sites.</p> <p>In terms of the percentage of affordable housing to be provided as part of private development, the LDF should:</p> <p>Keep the proportion of affordable housing sought at about 33% (more on major development sites) as at present</p> <p>Adopt the London Plan target of 50% affordable housing to be sought across the borough</p> <p>Adopt a new target of 60%-65% affordable housing to be sought across the borough based on an assessment of local needs</p> <p>Adopt a higher proportion of affordable housing sought on each site</p>	<p>Issue 14 - Affordable housing proportions. 57% think that a target of 33% should be sought for affordable housing with a higher proportion for major development. Just over one fifth (22%) think the London Plan target of 50% should be applied and 11.5% wish to exceed that target. Overview of written responses on Issue 14: 'Affordable housing proportions'. The responses suggest different threshold levels and proportions. High proportions risk reducing the amount of housing brought forward and low proportions leave housing needs unmet. Two broad areas of concern emerged: Targets, assessments and viability. Views on targets range from 33% to 65%, with thresholds anywhere between 15 and 25 units, the latter based on 'DOE Circular 06/98', which also uses a site area of '1 hectare for residential development'. The GLA consider that given the 'extent of unmet need and the limited capacity figure ... potentially a higher figure such as that adopted in Hammersmith and Fulham (65%) should be set... in some cases dependent on the availability of significant public subsidy'. There are suggestions that 'major developments should provide 40%' and that targets should be 'reviewed as years progress'. The figure of 33% is argued on the basis that 'an increased requirement could reduce the amount of housing coming forward'. It is suggested that reference should be made to the 'formula adopted in Westminster' and the 'GLA toolkit'. There are recommendations that targets should be 'related to floor space rather than unit numbers', that they should be 'supported by specific guidance' and that in some cases they should be set with specific sites in mind. 'Viability and deliverability' are seen to be key, suggesting that targets are 'indicative' rather than set in stone, and made with 'reference to draft PPS3 guidance'. In the view of a large education provider it is not appropriate to subject 'student accommodation to 32% think it should remain as it is, 16% think it should be reduced to 10 units, 12% support five units, 11% support no threshold - each scheme judged on merits; 10% support a floorspace threshold rather than unit threshold, 18% have no views/ don't know.</p>	<p>Not taken forward,</p>	<p>But included in Towards Preferred Options: Box 9.5</p>
<p>14b) Affordable Housing Threshold</p> <p>In preparing the LDF, the UDP threshold should:</p> <p>Remain as it is</p> <p>Be reduced to developments with a capacity of 10 units or more, in order that affordable housing can be sought on an increased number of smaller development sites</p> <p>Be reduced to developments with a capacity of 5 units or more, in order that affordable housing can be sought on an increased number of smaller development sites</p> <p>Be removed all together, with each development being considered on its merits, subject to agreed criteria</p> <p>Remove the unit threshold.</p> <p>Instead introduce a requirement to provide affordable housing above a maximum residential floor space threshold for the development. The criteria for determining the maximum floor space level would reflect standards considered to represent reasonable living accommodation</p>		<p>Taken forward. Para 8.3.4</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<p>14c) Affordable Housing and Commercial Developments</p> <p>Affordable housing is currently sought from housing schemes. The LDF should:</p> <p>Continue to seek affordable housing only from residential Developments</p> <p>Should introduce a policy to seek affordable housing from appropriate commercial development as part of mixed use schemes</p> <p>Should require large commercial developments to contribute to key worker housing</p>	<p>continue to seek affordable housing only from residential developments (13%), seek affordable housing from mixed use schemes (42%), require large commercial developments to contribute to key worker housing (33%), no views/don't know (12%)</p>	<p>Not taken forward.</p>	<p>Not taken forward. Not regarded as a political priority, and other planning obligations could be sought from commercial developments rather than affordable housing.</p>
<p>14 d) Affordable Housing: Intermediate and Social Housing Proportions</p> <p>The UDP does not specifically seek intermediate housing as the most acute need is for social rented provision. The LDF should:</p> <p>Adopt the London Plan proportions that of the affordable housing achieved, 70% should be social rented and 30% intermediate</p> <p>Determine the proportion of social rented and intermediate housing according to local needs in the borough</p>	<p>adopt the London Plan proportions (70% social rented and 30% intermediate housing) (14%), relate to local needs (54%), no views/don't know (31%)</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 8.3</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>14 e) Affordable Housing Location</p> <p>In order to create mixed and balanced communities (and because of high land values and the difficulties in identifying sites) the UDP seeks to have the affordable housing element of schemes provided on the development site. The LDF should:</p> <p>Continue to seek the affordable housing element of a scheme on the development site</p> <p>Seek to focus more affordable housing provision in the central and southern parts of the borough</p>	<p>seek affordable housing on development site (63%), focus more affordable housing provision in the central and southern parts of the borough (23%), no views/don't know (14%).</p>	<p>Taken forward. Para. 8.3.2</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<p>Issue 15: Houses in Multiple Occupation</p> <p>In an ideal world, everyone would have access to their own kitchen or bathroom. However, properties offering bedsit accommodation with shared facilities offer an affordable form of housing for some households. The LDF should:</p> <p>Continue to protect non self-contained bedsits as a form of low-cost housing throughout the borough</p> <p>Continue to protect non self-contained bedsits as a form of valuable low-cost housing but allow their loss where there is a concentration of other HMOs within the area</p> <p>Only allow the loss of non self-contained bedsits in specific circumstances, such as them failing to meet the Council's space standards or to secure the essential restoration of a listed building</p> <p>Allow the loss of bedsits to self-contained homes</p>	<p>Issue 15 - Housing in multiple occupation. Just over a quarter (26%) wish to continue policy that protects HMOs across the borough as a valuable form of low-cost housing. 21.5% would allow the loss of HMOs in specific circumstances related to space standards or the restoration of listed buildings. 20% would allow the loss to self-contained homes though 16% would protect HMOs except where there is a concentration in the area. Overview of written responses on Issue 15: 'Housing in multiple occupation'</p> <p>Many suggested that HMOs should be converted to self contained flats to meet reasonable standards of living. An equal number felt they should be retained, as they may provide an effective means of housing for those on moderate or low incomes. Two issues prevailed: Self contained or HMO. Many felt HMOs should be 'converted to self contained flats' or have direct 'access to their own bathrooms and kitchens'. Some felt that otherwise there could be safety issues and a lack of required privacy.</p> <p>The London Plan seeks to 'protect non self contained accommodation where it is of an acceptable standard and meets a housing need'. Affordable accommodation. HMOs provide 'appropriate accommodation for students', 'local workers', and 'single parents' if 'wardened'. They 'should be protected' as a 'form of low cost housing' that if of good quality provides 'reasonable accommodation for many people on moderate or low incomes who may otherwise not be able to afford to live in the borough'.</p>	<p>Not taken forward.</p>	<p>This issue will be addressed in the forthcoming development management policies DPD.</p>
<p>Issue 16 Housing for Special Needs</p>			
<p>A number of the borough's residential and nursing homes for the elderly have closed over recent years. The LDF should:</p> <p>Continue to resist the further loss of residential and nursing homes for the elderly in the borough</p> <p>Allow the loss of residential and nursing homes so long as they are replaced within the borough by special needs housing to meet appropriate needs</p> <p>Allow the loss of residential and nursing homes if they are replaced, even if this is outside the borough</p> <p>Not resist the loss of such homes</p>	<p>Issue 16 - Housing for special needs. The vast majority (68%) would continue to resist the further loss of residential and nursing homes in the borough. 17% would allow the loss if compensated by special needs housing elsewhere in the borough. Less than 5% would permit the loss if replaced elsewhere, including outside the borough. Overview of written responses on Issue 16: 'Housing for special needs'. Overview of written responses on Issue 16: 'Housing for special needs'</p> <p>There is a high level of support for the retention of the elderly in the borough through special needs housing though other special needs groups (students, disabled people) and new models of provision need consideration. Two issues prevailed: Many encouraged 'the provision of facilities for the elderly', but expert groups (PCT and TMO) suggested that, given new approaches 'such as "assisted living" and "supported housing"', that a 'more thorough consideration was needed.' Some suggested that special needs groups should be better defined, encompassing 'students', 'disabled people', and others, in order to 'clarify policy'. Integrated and active. It is widely felt that 'a balanced community includes special needs provision'</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 8 and box 8.5</p>	<p>The Draft CS encourages new provision and also protects existing facilities if viable The other options have been rejected because they don't provide any protection to current facilities or result in provision outside of the borough.</p>
<p>Issue 17 Lifetime Homes</p>			

<p>The London Plan expects all new housing to be built to 'lifetime homes' standards. Should the LDF introduce a policy which:</p> <p>Requires all new housing to be built to lifetime homes Standards</p> <p>Encourages all new housing to be built to lifetime homes standard</p> <p>Leaves it up the individual developer's choice</p>	<p>Issue 17 - Lifetime homes. 47% of responses - the clear majority - support the requirement that all new housing should be built to life-time standards with a further 20% saying they would wish to encourage such designs. 22.5% would leave this up to the developer. Quite a high proportion of respondents (10.5%) had no particular views or were 'don't know's'. Housing - Overview of written responses on Issue 17: 'Lifetime homes'.</p> <p>There is a high level of support for the retention of the elderly in the borough through special needs housing though other special needs groups (students, disabled people) and new models of provision need consideration. Two issues prevailed: The elderly? Many encouraged 'the provision of facilities for the elderly', but expert groups (PCT and TMO) suggested that, given new approaches 'such as "assisted living" and "supported housing"', that a 'more thorough consideration was needed.' Some suggested that special needs groups should be better defined, encompassing 'students', 'disabled people', and others, in order to 'clarify policy'. Integrated and active.</p> <p>It is widely felt that 'a balanced community includes special needs provision' and that these facilities should allow special needs groups to 'remain in the borough, near friends and family'. Where possible, 'support should be given to people in their own homes'. Where this is not possible, the elderly should, for instance 'contribute to the needs of the house' to keep them active and involved.</p>	<p>Not taken forward, but included in Towards Preferred Options: Box 9.10</p>	<p>The options rejected include leaving it up to the developers choice, because this may not result in any lifetime homes (LTH) being built. The final wording in the CS is that homes 'should be built to LTH standards'. Therefore the options to 'require' and 'encourage' all new homes to be built to lifetime homes standards have been rejected.</p>
---	---	---	---

Issue 18 Encourage large scale offices

<p>Should the Council be encouraging new large scale office development in town centre, in areas wells served by public transport, or should it be resisted across the borough?</p>	<p>Respondents suggest little prospect of demand for large scale office developments and that other areas should be prioritised. Two topics emerged: Scale. Many feel that the 'evolution of office space', especially for the Borough, is not to do with 'large scale requirements'. Smaller offices 'should be encouraged (as) not environmentally harmful'. 'Mixed use should be pursued' and 'scale' should be considered contextually. Some suggest 'affordable housing' for underused office space. Demand and transport. Large scale developments 'should be in highly accessible areas', though demand is 'unlikely (to see) an upturn', is 'declining (or) 'low'. 'Mixed use residential/commercial development should be pursued in connection with large scale development'. Employment Zones (EZs) do not present good opportunities due to 'poor public transport and road networks'. The borough is "low demand low supply" as regards offices according to the London Plan. There is 'no necessity to promote offices. Static/declining demand needs management in employment (and) land use change'</p>	<p>Encouraging large scale offices in town centres and other areas well served by public transport has been taken forward to 5.7a and 5.7c of Interim Issues and Options.</p>	<p>The rejection of new large scale business uses across the borough has not been taken forward as the Council recognises the contribution that large scale offices have to play in supporting the borough (and London) economy.</p>
---	---	---	--

Issue 19 Maintaining employment choice

<p>Employment land which is "needed" within the Employment Zones will be protected - but if it is genuinely surplus to requirements should the Council require mixed use development which may include residential and employment use, allow housing developments (either affordable or market) , or should all redevelopment be for employment uses? Should a similar approach taken outside the Employment Zones?</p>	<p>The responses suggest the need for an open evaluation of employment zones, use classes and land uses. Two areas of concern come to the fore: Employment and land use. Some wish to ensure that 'employment zone policy' does not provide 'blanket protection'. A re-evaluation of use classes is proposed recognising the 'blurring between light industrial, business and research' to ensure 'protection of light industrial use is not overly restrictive' and to attract 'modern service sector firms'.</p> <p>Housing. R.B.K.C is 'the richest borough in England with two of the poorest wards' suggesting a need to bridge the gap 'through affordable housing provision', 'living/workshop housing' and 'mixed use' generally. The London Plan supports 'skills development' and 'transport links' to build equal opportunities and assist the mobility-impaired.</p>	<p>Support for non business uses within the borough's employment zones has not been taken forward.</p>	<p>The core strategy does not support the provision of any uses within the Employment Zones which are not business uses, or uses which support of the function of the zone. There is concern that the introduction of non business uses into the Employment Zones will change the character of these zones - harming their employment function. This approach is supported by the representations received from the GLA. Furthermore given the large differential in land value, the introduction of any residential uses within the Employment Zones can increase "hope values" and further jeopardise existing lower value employment uses. More flexibility is appropriate outside the Employment Zones, where mixed use development is encouraged - although this should not be at the expense of existing business uses. The protection of business uses is supported by the SA, as a set out elsewhere in this section.</p>
---	--	--	---

Issue 20 Protect small scale business development

	<p>Issue 20: Protecting Small Scale Business Development. Should the Council encourage small business uses, encourage micro units, and/or protect small scale businesses. If small business units should be protected should this include: all small businesses, those that lie within higher order centres, those within in commercial mews, those in any mews and/or those that lie within larger buildings.</p>	<p>Responses suggest protection, but not at the expense of other viable uses or centres. Three inter-related issues emerged: Protection, uses and location. Most consider that protection should 'not be at the expense of the vitality of a particular centre or location' and that 'retention and relocation' should be considered rather than 'resisting loss at any cost'. The GLA 'support protecting small-scale business developments'. In terms of uses, a respondent wished to flag up differences between 'small scale industrial and office use', suggesting protection for the former. Another supported 'office use throughout the borough' given suitable infrastructure.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Boxes 5.7 a and 5.7.c of Interim Issues and Options</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Issue 21 Encourage small scale business devt</p>				
	<p>Should the Council support the provision of more small businesses, even if this it at the expends of residential units, or retail floorspace on upper floors of town centres. Should we be encouraging the provision of small serviced premises, and or preventing the amalgamation of small business units into larger ones?</p>	<p>The general view is that small business should be encouraged and supported but not at the expense of residential development: Business use and residential demand. Most believe the Council 'should encourage' or 'resist the loss of small scale business development' but 'not at the expense of residential units'. Small scale business needs 'protecting from unlimited residential demand'. It should be located 'anywhere in the borough' given appropriate infrastructure and design, and could be 'located below' associated 'residential units' or 'above shops'. Surplus office space should be 'utilised for housing need'.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Boxes 5.7a and 5.7c of the Interim Issues and Options.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Issue 22 Parking</p>				
	<p>To seek new housing with neither parking attached nor a right to a resident's parking permit.</p>	<p>64% of respondents were in favour of seeking new housing with neither parking attached nor a right to a resident's parking permit.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 8.9.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Issue 23 Streetscape</p>				
	<p>Continue to place emphasis on streetscape issues as the Council has been doing, for example in Kensington High Street</p> <p>Require appropriate new developments to contribute to local streetscape improvements</p> <p>Place emphasis on other areas/measures or other aspects of streetscape improvements</p> <p>Not place such emphasis on streetscape issues</p>	<p>Most feel the aim should be to enhance, extend and improve pedestrian environments including signage, street furniture and trees, all in a safe and secure environment.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 6a: Streets & Box 6.4a: Who should have priority in the public realm? & Box 6.4c: Managing the public realm</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Issue 24 Public transport and new development</p>				
	<p>Public transport and new development. When considering large scale development, the LDF should: a) Only allow development where access to public transport is good and there is sufficient capacity on public transport services; b) Allow development no matter what the level of public transport accessibility, even if this encourages trips by car; c) Allow development in areas where access to public transport is poor but where improvements are offered by the developer that would increase service provision in the area.</p>	<p>The majority (53%) favour permitting development only in areas well served by public transport. 39% would permit development in poorly served areas if improvements were offered by the developer. Only 2.5% would allow development regardless of public transport accessibility.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 5.3a-c</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Issue 25 Bicycling</p>				
	<p>In approaching bicycling the Council should: a) Seek to provide bicycle lanes wherever appropriate, often specifically allocating road space; b) Encourage bicycling by a wide range of measures other than bicycle lanes; c) Provide no specific measures for bicyclists.</p>	<p>43% would seek to provide bicycle lanes where appropriate. 36% wished to encourage bicycling by a range of measures other than bicycle lanes though 11% felt that no specific measures should be made for bicyclists.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 9.5 options b reflected in proposed policy</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Issue 26 Gated communities</p>				

	Resist proposals to gate new developments or existing communities by insisting on public rights of way over road Not resist proposals to gate new developments or existing communities.	60.5% wished to resist proposals to gate new developments and would insist on public rights of way over roads. 26.5% would not resist gating proposals for either new or existing communities. 13% had no views or were 'don't knows'.	Although the issue of 'Gated Communities' was not explicitly mentioned in the Interim Issues and Options Core Strategy, the document did state that the Council "wishes to encourage inclusive communities" under "6.4 Use of the public realm".	N/A
Issue 27 The Hierarchy of Town Centres				
	Recognise the framework of International, Major and District Centres set out within the London Plan Recognise the wider role of the borough's shopping centres and designate them as town centres, yet maintaining a simpler two tier, Principal/Local Shopping Centre hierarchy favoured by the existing UDP. Maintain the existing designation of the borough's shopping areas as 'shopping areas'	Two broad areas of concern emerged: New designations. Some feel that the 'London Plan (leads to) homogenisation', others that 'the categories don't really matter', what does is 'a vision and a strategy for each level of centre', 'appropriate designation' and the indications in a DPD of 'town centre boundaries, principal and secondary frontages as required by PPS6'. The designations 'should prevent making R.B.K.C a clone', should recognise the impact of 'supermarkets and DIY centres in their own right' and 'must allow for local/corner shops that meet everyday needs'. The GLA 'support adopting the London Plan hierarchy for the borough's shopping centres as a framework to coordinate appropriate types and levels of development and maximise choice'	Taken forward. Para 5.4.3 of Interim Issues and Options. This para includes a statement that the Council intends to adopt the mayor's hierarchy. It does not suggest options. Not taken forward Not taken forward	N/A The Council is generally supportive of both the principle of the London Plan's hierarchy and the position of the Borough's centres within it. (albeit with minor alterations) The use of a four rather than the existing two tier hierarchy allows a more 'tailored' approach to our town centre policies – an approach which can recognise the differing character and function of an International Centre (Knightsbridge) from a Major (for example Kensington High Street) or a District Centre (for example South Kensington). The maintenance of a simple two tier hierarchy has not therefore been taken forward. The Council supports the town centres as centres which contain a range of "town centre uses" which support the borough's residents and visitors to the centres. The core strategy supports this wider function of the town centres whilst recognising that their principal function will remain as centres for retailing. This wider role of centres is central to the approach set out within PPS6 and within the London Plan. The maintenance of our higher order centres as wholly "shopping" centres would not be tenable. This wider function is also supported by the SA. Whilst the results of the consultations do not offer an overwhelming direction there is not overwhelming support for town centres as being shopping centres and nothing else.
Issue 28 Function of local centres				
	Continue to recognise the primary retail role of local centres and allowing social and community uses (such as doctors' surgeries) where there is a local need, subject to the impact on residential amenity. Continue to recognise their primary retail role yet should allow non retail town centre uses (such as small offices, estate agents or restaurants) where there have been long term vacancies, subject to the impact on residential amenity Resist the addition of any further non-retail uses in local centres	Views support 'retail use on ground level' and 'office', 'new leisure and entertainment uses' above. 'Non-retail loss (e.g. libraries) should be restricted'. A 'lack of swimming pools' was also noted. Businesses 'should be retained' and BIDS set up to promote centres. 'Edge of centre development' was also mentioned. Many believe that the council 'should plan for growth', 'promote and enhance services' and 'enhance consumer choice' to 'meet the needs of the whole community' while taking heed of 'the market'. Each area 'should find its own formula' and 'avoid concentrations of particular types to seek diversity'. Success will 'depend on walking distances' and overcoming 'high rents'.	Taken forward. Box 4 Interim Issues and Options Taken forward. Box 4 Interim Issues and Options Taken forward. Box 4 Interim Issues and Options	N/A Primary retail role of local centres taken forward. Flexibility built into plan, so no need to list those exceptions when other town centre uses may be acceptable. N/A
Issue 29 Function of other centres				
	If you support other centres playing a wider more diverse role the LDF should:	27% wish to encourage new social and community uses throughout centres even at the expense of existing shops. 21% would allow non retail town centre uses within both the core and non core parts of the centres, whilst recognising that the centres should retain a primarily retail function. 19% would encourage new leisure, sport, entertainment uses or hotels within centres, either as uses in their own right or as part of mixed use retail proposals. 12.5% would ensure that the core areas remain focussed upon retail uses, normally only allowing non retail town centre uses within the non core areas of the centres. 5.5% would encourage large scale mixed use office development within centres. 15% - a high proportion, had no views or were 'don't knows'		

	<p>Ensure that the core areas remain focused almost entirely upon retail uses, normally only allowing non retail town centre uses within the non core areas of the centres</p> <p>Allow non retail town centre uses within both the core and non-core parts of the centres, whilst recognising that the centres should retail a primary retail function.</p> <p>Encourage new social and community uses throughout centres even if this is at the expense of existing shops</p> <p>Encourage large scale office development within centres as part of new mixed use proposals</p> <p>Encourage new leisure, sports, entertainment or hotels within centres, either as uses in their own right or as part of mixed use retail proposals.</p>	<p>Vitality and choice. Many believe that the council 'should plan for growth', 'promote and enhance services' and 'enhance consumer choice' to 'meet the needs of the whole community' while taking heed of 'the market'. Each area 'should find its own formula' and 'avoid concentrations of particular types to seek diversity'. Success will 'depend on walking distances' and overcoming 'high rents'.</p> <p>Retail and non-retail. Views support 'retail use on ground level' and 'office', 'new leisure and entertainment uses' above. 'Non-retail loss (e.g. libraries) should be restricted'. A 'lack of swimming pools' was also noted. Businesses 'should be retained' and BIDS set up to promote centres. 'Edge of centre development' was also mentioned.</p> <p>Policy. Government's PPS6 was mentioned. The London Plan 'requires boroughs to provide a policy framework for maintaining, managing and enhancing local and neighbourhood shopping' ... 'and other facilities in accessible locations'</p>	<p>Taken forward. Para 5.4.3 and 5.4.5 of Interim Issues and Options</p> <p>Not taken forward to Interim Issues and Options. The Interim Issues and options does not consider the types of uses that should be permitted within differing parts of the borough's higher order centres other than to note that the centres should maintain a varied mix of town centre uses.</p> <p>Taken forward. Box 4, 4,3 and 5 and para 5.4.3 of Interim Issues and Options,</p> <p>Taken forward. Encouraging large scale offices in town centres and other areas well served by public transport has been taken forward to 5.7a and 5.7c of Interim Issues and Options.</p> <p>Taken forward. Box 5.4a considers a mix of retail, restaurant and cultural uses within town centres. Box 5.5.b considers new hotels.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>The diversity of town centre uses required by PPS6 is provided by allowing a greater diversity of uses in the secondary areas of our HO town centres and by allowing non A1 uses within primary areas change to other non A1 uses. The need to protect existing A1 uses in primary areas is supported by the Council's Retail Needs Assessment which concludes that the health of some of our centres are likely to be under considerable pressure from the opening of Westfield London in Hammersmith and Fulham, and therefore that we need robust policies in place that resist the loss of existing A1 uses. The need for this robust approach is further compounded by the current recession- put even greater pressure upon the borough's centres.</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
Issue 30	Maintaining identity of centres			
	<p>Maintaining the identity of the borough's centres and protecting valued uses. In recognising the value of the individual character of the borough's centres and of certain "retail" uses, such as post offices, pubs, chemists and street markets, the LDF should:</p> <p>include policies which help express the individual character of particular centres, where this can be identified; seek to encourage the retention of post offices and other valued uses; Not raise the retention of post offices, pubs and other valued uses as little can be done using planning power, seek to encourage the retention of street markets.</p>	<p>There was overwhelming support for policies which protect the special character of the borough's town centres. Most responses referred to the particular need to protect the Portobello Road and to maintain its "uniqueness" The initial Issues Options consultation has illustrated an overwhelming level of public support for policies which seek to maintain the identity of the Borough's centres and to protect valued uses – support shown by over 99 percent of interested respondees to Issue 30. The initial consultation did not consider the expansion of the centres as a possible tool to help achieve this aim.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 5.4a of Interim Issues and Options</p>	<p>Maintaining the identity of the borough's centres has been taken forward. The core strategy does not include policies to protect post offices, as such policies could not be effectively uses as planning permission is not required for "changes of use" within Class A of the UCO.</p>
Issue 31	New social and community uses			
	<p>Continue to support proposals where a local need has been identified</p> <p>Support proposals to meet the needs of users from a wider geographical area where local need has not been established</p> <p>Continue to plan for and protect existing 'community' uses (such as education, health, social, libraries and religious buildings etc) within the borough</p>	<p>50% would continue to plan for and protect existing community uses (such as education, health, social, libraries and religious buildings etc.) within the borough. 37% would continue to support proposals where a local need has been identified. 8% would support proposals to meet the needs of users from a wider geographical area where local need has not been established.</p>	<p>Taken forward. 4.2 of Interim Issues and Options</p> <p>Taken forward. 4.2 of Interim Issues and Options</p> <p>Taken forward. 4.2 and 5.4b of Interim Issues and Options</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
Issue 32	Private schools and health facilities			
	<p>View private sector facilities as being as welcome as those provided by the public sector</p> <p>Only support private facilities where a well established local need has been established</p> <p>Support private facilities where no local need has been established</p>	<p>Many approve the idea of introducing private facilities given an established need and demand, though respondents require continuing support for public facilities. There is a responsibility to provide access to primary care facilities</p> <p>37% would continue to support proposals where a local need has been identified. It was pointed out that 'the market should decide'. The GLA state that 'the borough has a responsibility to ensure all residents have access to primary care facilities'.</p> <p>8% would support proposals to meet the needs of users from a wider geographical area where local need has not been established.</p>	<p>Taken forward. 4.4 and 4.5 of Interim Issues and Options</p> <p>Taken forward. 4.4 and 4.5 of Interim Issues and Options</p> <p>Not taken forward</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>The provision of a mix of private and public facilities is part of the borough's character but following advice from the GLA, it was determined that welcoming facilities where no need exists is unwise as it has little benefit to residents.</p>

Issue 33 New fee-paying schools				
Promote the availability of facilities in areas that are not largely residential, which are served by highly accessible public transport	43% would promote the availability in all locations throughout the borough, provided the site is served by highly accessible public transport. A third (33%) would promote the availability of facilities in areas that are not largely residential, which are served by highly accessible public transport. 11% would discourage the provision of further fee-paying schools anywhere in the borough.	Taken forward. 4.4 of Interim Issues and Options	N/A	
Promote the availability in all locations throughout the borough, provided the site is served by highly accessible public transport		Taken forward. 4.4 of Interim Issues and Options	N/A	
Discourage the provision of further fee-paying schools anywhere in the borough		Not taken forward	Whilst the borough's priority was to deliver a community school., the provision of private is part of the borough's character. In the case of primary schools and day-nurseries, private facilities ensure that no burden is placed on community schooling.	
Issue 34 Doctor's surgeries				
Allow the provision of a new surgery to take precedent over retaining the residential use	72% - the vast majority - would allow the provision of a new surgery to be assessed on a case by case basis, to allow for a balance between local need and the protection of residential accommodation. 20% would allow the provision of a new surgery to take precedence over retaining the residential use. Under 2% would allow retaining residential use to take precedence over the provision of a new surgery.	Taken forward.4.5 of Interim Issues and Options	N/A	
Allow retaining the residential use to take precedence over the provision of a new surgery		Not taken forward	All residents in the borough should be within 10 minutes of a health facility (including a GP). The best means of achieving this is to ensure that they are given priority over other uses including residential. This is supported by the Mayor, Government Office for London and NHS K&C. As such it is included in the final iteration of the Core Strategy	
Allow the provision of a new surgery to be assessed on a case-by-case basis, to allow for a balance between local need and the protection of residential accommodation		Taken forward. 4.5 of Interim Issues and Options	N/A	
Issue 35 Control Visitor accommodation				
Issue 35 Should the Council continue to permit the loss of hotels to other uses including other forms of temporary sleeping accommodation, or take a more restrictive approach.	The general view is that a high proportion of visitor accommodation is of poor quality, and this should be controlled. A concentration of hotels in the borough was noted. There are mixed views as to the need for and provision of quality accommodation. Most believed that balanced development should be encouraged, but that is a market issue. Poor quality visitor accommodation should either be upgraded or converted into office/residential use.	Both options taken forward. Box 5.5b of Interim Issues and Options asks the question again.	N/A	
Issue 36 Location of Visitor accommodation				
Issue 36: Should the Council permit new hotels in town centres, everywhere, or everywhere save where there is an over concentration.	Most feel visitor accommodation should be located in town or shopping centres, Many also feel that that there is no need for more hotels in especially in the Earl's Court and Courtfield wards.	Taken forward. Box 5.5b of Interim Issues and Options	N/A	
Issue 37 Quality of visitor accommodation				
Issue 37: Should the Council try to attract hotels of a certain standard to the borough?	Most responses seek action to improve low quality accommodation.	Not taken forward	The question of the whether the Council should protect hotels of a certain standard was not considered at the Interim Issues and Options stage as was not considered to be an appropriate policy given that the control of certain types of hotel is beyond the remit of planning.	
Issue 38 Protect hotel stock				
Should the Council continue to permit the loss of hotels to other uses including other forms of temporary sleeping accommodation, or take a more restrictive approach.	The general view is that a high proportion of visitor accommodation is of poor quality, and this should be controlled. A concentration of hotels in the borough was noted. There are mixed views as to the need for and provision of quality accommodation. Most believed that balanced development should be encouraged, but that is a market issue. Poor quality visitor accommodation should either be upgraded or converted into office/residential use.	Taken forward. Box 5.5b of Interim Issues and Options asks the question again.	N/A	
Issue 39 Encourage tourism				
Should the Council give more emphasis to encourage tourism, because of the financial and employment benefits its brings or continue to place emphasis on the character and function of the borough as a residential area.	The majority of consultees wanted the Council to continue to place emphasis on the character and function of the borough. The general view was that tourism should be encouraged and managed to benefit both residents and tourists.	Taken forward. Box 5.5a of the Interim Issues and Options asks the question again.	N/A	
Issue 40 Public open space provision				

	<p>Continue to seek new public open space in association with appropriate development throughout the borough, with appropriate safeguards to ensure that public access is retained</p> <p>Place emphasis on seeking new public open space in association with appropriate development in areas of public open space deficiency</p> <p>Seek financial contributions from appropriate development to improve the quality and attractiveness of local parks and other public open space</p> <p>Ensure that sufficient private amenity space is provided on site and that contributions to create or improve public open space are only considered where this is not possible</p>	<p>The majority of written responses felt that all new development should have adequate, accessible, open space, or contributions to its creation. The role of the river, waterways, parks and the Royal Hospital gardens is emphasised. Attendee of the workshop demanded more and improved public open space. There were also requests to ensure that open space and streets in general are disabled friendly. There were requests to make Brompton Cemetery more accessible. Portobello Green and Colville Nursery and Primary Schools were mentioned with regard to potential improvements. There were varied demands and many comments that prioritisation of the options would depend on circumstances and location. Even so, children's needs and biodiversity were the most popular. The youth outreach workshop identified demands for outdoor recreational facilities and better provision of sports</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 6.2 Quality of the public realm & Box 6b: Caring for our Public Realm: green spaces</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Issue 41 Financial contributions towards public open space				
	<p>Seek to improve parks and public open spaces across the whole of the borough</p> <p>Seek to improve parks and public open spaces only in the vicinity of the development</p> <p>Give priority to those areas of public open space which are most frequently used</p> <p>Seek contributions from developments within areas of public open space deficiency to improve the nearest available public open space</p>	<p>The majority of written responses felt that all new development should have adequate, accessible, open space, or contributions to its creation. The role of the river, waterways, parks and the Royal Hospital gardens is emphasised. Attendee of the workshop demanded more and improved public open space. There were also requests to ensure that open space and streets in general are disabled friendly. There were requests to make Brompton Cemetery more accessible. Portobello Green and Colville Nursery and Primary Schools were mentioned with regard to potential improvements. There were varied demands and many comments that prioritisation of the options would depend on circumstances and location. Even so, children's needs and biodiversity were the most popular. The youth outreach workshop identified demands for outdoor recreational facilities and better provision of sports</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 6b: Caring for our Public Realm: green spaces</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Issue 42 Priority for open space				
	<p>Visual amenity</p> <p>Children's playspace</p> <p>Outdoor leisure</p> <p>Biodiversity</p>	<p>The majority of written responses felt that all new development should have adequate, accessible, open space, or contributions to its creation. The role of the river, waterways, parks and the Royal Hospital gardens is emphasised. Attendee of the workshop demanded more and improved public open space. There were also requests to ensure that open space and streets in general are disabled friendly. There were requests to make Brompton Cemetery more accessible. Portobello Green and Colville Nursery and Primary Schools were mentioned with regard to potential improvements. There were varied demands and many comments that prioritisation of the options would depend on circumstances and location. Even so, children's needs and biodiversity were the most popular. The youth outreach workshop identified demands for outdoor recreational facilities and better provision of sports</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 6.2 Quality of the public realm & Box 6b: Caring for our Public Realm: green spaces & Box 6.4a Who should have priority in the public realm</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Issue 43 Wider use of garden squares				
	<p>Encourage wider general access to garden squares and private communal gardens</p> <p>Encourage further limited access to garden squares and private communal gardens by an increase in the number of open days every year</p> <p>Encourage further limited access to garden squares and private communal gardens for groups such as local schools</p> <p>Encourage further access to garden squares and private communal gardens for residents who live in their vicinity but do not currently qualify for access (subject to payment of the appropriate fee)</p>	<p>There were 29.5% of respondents which would encourage further access to garden squares and private communal gardens for residents who live in the vicinity but do not currently qualify for access (subject to payment of the appropriate fee). 26% would leave things as they are. 14.5% would encourage unconstrained access to garden squares and private communal gardens and an identical number would encourage further limited access to garden squares and private communal gardens by an increase in the number of open days every year. 12% would encourage further limited access to garden squares and private communal gardens for groups such as local schools.</p>	<p>Box 6.5 The provision of public or private open space</p>	<p>Taken forward but in a different manner - the focus is on public or private provision.</p>
Issue 44 Temporary use of open space				

	<p>Allow temporary uses on open spaces if these could realise additional benefits (such as for cultural, economic or regeneration purposes)</p> <p>Generally resist temporary uses on public open space</p> <p>Allow temporary uses on open space, but only for a short cumulative time period, for example a maximum of 4 weeks in any year when the use is open to the public</p>	<p>Though there is some dissent, most agree temporary uses of public open space can be culturally, economically and socially beneficial given clear guidelines.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 6.2 Quality of the public realm & Box 6b: Caring for our Public Realm: green spaces & Box 6.4b: Uses of the public realm</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Issue 45	Arts Cultural and Entertainment facilities			
	<p>Should the LDF give more active encouragement to such facilities provided they are in shopping centre locations? resist the loss of existing facilities give more active encouragement to facilities across the borough resist new facilities and allow the loss of existing.</p>	<p>There is a balanced demand to retain existing facilities and attract cultural enterprise.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 5, 5.5c and 5.5d</p> <p>Taken forward. Box 5. Taken forward. Box 5.</p> <p>Not taken forward</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A N/A</p> <p>There was overwhelming support for the creation of a borough that contains a rich mix of use. CE facilities, enjoyed by local people and by visitors in an integral part of this and integral to the creation of a "vital" and successful borough. This approach is also endorsed by government guidance, by the London Plan and by our own sustainability appraisal.</p>
Issue 46	Encouragement of Arts, Cultural or Entertainment facilities			
	<p>If further ACE facilities are to be encouraged should the LDF ensure that:</p> <p>priority be given to local aspirations priority is given to facilities of wider significance, of national or international importance.</p>	<p>Though one of London's strategic cultural areas is located within the borough, there are strong aspirations for further and wider cultural development. Whilst local needs are important we should also be encouraging national and international facilities.</p>	<p>Not considered at TPO</p> <p>Not considered at TPO Not considered at TPO</p>	<p>The function of the ACE facilities provided in the borough are not considered within the towards preferred options document. This issues are not however rejected at this stage as are picked up again at the June 09 draft.</p>
Issue 47	Broadening the definition of community uses			
	<p>Are there any particular arts, cultural or entertainment facilities that you feel are lacking in the borough?</p>	<p>Those that responded included Petrol filling stations and post offices as community uses, and small scale flexible performing arts centres for arts uses.</p>	<p>Petrol filling station were added as a social and community use within the draft plan (June 09). All performing spaces are considered to be an arts and cultural use and therefore are protected within the draft plan.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Issue 48	Role of Public Art			
	<p>Should the LDF continue to encourage the provision of public art?</p>	<p>The responses flag up issues around procedure, selection, taste and integral demand.</p>	<p>Not taken forward</p>	<p>This is not a strategic issue which the council considers should form part of the core strategy.</p>
Issue 49	Renewable energy			
	<p>The UDP acknowledges that energy efficient buildings are more difficult to design in densely built up areas like the borough because there is more overshadowing and building orientation is largely fixed. Conservation area and listed building policies may also restrict the use of some energy saving proposals. The re-use and/or the upgrading of existing buildings rather than their redevelopment is promoted. Does the UDP go far enough...</p> <p>The UDP recognises that energy efficiency forms an integral part of good design. Whilst the LDF</p> <p>- Continue to encourage energy efficiency through the siting, landscaping, design, use and re-use of materials, orientation and lighting of buildings;</p> <p>- Require developments over a certain size to incorporate on-site renewable energy equipment, such as solar panels or condensing combi-boilers;</p>	<p>Many suggest that 'energy efficiency' is as important as renewable contributions. There are concerns over development costs and potential impacts in conservation areas. There were also concerns over conflicts in policy between conservation and renewable energy, for instance photovoltaic cells or solar panels in conservation areas. It was felt important that clear guidance should be given on the issue. A balance or dialogue has to be sought between sustainability and conservation. Costs and development viability issues are raised.</p> <p>45% would encourage energy efficiency.</p> <p>30% would require developments over a certain size to incorporate on-site renewable energy equipment.</p>	<p>Taken forward. See Box 9.2 of the Interim Issues and Options, February 2008.</p> <p>Taken forward. See Chapter 9.2 of the Interim Issues and Options, February 2008.</p> <p>Taken forward. See Chapter 9.2 of the Interim Issues and Options, February 2008.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>

	- Require 10% of the energy needed in developments over a certain size to come from on-site renewable energy developments.	20.5% would require developments over a certain size to provide 10% of its energy requirements from on-site renewable energy sources.	Not taken forward.	The requirement for 10% of the energy needed in developments over a certain size to come from on-site renewable energy developments has not been taken forward, as it was the least favoured option during consultation. This will be replaced with requirements to meet Code for Sustainable Homes standards in the Interim Issues and Options.
Issue 50	Sustainable design			
	To what extent should the Council encourage sustainable design and construction in new and refurbished buildings: - Should energy efficiency and other aspects of sustainable design normally be given priority over the Council's other conservation and design policies; - Should leading edge contemporary design, regardless of its sustainable qualities, in new development and the use of traditional materials and construction in historic buildings be given priority - Should sustainable construction be given priority in new buildings, but be less rigorously applied in alterations to listed buildings and buildings in conservation areas.	17% suggest energy efficiency and sustainable design should have priority over conservation. 17% consider leading edge contemporary design, regardless of sustainability, and use of traditional materials and construction in historic buildings should be given priority. 55% think sustainable construction should be prioritised in new buildings.	Taken forward. See Chapter 9.2 of the Interim Issues and Options, February 2008. Taken forward. See Chapter 9.2 of the Interim Issues and Options, February 2008. Taken forward. See Chapter 9.2 of the Interim Issues and Options, February 2008.	N/A N/A N/A
Issue 51	Waste			
	Waste: To minimise the impact that our community has on the environment through the facilitation and encouragement of recycling, waste minimisation and energy efficient construction. Issue 51: Disposal of the borough's waste. Changes in waste planning policy at national and regional level may mean that the Council has to find a local solution to the problem of recycling and waste disposal. Options: 1) The LDF should recognise that the construction and use of an energy generating incinerator in the borough is an acceptable way of disposing of local residents' non recycled waste 2) Resist the construction and use of an incinerator within the borough to dispose of residents' non recycled waste 3) Wait until alternative waste disposal technologies have been proven to work in practice and at a reasonable cost, before reducing reliance on incineration to dispose of non recycled waste 4) Ensure that new major developments should have recycling facilities incorporated within them, including separate chutes and storage capacity for different types of waste	To minimise the impact that our community has on the environment through the facilitation and encouragement of recycling, waste minimisation and energy efficient construction. All the respondents agreed with this option Issue 51: Disposal of the borough's waste. Changes in waste planning policy at national and regional level may mean that the Council has to find a local solution to the problem of recycling and waste disposal. Options: The LDF should: 1) Recognise that the construction and use of an energy generating incinerator in the borough is an acceptable way of disposing of local residents' non recycled waste - 32 2) Resist the construction and use of an incinerator within the borough to dispose of residents' non recycled waste - 21 3) Wait until alternative waste disposal technologies have been proven to work in practice and at a reasonable cost, before reducing reliance on incineration to dispose of non recycled waste - 38 4) Ensure that new major developments should have recycling facilities incorporated within them, including separate chutes and storage capacity for different types of waste - 77 No views or don't know - 12	Where taken forward, the options were included in section 9.3. (waste)	Option 1: The construction of a waste incinerator in the borough. It was not taken forward from I&O as there is a presumption against this in the London Plan. Moreover, the respondents in I&O stage did not support this option Option 2: to resist the construction and use of an incinerator in the borough. It was not taken forward from I&O as the respondents in I&O stage did not support this option and the option was not very realistic due to the fact that there is a presumption against incineration in the London Plan. Option 3: Wait until alternative waste disposal technologies have been proved to work in practice. It was not taken forward from I&O as the waste problem needs to be solved and waiting is not a real option. Option 4 was taken forward to help meeting the waste apportionment set out in the London Plan. Waste issues will be covered more in depth in a forthcoming Waste DPD.
Issue 52	Issue 52: Cremorne Wharf.			
	The Cremorne Wharf Civic Amenity and Recycling Centre is closed but is the subject of direction by the Mayor of London, to maintain it as a wharf. The LDF should: 1) Seek to re open the site as a waste management facility 2) Allow the redevelopment of the site for another use, such as housing	Issue 52: Cremorne Wharf. The Cremorne Wharf Civic Amenity and Recycling Centre is closed but is the subject of direction by the Mayor of London, to maintain it as a wharf. The LDF should: 1) Seek to re open the site as a waste management facility - 58 2) Allow the redevelopment of the site for another use, such as housing - 20 No views or don't know - 25	Where taken forward, the options were included in section 10.2 (Key sites)	Option 2: To allow the redevelopment of Cremorne Wharf for another use such as housing. This option was not taken forward from I&O stage as Cremorne Wharf has a safeguarded Wharf Status and therefore it should be used for waste management. Option 1 was taken forward as Cremorne Wharf has a Safeguarded Wharf Status and should be used for waste management purposes. It will also help meeting the waste apportionment set out in the London Plan.

		Or should the provision of affordable housing remain a top priority?	The majority of consultees did not support this approach. However, both the GLA and GOL were concerned that this approach, whilst with the best intentions, could water down the Mayor's strategic objectives to maximise the provision of affordable housing	Not taken forward	Despite reservations from key stakeholders, there was overwhelming support for the provision of social and community facilities, this is also backed by the Council' Sustainability Appraisal. These have been lost to uses with a higher land value (primarily housing) in the past so the Council decided that the best means of assuring a new social and community offer, is to relax the s.106 requirements for affordable housing on appropriate schemes.
N/a	Box 4.3	Walkable neighbourhoods			
The issue was raised at this point.		What uses do you feel should be within 'local' walking range? Is 10 minutes the right 'time band' for local access? Should we recognise that parts of the borough may have to be treated differently because of their characteristics and function (such as Knightsbridge which is an international shopping centre, a prestigious hotel location and lies within central London's Central Activities Zone)? If so, can you identify which other areas should be approached differently?	Support the concept of the walkable neighbourhood or the idea that everywhere within the borough is within a 10 minute walk from a range of local facilities. A number of respondees have pointed out access going beyond simple proximity to a service - but includes both the attractiveness of the public realm. 'Walkability' can be improved if the public realm is improved and physical barriers (for example major roads) are 'lowered'. Similarly support - where referred to -- for the idea that everywhere is with a 30 minute trip (by public transport) for the higher order services. Generally responses did not list those services which should be in 'easy' and 'reasonable' reach. The only	Taken forward. 4.3 of Towards Preferred Options Taken forward. 5.4 of Towards Preferred Options	N/A N/A
Issues 32 and 33	Box 4.4	Education provision in the North of the Borough			
		Should the Council be building a new school in North Kensington or should it be looking to provide other forms of educational provision?	The majority of those who responded thought that, in their opinion a new school should be built in the north of the borough. There was no consensus between respondents whether a new school should be a state or private school. However, there was an overarching tone that the general choice of schools should be improved.	Taken forward. 4.5 and 12.4 of Towards Preferred Options Not taken forward	N/A There was broad consensus that the best option forward was to build a new school in the north of the borough. By designating schools as social and community use, their provision in Kensington and Chelsea is still protected and enhanced.
Issues 33 and 34	Box 4.5	Provision of health facilities			
		Do you agree that priority should be given to having a GP's Surgery within 10 minutes walk of every house. or should priority be given to upgrading provision in areas where existing facilities are not up to standard?	The consultation confirmed that the provision of a range of GPs surgeries across the borough is seen, by most, as an essential element of this chapter. In some cases this should be achieved by upgrading existing surgeries, and in others the creation of new facilities. The network of GP surgeries would most likely be best served by the creation of group practices rather than a rolling out of the poly clinic model across the borough. The GLA continue to take their line of a qualified support for maintaining a range for social uses – as long as it does not hinder the delivery of the Mayor's strategic policies. The Kensington and Chelsea Primary Care Trust stressed the need for the LDF to reflect the full range of health facilities within the borough, and welcome more engagement with the Council on planning and expansion of existing facilities or the procurement of new facilities. The Kensington and Chelsea Primary Care Trust also requested more encouragement from the Council in a joint commitment in achieving a full range of health facilities in the borough.	Taken forward. 4.6 of Towards Preferred Options Not taken forward	N/A Whilst the upgrading of facilities is important for maintaining the borough's already excellent provision. It is important that the Core Strategy furthers these ambitions in line with the Community Strategy and SA. Therefore this option was not progressed as an policy direction beyond this stage

Box 4.6 Providing facilities for community safety					
		Should requests from the Metropolitan Police to establish particular types of facilities in specific locations override policy provision if to do so improves services to the public and helps reduce crime?	This approach received a very high (through not unanimous) level of support. The Metropolitan Police Authority were fully supportive noting that this approach would maximise the provision of policing throughout the borough. Their comments conclude that they would support the location of 'police shops' within town centres. GOL suggests a different approach – of a supportive planning policy framework drawn up in consultation with the Police that enables development in appropriate locations rather than treating them as exceptions.	Taken forward. 4.7 of Towards Preferred Options	N/A
		Are there any other options?	N/a	N/a	N/a
Box 5 Fostering Vitality					
Issue 29 and 45		<p>Box 5: Fostering Vitality: At the core of the strategic objective of Fostering Vitality is this tension between residential amenity, and the mixed uses that give the borough much of its identity.</p> <p>Should residential amenity be protected at all cost?</p>	There was not a consensus on whether residential amenity should be protected at all cost. Some felt that it should be, whilst other considered that it was important to encourage a mix of uses within the borough- as it was this mix that create a diversity and vitality. It was however noted by many - including both GOL and the GLA that mixed use development should be designed in such a way as to ensure that the development does not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity. The Kensington society went so far as to suggest that in the past too many non residential uses have been squeezed out - and that a more robust policy approach be taken to try to maintain diversity. The introduction of more non retail uses should be linked to the existing hierarchy of local centres - and there principal function which is to serve the day-to-day needs of the local residents.	Not taken forward.	Whilst the protection of residential amenity remains important the protection of residential amenity "at all costs" is not considered to be a viable option, and has therefore has not been taken forward. There has been considerable support from the our stakeholders (at each stage of consultation) for the Council supporting a range of uses across the borough. GOL has gone as far a stating that a core strategy which supports the creation of a residential ghetto was in real danger of being found "unsound" at a subsequent EIP. Support for creating diverse neighbourhoods containing the range of uses needed by our residents and visitors is also supported by the SEA and by government guidance. Similarly the provision of a range of facilities is integral to the KCP's Community Strategy.
		Or should the Council encourage the mix of uses that add to the richness and quality of life of the borough?		Taken forward. Box 5.1 of Towards Preferred Options	N/A
Box 5.2 Should your borough continue to contain a mix of uses					

Not raised at Issue and Options

	<p>Box 5.2: Should your borough continue to contain a mix of uses? Despite the diverse mix of the uses within the borough, most of the demand for development in recent years has been for new housing. Given the values to be derived from this, the demand for land for new housing is likely to continue into the foreseeable future. The core strategy gives us the opportunity to withstand this pressure and to plan for a borough which is made up of a rich mix of uses. Should the Council</p>	<p>As with box 5 the issues and options consultation has highlighted a number of differing views. Perhaps unsurprisingly the House Building Federation and Fairview Homes support an approach which will put new housing above all other use. There is however a general (albeit not complete) consensus that the diversity of the borough needs to be maintained and that the Council should be encouraging well designed mixed use development - development which does not harm existing residential amenity. A number of respondees supported an option which would combine options (b) and (c) - if this aim can be achieved. A number of stakeholders who supported maintaining a diversity of uses suggested that a diverse mix of uses should be concentrated in existing centres, with residential being allowed 'dominance' elsewhere. The Kensington Society took this further suggesting that the maintenance of a diversity of uses should be linked with the walkable neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 5.1 of Towards Preferred Options</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>Promote the borough as a high class residential dormitory and favour residential use at the expense of the loss of uses such as retail, employment and tourism</p>		<p>Not taken forward.</p>	<p>Whilst the protection of residential amenity remains important the protection of residential amenity "at all costs", or the promotion of residential uses above all others is not considered to be a viable option, and has therefore has not been taken forward. There has been considerable support from the our stakeholders (at each stage of consultation) for the Council supporting a range of uses across the borough. GOL has gone as far a stating that a core strategy which supports the creation of a residential ghetto was in real danger of being found "unsound" at a subsequent EIP. Support for creating diverse neighbourhoods containing the range of uses needed by our residents and visitors is also supported by the SEA and by government guidance. Similarly the provision of a range of facilities is integral to the KCP's Community Strategy.</p>
	<p>Attempt to protect the diverse function of the borough, and only permit new residential development where it does not harm the borough's economy or its vitality? Or</p>		<p>Not taken forward.</p>	<p>This approach is not taken forward, with the Fostering Vitality section of the core strategy welcoming new residential development in many cases. The Council believes that a balance has to be reached between maintaining a diverse borough and providing the diverse mix of new homes needed. The Council's Employment land Survey supports the protection of existing light industrial and office uses - but does not go so far as to recommend the preclusion of new residential uses. The SA does not support this approach, a and there is no support from the public.</p>

		Seek to build upon the borough's existing diversity and permit business uses in residential areas as long as there is no impact on residential amenity?		Taken forward. Box 5.1 and Box 5.2 of Towards Preferred Options takes forward the Council's desire to build upon the borough's diversity. These boxes do not consider details concerning where new business development should actually be permitted.	N/A
Para 5.4.3 Function of Town Centres					
Issue 27, 29		The Council has endorsed the Mayor for London's hierarchy of centres, albeit with some modifications to reflect the special character of both the Portobello Road and Westbourne Grove. The Core Strategy will ensure that it is these centres which will remain the focus for town centre uses.	There was little general interest about the position of the borough's higher order centres within the Mayor's London Hierarchy. Initiatives to support the special character of Portobello Road were supported. The GLA did not object to the designation of "special district centres".	Taken forward. Box 5.4 of Towards Preferred Options	N/A
Para 5.4.5 Function of Higher Order Town Centres					
Issue 27 and 29.		Para 5.4.5 The Core Strategy will include strategic policies which will attempt to maintain the diversity of the borough's centres. These measures will include the designation of Portobello Road and Westbourne Grove as Special District Centres and an explicit recognition of the value of diversity within town centres.	The Initial Issues Options consultation has illustrated an overwhelming level of public support for policies which seek to maintain the identity of the Borough's centres and to protect valued uses – support shown by over 99 percent of interested respondees to Issue 30, 'Maintaining the identity of the Borough's centres and protecting valued uses'.	Taken forward. Box 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6 of Towards Preferred Options.	N/A
Box 5.3a North Pole Road station					
Issue 24		It is not clear at the moment how a station in the area of North Pole Road might be funded, but it would improve public transport accessibility in the north west of the borough. Do you support the idea of a new station in principle?	The majority of respondents considered that the Council should seek rail based options to ensure that the travel demands of new developments are sustainable.	Taken forward. Box 6.2, 12.1.	N/A
Box 5.3b Chelsea Hackney Line					
Issue 24		It is not clear when this may be brought forward, but it would have significant benefits to the south of the borough. Do you support the Chelsea Hackney Line in principle?	The majority of respondents considered that the Council should seek rail based options to ensure that the travel demands of new developments are sustainable.	Taken forward. Box 6.2.	N/A
Box 5.3c Crossrail					

Issue 24

	<p>For a station to be viable early research suggests it would require a throughput of some 12,000 passengers per day. This would have implications of the nature of the development which would have to be built in North Kensington to feed the station, and shape the vision for North Kensington. There is the potential that the station could be funded as part of a significant redevelopment on sites near Ladbroke Grove. This is set out in greater detail within the North Kensington Area Action Plan. Should the Council pursue a new Crossrail station in North Kensington? Are there any other options you would like to propose?</p> <p>Do you think that there are other public transport issues which should be given greater priority?</p>	<p>The majority of respondents considered that the Council should seek rail based options to ensure that the travel demands of new developments are sustainable.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 6.2, 12.1.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	--	--------------------------------------	------------

Box 5.4a How to maintain diversity

Issue 29 and 30 of Initial Issues and Options

	<p>Box 5.4a: How to maintain diversity within town centres Issue A new retail study is being undertaken that will consider how to improve the potential for independent shops, among other things. Our policies will be strongly guided by the outcomes of this study which are expected later in 2008.</p> <p>Options Subject to the results of the retail study, should the Council:</p> <p>Limit new retail uses to the borough's existing town centres where need for additional shops is demonstrated, unless the centres do not have the capacity to accommodate additional uses?</p> <p>Allow retail uses to establish beyond the existing town centres, thus potentially increasing the supply of shops, possibly reducing rents and thus allowing more space for independents?</p>	<p>The Interim Issues and Options consultation clearly illustrated the continued desire to maintain diverse centres, with respondees supporting any initiatives which may assist in achieving this aim. Some of the 'key stakeholders' namely the Kensington Society, GOL and the GLA strongly endorse the limiting of new retail uses to existing centres (unless these centres do not have the necessary capacity to accommodate the 'need'. This is the approach enshrined by PPS6 and the London Plan. There was also considerable support for option (b) or allowing shops outside centres, where this can help support independent retailers. There was a consensus that the Council should also be allowing a mix of uses within existing centres and for the idea to start requiring 'affordable shops'.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Boxes 5.5 and 5.6 of Towards Preferred Options.</p> <p>Taken forward. Considered again in Box 5.6 of Towards Preferred Options.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	---	--	---	-----------------------

	<p>be more relaxed about 'shop' uses in our town centres, and permit a mix of retail, restaurant and cultural uses to give our town centres an unique and attractive mix to attract a wide range of shoppers?</p>		<p>Box 5.6 of Towards Preferred Options. in parts. This box supports a mix of uses in the boroughs town centres. This diversity will not however be supported throughout town centres. The Council will continue to designate the core areas primarily for shopping uses, and the outer secondary areas for a greater mix of shopping and other town centre uses.</p>	<p>The Council recognises that whilst the principal function of the borough's higher order town centres is as shopping centres, a diversity of town centre uses should be supported. The diversity required by PPS6 is provided by allowing a greater diversity of uses in the secondary areas and by allowing non A1 uses within primary areas change to other non A1 uses. The need to protect existing A1 uses in primary areas is supported by the Council's Retail Needs Assessment which concludes that the health of some of our centres are likely to be under considerable pressure from the opening of Westfield London in Hammersmith and Fulham, and therefore that we need robust polices in place that resist the loss of existing A1 uses. The need for this robust approach is further compounded by the current recession- put even greater pressure upon the borough's centres. The Core Strategy offers is particular support for new arts and cultural and uses within the borough's town centres.</p>
	<p>require 'affordable shops' to be provided as part of major development schemes in the way that residential development has to provide affordable homes?</p>		<p>Taken forward. Box 5.6 of Towards Preferred Options.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Box 5.4b Provision of local uses</p>				
<p>Issue 30, 31</p>	<p>Box 5.4b: Provision of local uses Issue National policy states that new shopping, and other local uses, should be located in town and local centres in order to encourage multiple purpose trips and reduce reliance on the car. Against this, many people, and in particular the elderly and those with mobility difficulties, would like everyday services to be close at hand, that is within easy walking distance.</p> <p>To provide these services within easy reach across the borough, we would have to consider locating town centre uses outside of town centres.</p> <p>Do you feel that in a borough as small as Kensington and Chelsea, having local facilities within walking distances outweighs the benefits of having them in your nearest town centre?</p>	<p>The Issues and Options Consultation showed a wide level of support for the provision of local uses through out the borough be these in designated centres or 'out-of-centre'. Whilst the Kensington Society does strongly support local uses it questioned the need to encourage out-of-centre uses. Where a deficiency for a use has been identified this should be satisfied by either encouraging the use to locate in an existing centre - or by designating a new local centre. The society suggested that this approach would strengthen local centres. Most of borough will not need further out of centre shops - but limit non A1 uses from taking over local centres. Out-of-centre - local uses not felt to be necessary in Chelsea - given the areas is so compact. Earls Court to be included with a town centre designation to support major mixed use redevelopment.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 4.3 , 4.4 of Towards Preferred Options</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Box 5.4c Location of new town centre</p>				

Not considered at initial Issues and Options

	<p>With the on going regenerations needs in the north of the borough, the potential for housing estate renewal and the possibility of Crossrail, there is potential to restructure the north of the Borough to provide a new focus for homes and jobs.</p> <p>Do you think this is a good idea? Should the Council invite the Mayor for London to designate the area as an opportunity area within the next London Plan?</p>	<p>Wide spread support for exploring further the designation of the Kensal area as an Opportunity Area. The GLA notes that this would need exploring through the sub regional implementation framework. The Council will need to build up considerable evidence and justification in terms of employment capacity and estimates for new housing in addition to public transport accessibility. The Kensington Society doubted whether the development on the site could ever be of a sufficient scale.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 5.3 of Towards Preferred Options</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>The Core Strategy is not suggesting that the Kensal area be designated as an Opportunity Area. There has not been widespread support for this designation, with the GLA being questioning whether the nature of development envisaged being of the necessary scale. This position will be kept under review.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Box 5.5a What sort of tourism

Issue 39	<p>While tourism brings large revenues to the borough, the amount of visitor accommodation has been recognised as tending to have a negative impact on residential communities. But the borough will always be a magnet for visitors – and its many prestigious attractions and renowned shopping streets are not going to go away.</p> <p>Should the Council simply seek to minimise and contain the impacts of tourism or should it develop a strategy to make the most of the benefits that tourism can bring?</p>	<p>There was a high level of support (though not unanimous) for the Council to develop a strategy which makes the most of the benefits can bring rather than simply to seek to minimise and contain the impacts of tourism. This is not to say that there is support for the unfettered spread of tourism in the borough - rather than we should make more of the benefits which can be associated with tourism and curb its excesses. Reminder that Earls Court should be treated flexibly.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 5.11 of Towards preferred Options. The questions are not mutually exclusive, and both have been taken forward.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
----------	---	--	--	------------

Box 5.5b Protection of hotels

Issue 29, 35, 36, 38	<p>Do you think that the Council should continue to let hotels be lost to other uses, especially residential,</p>	<p>No consensus. About half those who responded supported neither the protection of existing nor the encouragement of new hotels. However some of the key stakeholders, particular the GLA and the Kensington Society supported a more positive approach, with the Kensington Society stating that in their view it was time to start retaining and improving hotels. Few of those who did support the encouragement of new hotels suggested suitable sites. A notable exception was the GLA who noted that whilst the borough was not a "strategic hotel locations" its town centres and the freeing of the CAZ may be suitable for smaller scale hotels. The Earls Court and Olympia group supported the Earls Court Site as being suitable for a hotel as part of a wider mixed use proposal.</p>	<p>Not taken forward</p>	<p>The loss of hotels is not considered to be consistent with that set out within the London Plan. The provision of an adequate number of hotel bed spaces is imperative to the success of the 2012 Olympics. Hotels are also seen to be an important generating use which contribute a significant proportion of the income generated within the borough, and a significant proportion of the jobs provided within the borough. The Council's position will be reviewed in 2012 following the Olympics.</p>
----------------------	---	--	--------------------------	--

		or should it start protecting the borough's existing hotels, at least until after the 2012 Olympics and Paralympics.		Taken forward. Box 5.12 of Towards Preferred Options	N/A
		Should the Core Strategy be sympathetic to applications for new hotels in town centres (hotels being defined as an appropriate town centre use)?		Taken forward. Box 5.12 of Towards Preferred Options	N/A
Box 5.5c Support of the borough's tourist attractions					
Issue 39 and 45.		Box 5.5c: Support of the borough's tourist attractions Issue If we are to retain and support the existing tourist attractions should we improve the visitor experience? One key way this can be done is by improving the quality of the public realm, the street spaces we all share. Another is by ensuring that there are related facilities such as cafes and small shops near the main tourist draws, especially in centres such as South Kensington.	Of those who responded to the issue, the majority supported the continued investment in the public realm. However, this view was not universal with others noting that the major tourist attractions were sufficient attractions in their own right and needed no further assistance. The Mayor was supportive of proposals to enhance the Kensington Museum Complex and the continued improvement in the cultural offer of though complementary mixed-use redevelopment. He also notes that reference should be made to Strategic Cultural Areas (in our case the South Kensington Museum Complex). The Kensington Society was supportive of a more positive approach towards tourism - an approach that needs to form part of comprehensive management policies to support tourism in ways that residents can also benefit.	Both options taken forward. Box 3.5 and 5.11 Towards Preferred Options.	N/A
Box 5.5d Establishing local cultural quarters					
Issue 45		Box 5.5d: Establishing local cultural quarters Issue How should the Council seek to develop the cultural activities from which this borough benefits as a whole? Should the Council designate such areas as a local cultural area where arts and cultural uses will be promoted? If so how would you like to see these areas change and develop? Should we be seeking to promote and allow cultural uses in any of our town centres, to widen the attraction to visitors, and provide a unique character to our shopping centres?	There was only limited support for the designation of any 'local' cultural quarters - rather there was general support, amongst those who made comments, for the promotion of cultural uses in any of our town centres. The trustees of the Phillimore estate urged flexibility with regard the Commonwealth Institute building. The Kensington Society specifically supported the Kensington High Street as the designation of a LCQ as well as suggesting that ACE uses should be an integral part of any town centre strategy for the future.	Taken forward. Box 3.5 and 5.8 of Towards Preferred Options Taken forward. Box 5.1 and 5.7 of Towards Preferred Options	N/A N/A
Box 5.6 Earl's Court Exhibition Centre					

The issue was raised at this point.

Do you think it would benefit the borough to become the host for 'London's Convention Centre'? If so, do you think that Earl's Court would be a good location for a new convention centre, be this as a stand alone development, or as part of a wider mixed use proposal?

Do you think that a better use of the site would be as a mixed use proposal without the convention centre but including offices, housing and a small element of retail?

Whilst there was support for a large scale convention centre on the site, many who responded were concerned that any large scale development could increase traffic congestion in the area - and should be treated with great caution. Interestingly the provision of a conference centre was not fully supported by the owners of the site who urged flexibility. They pointed out (as others did) that the GLAs report on the ICC questioned a "suburban and extension site", such as that at Earl's Court, promoting an ICC in the CAZ.

Box 3.4a of Towards Preferred Options.

The Earl's Court Strategic Site allocation (reflected within the Earl's Court Place) supports the mixed use of the site including an Exhibition/Convention centre. Mixed uses are supported by the Sustainability Appraisal and by PPS6 (within town centre locations). Given the site's size the provision of an element of residential accommodation is considered to be appropriate - and will not harm the commercial activity on the site. Similarly a significant element of offices is considered appropriate given the need for offices within the borough and the site's highly accessible location. The Council recognises that the use of the site as an International Conference Centre will depend on its viability - however supports the principle of this use or a cultural, exhibition or convention use that is at least a national destination. The site is highly accessible, and the provision of this cultural, exhibition or convention use would help achieve the Council's ambition of playing a wider role in contributing to London's role as a world city.

Box 5.7a What sort of business uses do we want

Issue 18, 20,29

Box 5.7a: What sort of business uses do we want? Which sorts of business should we seek to retain and / or promote (if any)? (business uses are those which are primarily offices, but also include light industrial uses, and to a lesser extent 'general industrial' uses)

The majority of respondents indicated that light industrial uses should remain where they are at present, but in particular within the borough's three employment zones, and also within commercial mews. The consultation also indicated a high level of support for small offices, with a number of respondents favouring the option of retaining small office space in areas of good public transport accessibility and particularly within town centres and within the Central Activities Zone. A mixed response was received with regard the provision of large office space. Most respondents were content with the current location of large offices, although opinion was divided as to whether we should be encouraging large offices in town centres and in other highly accessible areas.

	Should the council retain and / or protect light industrial uses or small offices, anywhere in the borough, or in specific areas such as the existing employment areas or town centres		Box 5.2 (protection of B1(c) uses and offices in town centres)	Taken forward. The Towards preferred Options document notes that the Council will protect all light industrial use across the borough. It is not considered appropriate to protect light industrial uses in Employment Zone or town centres only - given their rarity and the particular contribution that these uses play in meeting the particular employment needs of a sector of the borough's population which benefits from fewer job opportunities. Protection of B1(c) uses is also supported by the policies within the London Plan. TPO does not specifically consider the protection of small uses across the borough. This issues are not rejected at this stage as are picked up again at the June 09 draft.
	Should the council retain and / or protect larger offices? Anywhere in the borough or in specific areas, such as those locations with good public transport accessibility?		Box 5.2 (protection of offices in town centres)	TPO does not specifically consider the appropriate location of new large offices. This is picked up again at the June 09 draft.
Box 5.7b How much business should we have				
Not introduced in initial issues and options	Box 5.7b: How much business use should we have? Should the council retain and / or protect small offices? Anywhere in the borough, or in specific areas, such as in town centres? Ensure no net loss of business land? Allow some land to be re-used for another purpose? If so, how do we assess what land should change use? What new uses would you find acceptable? Social and community uses? Or for residential?	The issues and options consultation does not provide clear guidance on this matter. There was little support for significantly increasing the amount of business floorspace provided, but similarly there was only little support for allowing the loss of business to other uses. Where the loss of business uses could be justified by a robust evidence base, some respondents favoured alternative uses including those serving a local need as well as uses which include new waste management and recycling facilities.	Box 5.2 (protection of offices in town centres)	TPO does not specifically consider the protection/provision of small offices outside town centres. This issues are not rejected at this stage as are picked up again at the June 09 draft.
Box 5.7c How do we retain & establish business uses				

	<p>Box 5.7c: How do we retain and establish business uses? If we are to retain or attract business uses, it has to compete for land against more valuable uses, principally residential. We therefore need to have either land values that make the uses viable, or other mechanisms to 'subsidise' the business use. Should the Council: a) protect existing business uses to suppress the land value, allowing only new business uses to relocate on that site?</p> <p>b) identifying land currently not in business use and allocate it for that purpose?</p> <p>c) allow for mixed uses on the site so long as the number of jobs that the employment element can accommodate is equal to or more than the existing?</p>	<p>The results from the Issues and Options Consultation identified that the protection of existing business uses to suppress land value, whilst only allowing new business uses to relocate on such sites was the most popular solution. However there was support for allowing a site to be redeveloped for a mix of uses so long as the number of jobs that the employment element can accommodate is equate to or more than the existing use. This latter option was not supported by the GLA who saw this as too simplistic. Allowing mixed use development so long as the number of jobs is not reduced could lead to an erosion of functional capacity of industrial land.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 5.2 of Towards Preferred Options</p> <p>Not taken forward</p> <p>Not taken forward</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>The core strategy has not taken this option forward. The Council recognises that the maintenance of a rich diversity of uses is important for maintaining a vital and a sustainable borough. Only in the Employment Zones will vacant land be required to be used for business uses - although the previous use of such land will be in all but the most exceptional circumstances be business. The Employment Land and Premises study supports the protection of existing business uses, supports the creation of more business floorspace but doesn't go so far as to allocate land not currently used for business for business uses. There was no support for this option at consultation. Diversity of uses is supported by the SEA. The SEA does not however consider the detail of the amount of business land required.</p> <p>The core strategy has not taken this option forward as it is considered that the introduction of non business uses (or other uses which support the function of the zone) into an employment zone can undermine the function of the zone - even where there is no net loss of employment uses. There was no consensus on this from the public consultation. Many did not object to the introduction of non business uses where there was no net loss of business uses. The ISAR supports the allowing of a mix of uses in the Employment Zones, as long as existing business floorspace is not lost. It considers this option to be a "win-win" situation, with the other options not meeting the demands of the borough. However, others, including the GLA were concerned that such an approach could jeopardise the function of the zone. The Council concurred with this view.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		d) require the development provide for 'affordable business units', similar in concept to affordable housing, that may be on or off site?		Not taken forward	The Council has chosen not to take forward a policy to require the provision of affordable business space (via s106 agreements) as there was considerable concern from stakeholders that this would create an unlevel playing field - with providers of business premises being unable to compete with these affordable premises. The Council does however support initiatives which give local people a way into the business sector. This includes working with NOVA new opportunities, and the Portobello Business Centre to provide personalised training and support to residents who wish to support their own business.
Box 6a Caring for the public realm: Streets					
Issue 23: Streetscape		For street spaces the key issue is the tension between the dominant use of the space for motorised traffic, over the other potential users and uses of the space Option: Should we continue to give priority to vehicular traffic in the majority of our streets?	Few respondents felt the current balance in favour of cars is right and should continue. While indeed cars brought a 'buzz to street life' for some, the majority of you supported a refocusing of roles that delivered a more attractive street environment and to a wider user group. More priority for the less able was mentioned, who need to feel more confident about venturing out. Support was not unequivocal: rebalancing priorities could not be achieved in all streets, though there was no clear indication as to which ones; it should not be at the expense of moving congestion and pollution elsewhere in the borough; and we should not squeeze out buses from our streets, as they have a very positive role to play.	Taken forward. Box 7.2a Indicative Policy Direction - Streets and Spaces	N/A
Box 6b Caring for the public realm: Green Spaces					

Issue 40: Public open space provision

	<p>Option: Should we be striving to achieve new public open space in the borough? Or should we leave well enough alone and accept that the shortage of public open space is a consequence of living in central London?</p>	<p>The reactions were mixed on this option. Some felt we should be seeking new public open space in developments within the borough, and the GLA reminded us of the need to identify and address areas that fall below standard. Others recognised the tight constraints of the borough and agreed on taking a more flexible approach: for some this came from a general sense of satisfaction with the open space we have or from giving higher priority to other planning requirements; whilst for others this translated into seeking new open space where possible and financial contributions towards improving existing spaces where this is not. One additional thought was that the issue should be seen as closely connected to the reordering the streets to offer new kinds of attractive public spaces.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 7.2b Indicative Policy Direction - Green Spaces</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	--	---	---	------------

Section 6.2 Quality of the public realm

Issue 40: Public open space provision & Issue 42: Priority for open space

	<p>Option: Should the Core Strategy 'redress the balance' and make the public realm more accessible to these users?</p>	<p>Few respondents felt the current balance in favour of cars is right and should continue. While indeed cars brought a 'buzz to street life' for some, the majority of you supported a refocusing of roles that delivered a more attractive street environment and to a wider user group. More priority for the less able was mentioned, who need to feel more confident about venturing out. Support was not unequivocal: rebalancing priorities could not be achieved in all streets, though there was no clear indication as to which ones; it should not be at the expense of moving congestion and pollution elsewhere in the borough; and we should not squeeze out buses from our streets, as they have a very positive role to play.</p>	<p>Box 7.2a Indicative Policy Direction - Streets and Spaces & Box 7.5 Quality of the public realm</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	---	--	------------

Box 6.4a Who should have priority in the public realm

Issue 26: Gated communities & Issue 42: Priority for open space		Option: Should the Core Strategy 'redress the balance' and make the public realm more accessible to these users?	Few respondents felt the current balance in favour of cars is right and should continue. While indeed cars brought a 'buzz to street life' for some, the majority of you supported a refocusing of roles that delivered a more attractive street environment and to a wider user group. More priority for the less able was mentioned, who need to feel more confident about venturing out. Support was not unequivocal: rebalancing priorities could not be achieved in all streets, though there was no clear indication as to which ones; it should not be at the expense of moving congestion and pollution elsewhere in the borough; and we should not squeeze out buses from our streets, as they have a very positive role to play.	Taken forward. Box 7.2a Indicative Policy Direction - Streets and Spaces	N/A
Box 6.4b Uses in the public realm					
Issue 48: Role of public art & Issue 44: Temporary use of open space		Should the Council: a) encourage activities and facilities, such as children's play or public seating areas? b) encourage managed seating outside cafes and restaurants? c) promote managed spaces as venues for special events, such as street fairs, concerts, parades or occasional markets (for example Christmas fairs)? If you agree to (c) should these only be encouraged in specific locations and, if so, where?	The responses were close to being unanimous. Respondents supported all three options, but were quick to point out the need for a sensitive approach to location and careful management of the activities. For example, pavement cafes need wider footways and should be encouraged in busier, commercial locations, where they can add to vitality without upsetting residents.	Taken forward. Box 7.6 Activities within the public realm Indicative Policy direction	N/A
Box 6.4c Managing the Public Realm					
Issue 48: Role of public art & Issue 44: Temporary use of open space		a) maintain the present approach to managing public realm use and seek to reduce signs and other traffic management paraphernalia, not allowing the public realm to be used as free advertising space? Or, b) adopt a more radical approach to managing the public realm, which gives more space and control to pedestrians in particular, by 'sharing space' such as the proposals for Exhibition Road.	The majority of comments received encouraged us in our work to de-clutter our streets and remove non-essential street furniture, with some of you pointing to the need to restrict advertising on street furniture, and tackling telephone kiosks per se. The responses on shared space approach were more mixed, but generally supportive as an approach that needs to be tested or implemented in chosen locations. One raised the notion of shared spaces on a permanent, seasonal or occasion basis in support of making London a world-class walkable city for both residents and visitors.	Taken forward. Box 7.4b Designing and Managing the Public Realm	N/A
Box 6.5 The provision of public or private open space					

Issue 43: Wider use of garden squares

	<p>Should the Council: a) seek to ensure that new open space is accessible to the public? or b) allow new public space to be private, with access only to those who live in the associated development?</p>	<p>The reactions to this option were mixed. Some felt we should be seeking new public open space in developments within the borough, and the GLA reminded us of the need to identify and address areas that fall below standard. Others recognised the tight constraints of the borough and agreed on taking a more flexible approach: for some this came from a general sense of satisfaction with the open space we have or from giving higher priority to other planning requirements; whilst for others this translated into seeking new open space where possible and financial contributions towards improving existing spaces where this is not. One additional thought was that the issue should be seen as closely connected to the reordering the streets to offer new kinds of attractive public spaces.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 7.2b Indicative Policy Direction - Green Spaces</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	---	---	------------

Box 7 Renewing the Legacy

<p>Issue 2: Heritage and Environmental Quality</p>		<p>Do you agree that we should be putting equal weight on both: Maintaining excellence in the care for our built heritage; and Ensuring excellence in new development across the borough? Have we identified the right issue?</p>	<p>The majority of respondents felt the approach we put forward was the right one for the Royal Borough. Some of you did qualify your support, reminding us not to protect buildings simply because they are old, but because they make a positive contribution. A simple approach would be to require all development to be of excellent quality, including improvements to the public realm. A minority felt we are too prescriptive in requiring high quality design and that this only adds to the expense and at the cost of other more important planning priorities.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 8.2 Conserving our Heritage Assets Indicative Policy Direction</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	--	--	---	--	------------

Box 7.2 High Quality Design

<p>Issue 2: Heritage and Environmental Quality</p>		<p>Option: Do you agree that the highest standards of design should be applied across the borough or should most attention be given to conservation areas?</p>	<p>In the first consultation the majority of respondents felt that we should carry forward the objectives for conservation and good design, allowing for change in a sensitive manner. This was closely followed by those who thought that a more restrictive approach should be adopted, where conservation and good design principles would always be the principal concern. This outcome, taken together with our duty to give "special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of the conservation areas, means that we offer no alternative strategy for listed buildings or for those parts of the borough in conservation areas.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 8.3 High Quality New Design Indicative Policy Direction</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	--	--	--	---	------------

Box 7.3 Density of Development

Issue 11: Housing density

	<p>Options The Council could adapt the London Plan's 'density matrix' and apply to new developments; or would this prove too inflexible? Should we give priority to making sure that new development fits into its surrounding context rather than on placing emphasis on a density matrix?</p>	<p>References were made to the need for efficient land use. For some respondents, it was less a matter of meeting the minimum density levels, but more a case of promoting high density development per se. This extended to seeing the upper density levels not as limits, but as being applied flexibly, permitting the relevant density range to be exceeded in accessible locations where the townscape would not be harmed. For others the density ranges were to be tempered by a greater appreciation of the local context, including local character, townscape and public transport capacity. Any schemes outside the density range would require special justification.</p>	<p>Box 8.4 Density of Development Indicative Policy Direction</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Box 7.4 Tall Buildings</p>				
	<p>Do you think that: a) The Council should endorse the approach of the High Buildings Strategy and recognise that tall buildings may be appropriate in areas which are both well served by public transport and not located in any sensitive areas, and fulfil a wider 'townscape' landmark function? b) In relation to the specific circumstances mentioned where tall buildings may be appropriate, should the upgrade of the Hammersmith and City Line be in place before any redevelopment takes place?</p>	<p>The responses were fairly evenly split: One-third wished the Council to endorse the high building strategy of defining appropriate and sensitive locations. As alternative options, a further third would resist the development of any new tall buildings in the borough; and the remaining third supported a less prescriptive tall building policy that better reflected the London Plan; notably, where tall buildings form attractive landmarks; act as catalysts for regeneration; and are acceptable on design grounds. A few responses suggested additional areas suitable for tall buildings (Earl's Court and Notting Hill Gate) and that our approach is inconsistent with our North Kensington Area Action Plan which promotes regeneration. Others registered their dislike of tall buildings close to the River Thames and the Grand union Canal. Only a handful of you responded on whether tall building could precede transport infrastructure improvements, with the comments being fairly inconclusive.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 8.5 Tall Buildings Indicative Policy Direction</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Box 7.5 Demolition of Eyesores</p>				

<p>This issue was not brought up at Issues and Options, however, the issue was considered of strategic importance given that eyesore buildings could have a continued negative impact on the borough's high quality built environment and therefore eyesores needed to be addressed.</p>		<p>Should the Council recognise that the costs which may be associated with the demolition of an eyesore building, and its replacement with a high quality building, may require some policy provisions to be relaxed in order to bring forward proposals for their removal? Are there any buildings in your area that that you consider to be eyesores? What are they?</p>	<p>The responses demonstrated some appetite for a more positive approach to remedying building mistakes of the past, though there is the sense that the proposal requires further thought, particularly regarding how we define 'eyesores' and to what extent would other planning priorities be set aside. The difficulty of defining 'eyesores' was mentioned by some of you, with caution being expressed regarding not being duped by matters of taste and fashion, and that the variety of styles developed over a long period is an important architectural feature of the borough. Several respondents however, were ready to offer up several candidates, including the Royal Garden Hotel, World's End Towers, Campden Hill Tower and Newcombe House.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 8.6 The demolition of Eyesores Indicative Policy Direction</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Box 7.6 Access</p>					
<p>This issue was not brought up at Issues and Option as it was considered a strategic issue.</p>		<p>The Council does not offer any strategic options as inclusive design is key to achieving a high quality sustainable environment</p>	<p>As we did not offer any strategic option there were no responses.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 8.7 Access Indicative Policy Direction</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Box 8 Diversity of housing</p>					
<p>I &O various: Issue 13, 14, 17,</p>		<p>It is diversity of housing at a neighbourhood scale, rather than 'straight' affordability which is the key. Is the most important housing issue facing the borough the affordability of houses? Or while affordability is of vital importance, would you agree that the key objective is to deliver neighbourhoods that are mixed in tenure, size, and suitability to people at different stages of life.</p>	<p>The consultation responses indicated that there is support for both mixed communities and increasing the supply of affordable housing. A number of respondents noted that many parts of the borough are not characterised by mixed tenure communities. In the south of the borough there is little affordable housing, except in the south-west, and conversely in North Kensington there is a high concentration of social rented housing. One respondent suggested encouraging more intermediate housing in the north of the borough. It was noted that providing affordable housing at the local level is a key tool for achieving mixed and balanced communities. GOL commented that both issues are important and it should not be a choice as to which issue is the over-riding consideration.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 9.1</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>8.2 Volume of housing provision</p>					

	Box 8.2	<p>Box 9.2 Indicative Policy Direction The housing target is fixed until the next review of the London Plan. The ten year target is for a minimum of 3,500 units to be provided in the borough between 2007/08 and 2016/17. This target may be exceeded if all anticipated developments are implemented. The Council will produce indicative housing figures for the period 2016 – 2026 once the Mayor’s guidance on this matter is available. These figures will be rolled forward to 2028.</p>	<p>The Interim Issues and Options did not present any options on this issue. No comments on the housing target were received.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 9.2</p>	<p>N/A</p>
14d)	Box 8.3	Affordable housing - balance of social rented & intermediate housing			
14d)	Box 8.3	<p>When affordable housing is provided by development, Policy 3A.7 of the London Plan seeks its provision as 70% social rented and 30% ‘intermediate’ housing. In our initial consultation, you told us that you would prefer that the proportion of social rented / intermediate housing should be determined according to local needs in the borough. Where local needs show that there is a demand for intermediate housing, there is an additional problem – land values in the Borough are so high that very often the intermediate housing is not ‘affordable’ to those at whom it is aimed. Where local needs show that there is a demand for intermediate housing, there is an additional problem - land values in the Borough are so high that very often the intermediate housing is not ‘affordable’ to those at whom it is aimed. Should the Council provide the affordable housing in the proportions of social rented / intermediate advocated by the Mayor of London across the borough; b) vary the proportions according to the disposition of housing tenure already to be found in a particular location in order to achieve mixed and balanced communities? For example, in areas of</p>	<p>The consultation responses indicated a range of views. Overall there was very little support for option c), but support for both option a) and b). The GLA stated that in certain circumstances it is acceptable to vary the proportions of intermediate/social rented housing, but that any variance from the 70/30 split must be supported by evidence. One respondent felt that the split should be determined on a site-by-site basis, taking into account the nature of the development, other community benefits and availability of public subsidy.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 9.6</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	Box 8.4	Incorporating market housing as part of estate renewal			

12	Box 8.4	Do you agree with our approach that private housing provided as part of a programme of estate renewal should not in itself attract an affordable housing contribution? Or should the Council insist on additional affordable housing units over and above those being replaced?	There was a mix of opinions on these options, with some of you arguing that option b) should be followed but others stated that it would depend on viability and therefore should be determined on a site-by-site basis. Therefore option a) was felt to be the most appropriate. The inclusion of intermediate housing in estate renewal, rather than more social rented housing, was also referred to as desirable. Several respondents suggested that funding for estate renewal could be provided in part from commuted payments where on-site provision of affordable housing is not practical in development proposals. One respondent argued that the Council should be more flexible in the use of commuted payments for affordable housing.	Taken forward. Box 9.8	N/A
----	---------	---	--	------------------------	-----

Box 8.5 Supported housing					
---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

16	Box 8.5	Box 8.5: Supported housing Issue We want to create a future for residents of all ages in a way that is responsive to changing needs and preferences. Should the Core Strategy: a) encourage special accommodation for the elderly and other vulnerable residents in addition to protecting and improving that which already exists? b) embrace the new types of provision for the elderly and other vulnerable residents in order to enable them to live independently yet stay within the borough, near to family and friends? c) direct such provision towards particular parts of the borough - or is the need borough-wide?	There was a general consensus that options a) and b) should be pursued so that existing provision could be protected and new models, such as extra care housing, could be developed. There was support for classifying extra care schemes as use class C2.	Taken forward. Box 9.9	N/A
----	---------	---	--	------------------------	-----

Box 8.6 De-conversions					
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

8		Issue: One way of increasing the supply of family housing is through 'de-conversions' where a number of flats in the same building are turned back into single family dwelling. This does not always need planning permission. In those circumstances where the Council does have control, should the Core Strategy resist the loss of a number of small flats or welcome the creation of a large family home? Should the Council only encourage de-conversions in certain circumstances, for example where a significant improvement to the quality of the house is achieved.	There was no consensus on this issue. Some respondents thought the Council should resist de-conversion or only allow it on an exceptional basis if the property was used as affordable housing. One argument cited against de-conversion was that de-converted single family homes may only be occupied for a few weeks of the year and consequently their occupants would not contribute to local community life. One respondent thought it was acceptable to de-convert where the existing quality of the building was poor. Others felt that de-conversions to create family dwellings should be welcomed because they bring improved living standards, listed building and conservation area benefits and a reduction of parking stress. It was argued that de-conversions should also apply to those houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) which fail to provide adequate living standards.	Taken forward. Box 9.11	N/A
Section 8.7 House extensions					
Issue 7		No options were put forward.	No options were put forward, and no comments were received.	Taken forward. Box 9.12	N/A
Section 8.8 Amenity Space					
Not covered		Amenity Space	No options were put forward, and no comments were received.	Taken forward. Box 9.13	N/A
Box 8.9 Car parking for residential uses - car-free development					
Issue 22		In order to reduce the impact of new development on the local road network, air quality and residential amenity the Council will seek to reduce the levels of parking provided in new developments. Options Do you support the current approach of allowing new development to have on-site parking but removing the occupiers' rights to have a parking permit? In the light of environmental concerns, and where there is good accessibility, should we require development to have no off-street parking as well as being permit free? Should permit free / parking free be applied across the Borough or only in certain areas; and if so, where? Other Options What other options should be worth considering?	The majority of you were at least supportive of retaining the Council's current approach to car-free and permit-free development, an approach which is to allow car parking to our maximum standards and to require permit-free agreements. A significant proportion of you also supported a requirement that new development in areas of good public transport accessibility should be car free as well as permit free. There was a mixture of responses to where car free and permit free developments should be located. Some of you stated that anywhere within the borough would be suitable whilst others offered potential criteria that may help identify suitable locations for car and permit free development. These included areas such as those with high on-street parking stress, good public transport accessibility and those close proximity to tube stations. Not all respondents supported car free or permit free with some stating that market housing is likely to require access to a car. The use of car clubs to complement and improve the acceptability of permit free and car free developments was raised by a number of you.	Taken forward. Box 6.3	N/A
Box 8.10 Gypsies and Travellers					
Not covered	Section 8.10	Gypsies and Travellers	No options were put forward, and no comments were received.	Taken forward. Box 9.14	N/A

Box 9 Securing our children's future					
Issues 49, 50 and 51		The issue at the core of the strategic objective of Securing our Children's Future is not so much a choice as a question of how far should we only seek to meet the legal obligations that are placed upon us?	It was suggested that the borough should seek to be 'exemplar' or 'ambitious' towards tackling climate change. In this regard, one respondent stated that the Council needs to set realistic targets to sustainability and ensure that they are technically feasible without negatively impacting on the viability of a development.	Taken forward. Box 10.1 of the Towards Preferred Options	A combination of these options has been taken forward. One that goes beyond legal obligations, but does not aspire to be the most sustainable borough in London, as this is unrealistic given the number of listed buildings and conservation areas.
Issue 49, 50 and 51		Or should we take the lead in demonstrating that we can, indeed become the most sustainable borough in London.	The majority of respondents supported proposals to take the lead in demonstrating that we can become the most sustainable borough in London. In particular, the GLA supported this proposal as it is broadly consistent with the London Plan approach to tackling climate change. Several respondents felt that being the most sustainable borough in London is very difficult to measure and achieve, and policies must be realistic and viable.	Taken forward. Box 10.1 of the Towards Preferred Options	
Box 9.2 Climate change - protecting the local and global environment					
Issue 50, Option i and iii	Options	There are many ways to significantly improve energy efficiency and install renewables without having an aesthetic impact. However Do you find small solar photovoltaic or wind turbines visually unattractive in conservation areas?	The GLA raised concern that this section focused on the impact of renewable energy technology on the townscape character and did not sufficiently address the potential for micro generation, decentralised and renewable energy. You felt that photovoltaics were generally acceptable in conservation areas, as long as they were screened and sensitively designed. However, you saw wind turbines as more visually obtrusive. Several other techniques were also well supported, including Combined Cooling, Heat and Power (CCHP), district heating, green roofs and the reuse / conversion of existing buildings.	Taken forward. Box 10.2, bullet 6	N/A
Issue 49, Option i and ii and		There are many other ways can tackle climate change, some of which are set out in the margin note. Do you have any views on any of the suggestions. Those set out in the margin note include using the Code for Sustainable Homes; reducing parking; requiring green roofs; expecting all large developments to provide a combined heat and power plant and district heating system; establish a borough wide Combined Heat and Power Network; resist mechanical cooling in individual homes; resist demolition; and require that all new buildings be built for a 3 degree level of warming.	There was also support for requiring all new development, including extensions and their associated dwellings, to achieve Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. One respondent also stated that this should apply to major refurbishments, conversions and change to residential use. The GLA particularly supported the proposals for CCHP as these are consistent with the requirements of the London Plan. However, the GLA raised concerns about the use of Biomass. Two respondents expressed concerns about the potential impact of mechanical cooling, lighting and plant use for underground development and the associated energy use should be offset by carbon reductions in the rest of the property.	Taken forward. Box 10.2, bullet 1 to 5	N/A

NEW		If you support the principle of the creation of a new town centre in the north of the borough (see the option in box 5.4c) do you think the Council should promote this as an exemplar for sustainable design - an area where the Council should require the highest environmental standards.	No record of consultation findings found	Taken forward. Box 5.1 of the North Kensington AAP	N/A
Box 9.3 Waste					
Issue 51		How should the borough deal with waste It seems impractical to allocate scarce land for waste treatment facilities alone. 1) explore mixed-use developments, with waste management facilities at ground floor and basement level and with other uses above (this has worked in the past at the Council's Warwick Road Depot, which could be a model for future development). 2) Are there any other options you would like to propose? 3) to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport to support the export of waste	Importance of reducing waste at source. Unsatisfactory use of Cremorne Wharf and limited amounts of waste shipped by river. Need to consider new and innovative waste technologies which may help reduce the amount of space required for waste treatment. Combining land uses could be beneficial by achieving efficient use of space. Consideration of policies and legislation in place. Need of flexibility to enable site-specific circumstances to be taken into account. Sites in the borough are too scarce to be used for waste facilities alone and provision should be mixed use development at ground and basement levels. Some of the Borough's waste disposal practices have adverse consequences: high costs and lack of space or car availability encourages dumping. Need to improve composting too. Agree with proposals in box 9.3 New developments to manage waste on site. If locations for waste management facilities cannot be found in the borough, there is a need to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport to support the export of waste.	1) to provide waste facilities in major developments kept in TPO section 10.4 2) To reopen Cremorne Wharf as a waste management facility was kept in section 3.9	All these options were taken forward and will be included in the forthcoming Waste DPD.
Issue 52	Box 9.4	Flooding	Need to explore waste facilities generating heat and power for local use in mixed-use developments and would need to accommodate the range of facilities that might be required over the lifetime of the Plan. Support for the strategy of maximising the use of existing sites, re-using surplus waste transfer sites and incorporating waste management on the lower floors of multi-storey, mixed-used developments. GLA: need to refer to the Safeguarded status of Cremorne Wharf.		Option taken forward. Cremorne Wharf has a Safeguarded Status and should be used for waste management purposes. It will be included in the forthcoming Waste DPD.

		<p>Flooding was mentioned in this document as a recognition of the existence of the problem but there were no strategic options put forward.</p>	<p>There was no specific question in the consultation regarding flooding. However, we received suggestions from the Environmental Agency and Thames Water among others, which highlighted both the importance of surface water being dealt as close to the source as possible and the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems as a mitigation measure to reduce the impact of development. Other suggestions included the adoption of a drainage hierarchy which puts connecting to a combined sewer at the bottom of the hierarchy and there was support for schemes such as the Thames Tideway Tunnel Development to reduce sewer flooding and measures for retrofitting dwellings at risk from flooding.</p>	<p>Flooding issues are covered in section 10.5 of TPO</p>	<p>No option not taken forward. Flooding policy was developed from the responses to consultations and the development of local knowledge and research.</p>
Box 9.5 Walking and cycling					
Issue 25		<p>Walking and cycling are good for you but traffic can deter many from active involvement – routes can be unpleasant to walk along and it can be frightening to cycle along busy roads.</p>	<p>There was no clear majority view on the issue of proactively promoting walking and cycling and restricting the dominance of cars. Nearly as many favoured incorporating both as favoured the proactive promotion of walking and cycling. A number of alternative measures were suggested. These include more and segregated cycle lanes, the use of 20mph zones, more cycle parking in new developments, an improved pedestrian environment, the use of shared space principles in the public realm and a bicycle rental scheme such as that launched last year in Paris.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 6.4, box 12.2</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Box 9.6 Parking car-ownership/car clubs					
Issues 22		<p>There is intense demand for on-street car parking. As car clubs become more popular and well used, the Council could begin to reduce on-street parking capacity.</p> <p>Options</p> <p>Do you agree that car clubs should be further encouraged to reduce the demand for on-street car parking? Should the space regained from the reduction in car parking spaces be used for other things such as to green travel and other social uses? Should the space be allowed for more tree planting to help mitigate the 'urban heat island' effect?</p> <p>Other Options</p> <p>Are there any other options you would like to propose?</p>	<p>The majority of you were in favour of the car club although, as a relatively new concept, the need for greater evaluation of its benefits was stated by some. The provision of trees and other alternatives to car parking in the street were also generally supported with alternatives including traffic management improvements for walking and cycling. The need to secure travel plans and provide more detailed guidance on car parking levels was also stressed by some. The paucity of vehicle fuelling stations, particularly those that provide LPG, was also raised as an issue for car clubs. There was some concern that car clubs are too expensive and only a useful alternative to the car if one lives close to a car club bay.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 6.3</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Box 9.7 Air quality					

New		The Council offers no strategic alternative to a policy which seeks the integration of land use and transport policy and which reduces the need to travel by car - and therefore which will have a positive impact on air quality. The locating of major trip generating uses in areas which are accessible by foot, by bicycle or by public transport is central to many of the Core Strategy themes, not least keeping life local and fostering vitality.	There was a small response which suggested general support for this approach. The Kensington Society supported the fact that improved air quality should flow from other policies, but considered that the borough should be looking for additional measures to assist the improvement in Air Quality. One respondent stated that air quality has a major impact on health and should be measured at more sites, such as Cheyne Walk which is on the boundary of the extended congestion charge zone.	Taken forward. Box 10.3 of the Towards Preferred Options	N/A
Section 9.8 Nature conservation					
New		Despite the densely built character of the borough there is a surprising variety of habitats with 22 Sites of Nature Conservation Importance designated within its boundaries. However, the opportunity to create further habitats is limited so emphasis will be placed on protecting and enhancing the borough's existing biodiversity resources. This will involve increasing biodiversity in the borough, counteracting habitat fragmentation and recreating and enhancing natural landscapes and features. The challenge will be to integrate these within the dense urban fabric of the borough. No strategic options are therefore being presented.	There were several responses to the lack of a strategic option presented in the Issues and Options report. The Environment Agency feels that it is necessary for more emphasis to be placed on protecting and enhancing biodiversity, ecological and landscape value through the use of buffer zones alongside watercourses (Blue Ribbon Network as defined by the London Plan) and incorporating green/brown roofs and SUDs. The GLA states that the Council should make reference to the London Plan Best Practice Guidance on Development Plan Policies for biodiversity, published in 2005, which sets out details of the policy areas and possible wording for biodiversity policies to be in general conformity with the London Plan.	Taken forward. Box 10.6 of the Towards Preferred Options	N/A
New			The GLA also state that the London Plan requires DPDs to identify areas of deficiency in access to nature and the opportunities for addressing the deficiency, and refers to the London Plan Implementation Report on Improving Londoners Access to Nature. One respondent suggested that the Council should ensure that developments, rather than providing outdoor paving and shrubs, should be required to provide open space, lawns, shade trees and natural open space, which can adsorb rainfall.		The Core Strategy has not identified areas of deficiency to nature conservation as these are identified in the London Plan. The biodiversity resource in the Borough is remarkably rich, with 24 SNCIs. The Core Strategy also proposes to create a network of green corridors linking into the Blue Ribbon Network.

NKKAP I and O

Where come from (where in Issues and Options?)	Box	Policies/options	Summary of response	If this is taken forward - where in the Towards Preferred Options?	Why has option not been taken forward?
Box 3.1 Transport Options					
Box 5.3a-c, 9.5		<p>a) In broad terms, there are two options in relation to public transport. Do we only focus on exploring some additional bus services to mitigate the area's isolation, or should we in addition seek structural changes such as stations at North Pole Road and Crossrail, to improve the quality of life of existing residents, as well as enabling better use of future development opportunities? What other options are there that you believe we should be taking into account?</p> <p>b) In relation to pedestrian accessibility, would you agree that opening up new and improving existing access routes should be a strategic priority?</p>	<p>Many respondents were concerned that the proposals for new rail stations in the north of the Borough, particularly a new Crossrail station, were unrealistic and the need to increase densities, again particularly to feed a new Crossrail station, would have an unacceptable impact on the area. The need and potential value of improvements to the local bus network and the Hammersmith and City line were highlighted. There was divided opinion however and some supported new rail stations in the north of the borough, particularly on the West London Line.</p> <p>There was strong support for improved pedestrian and cycle routes in the north of the borough given the significant physical barriers that exist there, including the Westway, Hammersmith and City line, Canal and main line rail route out of Paddington. There was also strong support for improving links west into Hammersmith and Fulham, particularly White City and the development area to the north of that site when firm development proposals come forward.</p>	Taken forward. Box 12.1	N/A
Box 3.2 Westway					
		<p>Mixed vision for the Westway Trust or focus on a single theme? If mixed: Zone 1: Focus on sports development Zone 2: New business uses Zone 3: New public square and new start up businesses.</p>	Overwhelming support for continuing the approach of developing a mix of uses in the area.	Box 12.3 Towards Preferred Options.	N/A
Box 3.3 Education					
	Box 3.3	Education - Refurbishing existing or build a new school	The vast majority of respondents believed that the Council should pursue the redevelopment of a new school building.	Taken forward. Box 12.4	N/A
Box 3.4 Estate Renewal Options					
		Should the Council focus on the estate that are the hardest and most costly to maintain, or should there be a longer term plan to renew all estates over the next 20 or so years?	<p>There was no consensus, with many of those who responded concerned about any plans to redevelop their homes. In terms of the Stock Options review many suggested that there was a need for an indication of the extent of the renovations needed and the funding. The preferred option report must be flexible enough to accommodate the findings of the review. An increase in densities is not universally supported.</p>	Issue taken forward in Box 9.8 of Towards Preferred Options	N/A
Box 3.5 Economic Activity and Employment Options					

	Should our focus be to continue to plan for and support small enterprises, including those that need a low land value? Another approach might be to look for a more fundamental change to the area to establish a new 'employment hub', that attracts employment to the area and perhaps seek designation as an Opportunity Area in the Mayor's London Plan?	Wide spread support for the Council to plan for small businesses and initiatives which would address barriers to employment.	Taken forward. Box 5.2 of Towards Preferred Options - across the borough rather than just in the former NKAAP area.	The Core Strategy is not suggesting that the Kensal area be designated as an Opportunity Area. There has not been widespread support for this designation, with the GLA being questioning whether the nature of development envisaged being of the necessary scale. This position will be kept under review.
Box 4.1 Three Areas for Action Areas				
	Should there be a single North Kensington Area Action Plan, of three for the Kensal, Latimer Road and Portobello Areas?	Mixed views – but more support for continuation with one document. It was felt that this will allow for a more strategic approach, particularly with regard to transport. In addition, three separate action plans would require a change to the Local Development Scheme – and each plan on its own may not warrant an area action plan.	North Kensington Plan was combined with Core Strategy at Towards Preferred Options stage as this and the Issues and Options consultation highlighted just how important the regeneration of the north of the Borough is and how it is integral to achieving an effective and truly "spatial" core strategy.	N/A
Box 4.2 Kensal area				
option i	Modest change (reference to estate renewal in Wornington which now forms part of Golborne/Trellick) - This would involve largely maintaining the status quo with the exception of the Wornington redevelopment. Retail provision would continue at the present level and there would only be minimal changes in terms of employment growth	Only one respondent favoured this option as it was believed (incorrectly) that the other options would result in gentrification.	Not taken forward	This option is unsuitable of the area the potential of Kensal. The area has the potential to be significantly regenerated and this option does not allow for this to be undertaken.
option ii	Medium change - This would involve developing several estates together with more retail provision and an expansion of employment opportunities with improved bus services	Whilst this approach has a degree of public support. It is not supported by the evidence base including the Council's Pre-Feasibility Study which acknowledges that there is potential to deliver a "viable, transformational project"	Not taken forward	This option is unsuitable of the area the potential of Kensal. The area has the potential to be significantly regenerated and this option does not allow for this to be undertaken.
option iii	Significant change - This would involve developing several estates. It would also involve striving for a Crossrail Station which would significantly improve public transport accessibility.	This approach was largely supported by consultees who believed that a Crossrail station could unlock a great deal of potential for the area. Comments received also encouraged the provision of social and community facilities to be an essential part of any redevelopment	Taken forward. Box 13.3a and 13.3b	N/A
Box 4.3 Latimer				
option i	Modest Change - This option would not involve estate renewal. The retail and employment offer would remain similar to the existing. The employment zones would be retained and there would be minor improvements to the public realm. Access to White City would be increased.	Two workshops were held in the area. There was a high number of supporters for modest change at the second workshop, with many respondents citing a 'no change' approach.	Not taken forward	This option was not favoured by the majority of respondents, and furthermore would not have been found to be encouraging regeneration in north Kensington, which is fundamental to the overall vision of the Core Strategy.

option ii	Medium Change - This would involve redevelopment of one or two of the estates. Applications for business uses would be more favourably considered throughout the area, not just in employment zones. There would be a moderate increase in retail provision. Access to White City would be increased.	This option received a very low rate of response and was generally unwelcome.	Not taken forward	This option was not favoured by the majority of respondents, and furthermore would not have been found to be encouraging regeneration in north Kensington, which is fundamental to the overall vision of the Core Strategy.
option iii	Significant Change - This would involve comprehensive redevelopment of several estates together with the Kensington Sports Centre, with the fundamental assumption that the sports centre should be reprovred. This would result in a more mixed tenure community, potentially a new neighbourhood shopping centre around Latimer Road and a new high quality open space for the surrounding residents. Access to White City would be increased.	The significant change option received the highest numbers of votes and general support.	Taken forward. Box 13.5a and 13.5b	N/A

Box 4.5a Portobello and Westbourne Grove Spatial area.

Portobello and Westbourne area was not considered at Initial Issues and Options stage.

<p>The starting point for the Issues and Options Consultation was that there was a need to protect the special retail character of the area. Each option (the modest, medium and significant change options) included policies to attempt to safeguard small units, use S106 agreements to provide 'affordable shopping units', as well as streetscape improvements to the area. The options were:</p> <p>Modest change option, protect retail character of the area with town centre boundaries remaining the same.</p> <p>Medium change option involves extending the retail offer eastwards between Portobello and Westbourne Grove.</p>	<p>There is overwhelming support, demonstrated both from the response to the initial and this recent issues and options consultation on the core strategy and the issues and options consultation on the NKAAP, for the protection of the special retail character of Portobello Road, its market and antiques trade included. There is support for the range of measures that may help achieve this, including the provision of affordable retail units, resisting the amalgamation of smaller units and the like.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 13.6 of Towards Preferred Options</p>	N/A
	<p>There have been relatively few comments concerning the expansion of the Portobello Road east towards Westbourne Grove, and no consensus of views. There was however only very limited support for linking Portobello to Westbourne Grove. Concerns were raised that any expansion the associated alterations to Portobello Court could harm the amenity of the area. Some consultees, including the GLA noted that any expansion should only be entertained if supported by identified retail need.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Box 13.6 of Towards Preferred Options</p>	N/A
		<p>Not taken forward in entirety</p>	<p>The Council does not endorse the wholesale expansion of the Portobello Road to Westbourne Grove. Such an approach would not be supported by the Council's Retail Needs Assessment, which notes that there is only limited scope for expansion in the short and medium term. Expansion may be suitable where it may strengthen the draw of both centres, yet where it is designed in such a way as not to dilute the individual characters of each centre</p>

		Significant change option, involve extending retail provision both eastwards and northwards.	There have been relatively few comments concerning the expansion of the Portobello Road north and east . A number of consultees supported expanding the market stalls northwards to increase the links between the north end of Portobello Road and Golborne Road, but this did not include discussion regarding the northward expansion of shop units themselves. It was also noted that many of the existing pitches remain unused and that the expansion of pitches may prove fruitless. A vision for Golborne was suggested and that its 'gentrification' should be resisted. There was only very limited support for linking Portobello to Westbourne Grove. Concerns were raised that the associated alterations to Portobello Court could harm the amenity of the area. Some consultees, including the GLA noted that any expansion should only be entertained if supported by identified retail need.	Not taken forward in entirety	Whilst the Council seeks to improve links between the Portobello Road and Golborne Road, the Council is not intending to promote the expansion the retail offer northward. Northward expansion is not supported by the Council's Retail Needs Assessment. The RNA concludes that the "viability of extending the Portobello Road frontage northwards is... limited.... A major redevelopment of the area would be required to create active frontages on to this section of Portobello Road, but the shop units provided would be a significant distance from the prime shopping area in Portobello Road." In the view of the RNA "it would be more difficult to attract operators to this area because pedestrian flows are likely to be much lower." This situation may change if significant new residential development is to occur in the area, development probably based on a new Crossrail station up at Kensal. Furthermore expansion of the retail offer (rather than links) has not been endorsed by consultees.
--	--	--	---	-------------------------------	---

Box 4.5a Notting Hill Gate

NEW	Issue	The introduction to this section summarises various issues facing the Notting Hill Gate District Centre.	Several of you suggested that Notting Hill Gate should be considered as a separate plan or area, especially as the location, issues and vision are unique to this centre. The issues relating to Notting Hill Gate district centre raised during the consultation generally include a poor quality shopping experience with little character; poor pedestrian environment with vehicle dominance and proliferation of street furniture; a lack of central focus, iconic buildings and sense of welcome; too many large multiples and chain stores which result in the loss of small independent shops and businesses; the proliferation of estate agents, bureau de change and coffee shops; and the retention of the farmers market.	Taken forward. Box 13.7 of the Towards Preferred Options	N/A
NEW	Option i	Should the modest change option be pursued? This would involve the refurbishment of the post-war buildings.	There was little support for the option of least change.	Not taken forward	There was little support for this option during the consultation.
NEW	Option ii	Should the medium change option be pursued? This would involve the recladding of the post-war buildings to change their external appearance, and improvements to the street.	There was generally equal support for reusing the existing buildings with improvements to the external appearance and redevelopment of most if not all of the buildings. Metro Shopping Fund supports the option to reuse existing buildings (Option 2) as the only economically viable option, given the length of leases, ownerships and implications for trade. Metro Shopping Fund also states that the reuse of existing buildings has fewer environmental impacts.	Taken forward. Box 13.7 (Alternative 1) of the Towards Preferred Options	N/A

NEW	Option iii	Should the significant change option be pursued? This would involve the redevelopment of much if not all of the post-war buildings, along with improvements to the street.	There was generally equal support for reusing the existing buildings with improvements to the external appearance and redevelopment of most if not all of the buildings. One respondent considered that the higher densities and additional housing in Option 3 would result in wider regeneration benefits for the centre, and another expressed a desire to retain the small business units. The GLA broadly supports redevelopment, but requires greater emphasis on environmental sustainability and promoting sustainable modes of transport. The Notting Hill Gate Improvements Group supports an iconic redevelopment of Newcombe House, creating a “wow” factor such as Barkers or the Gherkin. The Improvements Group, together with many of the respondents, strongly promotes a new enlarged square as a central focus and opportunity to accommodate the farmers market. In terms of building heights, views were mixed, with some respondents prioritising exceptional building quality and others prioritising smaller scale buildings as an alternative to Westfield London.	Taken forward. Box 13.7 (Alternative 2) of the Towards Preferred Options	N/A
-----	------------	--	---	--	-----

Box 5.1 Kensal Sites					
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--

	option a)	Should each four sites be developed in a piecemeal fashion, as each becomes available	Consultation asked if you believe that each of the sites should be developed as they became available or if you felt that a comprehensive approach should be taken to establish a mixed-use environmentally responsible development in the longer term. It also asked if you felt that sustainability should be at the heart of the redevelopment and what importance you gave to bridging the tracks in order to integrate the site to the wider area. The majority of responses supported the proposal that sustainability be at the heart of the development. The grouping of the sites for comprehensive development was broadly supported by respondents, including the GLA, but many thought that this should only be pursued as long as it does not delay development beyond 50 years. Cross London Rail Links Ltd state that the Crossrail Bill (now Crossrail Act) seeks power to permanently relocate EWS to the North Pole Depot and will also seek to safeguard the Gasworks site for Railway options. However the fact that it is safeguarded does not necessarily mean that development cannot take place.	Not taken forward	This option is not suitable if the Site is to create widescale regeneration. Whilst it is acknowledged that the development will have to be phased. The Council has been advised by GoL and GLA support joint working amongst stakeholders and it is believed that by adopting a more united approach, a better end result which can deliver the vision of the Core Strategy can be realised.
	option b)	Should a comprehensive approach be taken to establish a mixed-use Eco-Town in the longer term		Taken forward. Box 13.3a and 13.3b	N/A
	option c)	Do you agree that sustainability should be at heart of this redevelopment if it went ahead		Taken forward. Box 13.3a and 13.3b	N/A
	option d)	Bridging the track has significant visibility issues. How important do you think it is that priority is given to bridging the tracks the integrate the site and the wider area		Taken forward. Box 13.3a and 13.3b	N/A

Box 5.2 Kensington Sports Centre					
----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

NEW	Issue	In relation to the sports centre, it is assumed that facilities at least as good as, if not better than, the existing, need to be provided. Would you wish to see	Some respondents stated that the swimming pool should be retained for public use and one respondent mentioned that they did not want to see redevelopment, because the sports centre has only recently been refurbished.	Strategic Site in Box 13.5b of the Towards Preferred Options	Taken forward, although not in much detail at TPO stage
-----	-------	---	--	--	---

NEW	Option a)	A new sports centre rebuilt on its existing site? Would you be happy to see housing on part of this site to fund the new sports centre, or would you prefer another use next to the sports centre?	Most respondents favoured this option. There was recognition that the site is currently underused and could potentially accommodate a school and sports facilities.	Strategic Site in Box 13.5b of the Towards Preferred Options	Taken forward, although not in much detail at TPO stage
NEW	Option b)	The new sports centre built in another location, and if so, where? To what use would you put the existing sports centre site?	There was little support for this option.	Not taken forward	There was little support for this option during the consultation.
Box 5,3 Worrington Estate					
New	Issue & Options	Redevelopment of the site, using funds from private housing, will allow the existing social housing to be replaced with social housing to a much higher standard, and that will be easier to maintain in the long term. If redevelopment does not go ahead, what other options are there for significant improvements to the quality of the existing social housing provision?	In order to facilitate the redevelopment and to create a social mix, there was general support by those consulted for mixed tenure housing. The majority of respondents emphasised that affordable property to buy and rent should be available, with current residents and local people given priority. The GLA generally supports the renewal of the estate provided that there is no loss of affordable housing. There was limited support amongst those who responded for the exploration of a sensitive refurbishment of the estate as a viable alternative to the extensive redevelopment of the site. The Kensington Housing Trust stressed that an assessment of the implications of leaving the estate as it is has been carried out. The outcome of the assessment concluded that this approach would result in the existing housing becoming unusable within twenty years.	Taken forward. Box 13.4b of the TPO	N/A

Towards Preferred Options

Where come from (Interim Issues and Options or NKAAP Issues and Options)	Box No.	"Preferred options and alternatives (where present)	Summary of response	If this is taken forward to the June 09 Places and sites document?	Taken forward to draft plan July 09?	Why has option not been taken forward? (NB only include if rejected at this stage. Reason for taking forward will be explained at the end of the process)
Section 2.7		The spatial vision				
Box 2.2		<p>Maintaining the Borough's Excellence The borough will remain one of the most desirable places to live, with a very high standard of historic environment with 70% of the borough as conservation areas. Development opportunities will be seen as a means of meeting immediate needs, such as the demand for housing. New bus services will provide better north-south links across the borough. Car dependency will have been reduced with a consequent rise in air quality. The predicted expansion in demand for retail after 2012 will be accommodated in the existing town centres in the south of the borough. Existing employment uses will be protected. Existing social and community facilities will be protected. Carbon reduction will largely rely on micro-generation.</p> <p>Improving an Excellent Borough The borough will remain one of the most desirable places to live, with a very high standard of historic environment with 70% of the borough as conservation areas. Through the careful planning of development opportunities, wider regeneration benefits will be achieved, even though this may put off meeting some immediate needs, leading to possibly two new town centres in the north of the borough. One, or perhaps two, new stations will be opened in the north of the borough, as well as improvements in bus services north-south. Car dependency will have been reduced with a consequent rise in air quality. The predicted expansion in demand for retail after 2012 will be accommodated across the borough, including in the north at Notting Barns West and at Kensal, where masterplans for the future of these areas will have been prepared. Life expectancy in the north of the borough will be significantly improved.</p> <p>Existing employment uses will be protected and new office uses established in or near town centres. Existing social and community facilities will be protected, and in those areas without good access to these facilities at present, s.106 contributions will be used to improve access. Carbon reduction will be achieved through a district heating and power network, with the main centres of these being on the major development sites.</p>	<p>There was considerable support for the second of the two alternative visions, "Improving an Excellent Borough". The GOL representation stated "...Improving an excellent borough' supports the future additional growth of the borough whilst the alternative vision 'Maintaining the borough's excellence' is a business as usual approach. They did not consider that the status quo option was a real strategic spatial option.</p>		<p>Not taken forward.</p> <p>Taken forward to CV1 , Vision for the Royal Borough: Building on success, and to the visions of each of the seven strategic objectives.</p>	<p>As set out by GOL and a number of other consultees, merely maintaining what we have is not a viable vision for the future.</p> <p>N/A</p>
Box 3.3						

Introduced at this stage.

	<p>Do you agree that Kensington High Street will continue to enjoy its role as Major centre, containing a wide range of comparison shops meeting the needs of residents and those visiting the borough. To this end, the council will seek to ensure that the centre's retail offer is not diminished, and that the offer, whatever its nature, will be of the highest quality and will ensure that the High Street remains a shopping 'destination'. The Council will work with shop keepers, land owners and other stakeholders to make the most of the opportunities associated with the opening of Westfield London. Kensington High Street will continue to act as the service centre for residents in both Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster, providing the shops and uses which will meet their day-to-day needs. New development within the Kensington High Street will support the centre's function as a location for small offices.</p>	<p>Ten responses received. Most respondents recognise that Kensington High Street is likely to be under considerable pressure from the opening of Westfield London, and that a vision is essential if the High Street is to retain a role. The vision for the centre must be about positioning the High Street for the long rather than the short and medium term. This vision should be developed with the key stakeholders and included in the next iteration of the plan. Two of our key stakeholders, the GLA and the Kensington Society, specifically support the Council's ambition that the High Street remains a key location for small offices. The detailed vision still needs agreement, although there is a general recognition that the High Street is unlikely to be able to compete with Westfield on its own terms, and therefore that it must offer a unique shopping experience</p>	<p>Vision taken forward to Chapter 13, the Kensington High Street Place.</p>	<p>Taken forward</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Box 3.4a Vision for Earl's Court Spatial Area</p>					
<p>Box 3.4</p>	<p>Earl's Court Possible Vision for Earl's Court Spatial Area Do you agree that... The Earl's Court one way system must be unravelled. The connectivity between Earl's Court Town Centre and the Exhibition Centre site must be improved. Create better pedestrian access across Cromwell Road to allow Warwick Road residents improved connection to Earl's Court Town Centre. This would form part of a wider improvement scheme of Cromwell Road, such as boulevard planting and other public realm enhancements. The pedestrian connections between different tube and rail stations should be improved to make the most of the interchange potential. The future role of Brompton Cemetery may be reconsidered. While it needs to maintain its primary role of honouring past generations, is there scope for it to offer wider recreational benefits?</p>	<p>Thirty responses received. There was general support for the Council's possible vision for the Earl's Court Spatial area. New development should be mixed use – and any vision for the area should emphasise the opportunities for new development to provide for the social infrastructure of the area. The majority of those who responded support the provision of a convention centre on the Earls Court Exhibition Centre, although interestingly this vision is not necessarily shared by the owners of the site who see the core strategy as "a major opportunity to create high quality landmark development of a mix of uses". The Towards Preferred Options document asked whether there was scope for the Brompton Cemetery to offer wider recreation benefits whilst maintaining its primary role of honouring past generations. There was a general recognition that this was the case.</p>	<p>The option taken forward is a mixture of all the three alternatives: mixed use development including residential and office with a convention centre at its heart as it was seen as the more feasible after the consultation process. This issues were included in Chapter 5 of the Places document.</p>	<p>Option taken forward to Chapter 10, Earl's Court Place of the document</p>	<p>Taken Forward</p>
<p>Box 3.4b Alternative Options for Earls Court</p>					

	Alternative Options for Earl's Court: Do you support any of these? Office-led mixed use development. An office-led mixed use development would make the most of one of the few remaining highly accessible development sites within the borough as it is close to Earl's Court and West Brompton Underground Stations. There are very few other potential employment sites within the borough, which would make a suitable employment development site, mixed with residential. It therefore makes it an ideal candidate for such a development and could potentially involve changes to the town centre boundary. Residential-led mixed use development Residential development located in highly accessible locations such as Earl's Court promotes sustainable living and would improve the vitality of the town centre, particularly the evening economy. A residential led development would enable the provision of additional social infrastructure such as new health and education facilities. A development which is predominantly housing would also assist in providing additional affordable housing in the borough. Convention /Exhibition Centre (this could	Thirty responses received. There was general support for the Council's possible vision for the Earl's Court Spatial area. New development should be mixed use – and any vision for the area should emphasise the opportunities for new development to provide for the social infrastructure of the area. The majority of those who responded support the provision of a convention centre on the Earls Court Exhibition Centre, although interestingly this vision is not necessarily shared by the owners of the site who see the core strategy as "a major opportunity to create high quality landmark development of a mix of uses". The Towards Preferred Options document asked whether there was scope for the Brompton Cemetery to offer wider recreation benefits whilst maintaining its primary role of honouring past generations. There was a general recognition that this was the case.	The option taken forward is a mixture of all the three alternatives: mixed use development including residential and office with a convention centre at its heart as it was seen as the more feasible after the consultation process. This issues were included in Chapter 8 of the Strategic Sites document.	Option taken forward to Chapter 26, Earl's Court Place of the document	Taken Forward
Box 3.4c Warwick Road					
	Policy Direction for the Warwick Road sites To achieve a coordinated design approach of the four sites for housing-led mixed use development to cater for the needs of new residents whilst respecting the needs of the wider area. The site will also include provision for a new school and public open space.	Warwick Road was part of the Earl's Court Spatial area. For this spatial area as a whole, thirty responses were received. There was general support for the Council's possible vision for the Earl's Court Spatial area. New development should be mixed use – and any vision for the area should emphasise the opportunities for new development to provide for the social infrastructure of the area. The majority of those who responded support the provision of a convention centre on the Earls Court Exhibition Centre, although interestingly this vision is not necessarily shared by the owners of the site who see the core strategy as "a major opportunity to create high quality landmark development of a mix of uses". The Towards Preferred Options document asked whether there was scope for the Brompton Cemetery to offer wider recreation benefits whilst maintaining its primary role of honouring past generations. There was a general recognition that this was the case.	Option taken forward to Chapter 7 of the Strategic Sites.	Option taken forward to Warwick Road Strategic Site	Taken Forward
Box 3.5 South Kensington Museums Complex Spatial Area					
Box 5.5d Interim Issues and Options	Do you agree that...the Council is right to support the designation of the South Kensington museums complex as a Strategic Cultural Area and will ensure arts and cultural uses within this area are protected and enhanced. The area is generally considered worthy of World Heritage status. The Council recognises the need to improve the visitor experience while ensuring any improvement to the museums and South Kensington District Centre not only benefits tourists but also local residents. The Council will continue to work in partnership with the City of Westminster and the Mayor for London in delivering the Exhibition Road Project.	There was support for the view that improvements to the public realm must benefit locals and tourists alike. It was recognised that there are particular opportunities in South Kensington for improving the quality of the public transport interchange of the London underground station, unravelling of the one-way system, and for the improvements to the pedestrian tunnel and the transformation of Exhibition Road. The respondees also pointed out that much of the built environment was of the highest quality, lying within conservation areas and containing a large number of listed buildings. Development within the area must respect the built environment.	Vision taken forward to Chapter 11, the South Kensington Place.	Taken forward	N/A

Box 3.6		Kings Road/Sloane Square Spatial Area				
Introduced at this stage.		<p>Box 3.7 Possible vision for King's Road and Sloane Square: Do you agree that the King's Road will build on its strengths as a 'vital' and successful town centre and accommodate a significant amount of the comparison retail growth identified as being required after 2012 within the south of the borough. Where possible the Council will look to accommodate the need for new shopping within the existing centre, but will look to expand the centre where necessary and where appropriate "edge of centre sites" can be identified. The Council will build upon the King's Road's status as an iconic 'shopping street' and encourage uses which build upon the remaining character and diversity within the centre. The area will be improved by the removal of visual clutter and by making pedestrian movement easier. The Council will encourage uses that help support the Royal Court Theatre and the Saatchi Gallery, and endorse new arts and cultural uses in the centre</p>	<p>There was general support of the Council's vision to build upon the centre's strengths as a 'vital' town centre. These strengths include the draw of the centres cultural uses (both those identified within the Towards Preferred Options document and those not). There was also recognition by some that Sloane Square is in need of improvement. Improvements to the environment will help ensure that the area stays attractive in the face of increased competition. One consultees suggested that Kings Road, Sloane Square and Sloane Street to be identified as a collective International Centre as all contain first class shopping facilities which are world renowned. Care must however be taken to retain the character of the area, with one consultee stating that the Council should resist the temptation to expand retail occupancy with non boutique shops</p>	<p>Vision taken forward to Chapter 12, the King's Road/Sloane Square Place.</p>	<p>Taken forward</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Box 3.7		Knightsbridge Spatial Area				
Introduced at this stage.		<p>Box 3.6 - Possible vision for Knightsbridge: Do you agree that...Knightsbridge will continue to enjoy its role as an International Centre, containing a wide range of globally attractive comparison shopping. The loss of shops in the core areas of the centre will be resisted. Knightsbridge will continue to act as the service centre for residents in both Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster, providing the shops and uses which will meet their day-to-day needs. The streetscape will be improved, making the centre a more attractive place to visit and in which to shop. This will include the street improvements to Basil Street and the corner of Hans Crescent and Hans Road</p>	<p>There is general support for Knightsbridge remaining an International Town Centre. The Kensington Society were of the view that active management is required if the centre is to retain its position with competition from a revitalised and managed West End and the new Westfield London centre. Its role as major hotel and office centre is also seen to be significant. The importance of maintaining Knightsbridge as a centre serving local residents was also noted as was the need to improve the streetscape/ pedestrian environment. Some residents were concerned that the town centre uses should not be allowed to spread into the neighbouring residential areas whilst others considered that the secondary & tertiary retail units in side streets that serve to blur the commercial and residential elements of Knightsbridge to the particular benefit of local residents.</p>	<p>Vision taken forward to Chapter 10, the King's Road/Sloane Square Place.</p>	<p>Taken forward</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Box 3.8a		Lots Road and World's End Area				

Box 3.8	<p>Possible Vision for Lots Road and World's End Area Do you agree that...</p> <p>As this area is a vibrant mix of land uses the vision is multifaceted. The overall vision for this area however needs to focus on the general improvement of the environment. The Lots Road Power Station site development will play a vital role in improving the vitality of the area and the implementation of the planning permission should be encouraged. A major component of this would be to revitalise the World's End Estate given its dominance over the Lots Road area. An essential aspect of this would be the improved integration of the World's End Estate to draw people towards the King's Road which would both improve the level of activity there as well as better serve the community of the Estate.</p>	<p>4.18 Eight responses received. There was little agreement regarding the future for the Lots Road spatial area. Whilst there was some support for the comprehensive development of the area and the need to revitalise the Worlds End Estate some consultees are concerned that this section lacks any real vision – and suggest that the Council should designate the area as an Area Action Plan. Concerns are raised that the Council does not appear to fully recognise the problems within the area, including the problems of rat-running, poor public transport (with the new station at Imperial Wharf already being nearly at capacity), poorly maintained car parking, the lack of social and community facilities as well as the problems associated with the Worlds End Estate. These consultees are also concerned about the design of the new secondary school in the area and, in some cases the development currently being built out on the Lots Road Power Station Site.</p> <p>There was some concern that designation of the entire area as a spatial area was an over simplification given the radically differing character of the different areas. These views were not however universal. Taking the Lots Road power station site, for example, another consultees wanted the Council to further emphasise its qualities and the contribution that it would play in helping creating mixed and balanced communities. Similarly one consultee's rejection of the Employment Zone designation was countered by the GLA's strong support for its function. Questions were raised concerning the future use of the waste site at Cremorne Wharf.</p>	<p>The need to revitalise the Worlds End Estate by providing mixed uses and recognising the problems within the area including poor public transport and the lack of social and community facilities is included in the vision for the area. Investigating the possibility of the designation of a conservation area in Lots Road area is also included.</p>	<p>Taken forward on chapter 18 of the draft Plan on July 09</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Box 3.8b Policy Direction for the Lots Road Power Station Site					
	<p>Policy Direction for the Lots Road Power Station Site</p> <p>A High quality, high density residential mixed use development, containing a significant element of business supporting the sites location within the Lots Road Employment Zone. A mixed and balanced community, including a significant element of affordable housing. The inclusion of a significant retail element, (possibly resulting in the designation as a local centre,) to assist in meeting the day-to-day shopping needs of residents of this part of the borough. A local concentration of social and community uses to serve the local community.</p>	<p>4.18 Eight responses received. There was little agreement regarding the future for the Lots Road spatial area. Whilst there was some support for the comprehensive development of the area and the need to revitalise the Worlds End Estate some consultees are concerned that this section lacks any real vision – and suggest that the Council should designate the area as an Area Action Plan. Concerns are raised that the Council does not appear to fully recognise the problems within the area, including the problems of rat-running, poor public transport (with the new station at Imperial Wharf already being nearly at capacity), poorly maintained car parking, the lack of social and community facilities as well as the problems associated with the Worlds End Estate. These consultees are also concerned about the design of the new secondary school in the area and, in some cases the development currently being built out on the Lots Road Power Station Site.</p>	<p>This strategic site was not included in the Strategic Sites Document in June 09. However, it was included in later iterations of the Core Strategy for information purposes on the approved application for the site.</p>	<p>Taken forward on chapter 27 of the draft Plan on July 09</p>	<p>Taken forward</p>

			There was some concern that designation of the entire area as a spatial area was an over simplification given the radically differing character of the different areas. These views were not however universal. Taking the Lots Road power station site, for example, another consultees wanted the Council to further emphasise its qualities and the contribution that it would play in helping creating mixed and balanced communities. Similarly one consultee's rejection of the Employment Zone designation was countered by the GLA's strong support for its function. Questions were raised concerning the future use of the waste site at Cremorne Wharf.			
Box 4.2		Social and Community Uses				
Box 4.2		The Council recognises that the heart of the borough lies in its community and the need to provide for communities' needs locally, such as local shops and social and community facilities, which are accessible to all and allows community life to flourish	There was widespread support for the Council's ambition to maintain a mix of uses within the borough, and to provide for the communities needs locally. Particular value was placed, by some, upon medical uses and upon the provision of local shops.		Taken forward. CK 1	N/A
Box 4.3		Walkable Neighbourhoods				
Box 4.3		<p>The Council recognises the need for social and community uses and local retail to be conveniently located so that they are accessible to all by foot.</p> <p>The Council will establish an appropriate walking time for the borough and work with providers to help ensure that everywhere within the borough is within of the established walking time of a "day-to-day" or "local" use.</p> <p>The Council will ensure that our existing stock of 'local' uses are not depleted</p>	There is widespread support for the concept of the walkable neighbourhood(including support from the GLA), although no consensus on what a reasonable walking time to a range of facilities should be – five or ten minutes. The need to recognise "cycling neighbourhoods" was also suggested by one consultee. The concept of walkable neighbourhoods was also supported by residents' groups		Taken forward. CK 3	N/A
Box 4.4		Local Retail				
Box 5.4b		The Council will support the provision of local shopping and other local uses throughout the borough. Whilst these uses will be encouraged to locate within existing town centres the Council recognises that there may be circumstances where this is not possible. In many cases this could be resolved by allowing isolated local uses un areas within easy reach of the potential users.	Overall the key message was that the policy needs to be flexible in terms of providing for local retail needs. There was a concern that there was no definition of what 'edge of centre' means exactly. It was considered that key services needs to be reassessed.		Taken forward. CK 2, CF TP2 and CF TP3	N/A
Box 4.5		Education -				
Boxes 4.4 and 12.4		The Council will seek to ensure that primary schools are within a reasonable walkable distance from every home in the borough. New and extended education provision funded through Building Schools for the Future will be supported by the Council.	Consultees supported the wide spread provision of primary schools. There was however some concern that the document was not making explicit links between housing supply and education requirements. Comments were received stating that all levels of education, not just primary schools, were of importance.		Taken forward. CK 1	N/A
Box 4.6		Health Facilities				

Box 4.5		The Council will work in partnership with the Kensington and Chelsea Primary Care Trust and the private medical sector to ensure that high quality, accessible health care facilities are provided in areas of need, and existing facilities are improved, so that the needs of the current and future population are catered for. The Council will require new health facilities provision where the Primary Care Trust identify such a need and will seek Section 106 funding for such facilities.	There was a concern that this section referred only to the PCT. All health providers (including medical training facilities) operating within the borough should also be acknowledged. Reference to the role of S106 is needed, particularly identifying what further health facilities could be provided by S106 agreements. There was a request for health 'hotspots' to be mapped and illustrated in this section.		Taken forward. CK 1	N/A
Box 4.7 Facilities for Police						
Box 4.6		There will be a presumption in favour of the creation of new police facilities if the facility will improve services to the public and help reduce crime. This presumption will normally override other policy provisions. The LDF will contain policies which support the specific land use requirements of the Metropolitan Police Authority when these have been identified.	Those few consultees who made comments on this section supported this policy approach and the continued joint working with the Police.		Taken forward. CK 1	N/A
Box 4.3 Walkable Neighbourhoods						
Box 5.4b of Interim Issues and Options		Box 4.3 of the TPO consultation introduces the "walkable neighbourhood." The Council recognises the need for social and community uses and local retail to be conveniently located so that they are accessible to all by foot. The Council will establish an appropriate walking time for the borough and work with providers to help ensure that everywhere within the borough is within of the established walking time of a "day-to-day" or "local" use. The Council will ensure that our existing stock of 'local' uses are not depleted.	Eleven responses received. There is widespread support for the concept of the walkable neighbourhood, although no consensus on what a reasonable walking time to a range of facilities should be – five or ten minutes. The need to recognise "cycling neighbourhoods" was also suggested by one consultee as was a request for the Council to reassess the reasonable public transport journey time. The current 30 minute journey was considered by the consultee to be too long.		Taken forward to SP Local Shopping Facilities and SP Walkable Neighbourhoods and Neighbourhood facilities in July 09 Draft Plan	N/A
5.4b?? Box 4.4 Local Retail						
	Box 4 and 5.4b	The Council will support the provision of local shopping and other uses throughout the borough. These will be encouraged within the town centres, but the Council recognises that there may be circumstances where this is not possible. We will work with supermarkets to establish whether convenience needs of our residents can be met within existing centres or by expansion of our centres.	Overall the key message was that the policy needs to be flexible in terms of providing for local retail needs. There was a concern that there was no definition of what 'edge of centre' means exactly. It was considered that key services needs to be reassessed.		Taken forward to SP Local Shopping Facilities and SP Walkable Neighbourhoods and Retail TPO in July 09 Draft Plan Not taken forward.	N/A The Council will base its support for new convenience shopping floorspace in the retail need assessment and the "walkable neighbourhood". It endorses the town centre first approach set out within PPS6 and the London Plan. Expansion of centres will only be appropriate where it can be shown that need cannot be met within the centre.
Box 5.1 Fostering Vitality						

Box 5 Interim Issues and Options		<p>Box 5.1 confirms the Councils intention to encourage diversity of uses within the core strategy.</p>	<p>The consultation showed widespread support for a core strategy which encourages the maintenance, or the creation of, a diverse borough which contains a mix of residential, commercial and local need uses. Many consultees noted that there was no reason why residential and commercial uses could not coexist happily. Good design is integral to the creation of a successful and diverse area. Some consultees suggested that new commercial uses, and in particular retail or office uses, should generally be located within existing town centres. Others stressed the need to continue to prioritise residential uses over others, perhaps as part of a new mixed use development.</p>		<p>Taken forward to Vision of Fostering Vitality in July 09 Draft Plan</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Box 5.2 Businesses</p>						
Box 5.7a and Box 5.7b, 5.7c of Interim Issues and Options		<p>Box 5.2 Businesses. Indicative policy direction The Council will protect all light industrial uses in the borough with the aim of ensuring no net loss of light industrial use. Where changes are permitted an equivalent amount of floorspace of similar accessibility must be provided, except where the change is to logistics, utilities, transport functions, waste and recycling expansion facilities. The Council will explore the potential for the provision of further office floorspace in addition to the existing supply made up of existing provision and schemes with planning permission.</p>	<p>Many respondents stated that the LDF should continue to protect and focus employment in existing employment zones and not impose a blanket protection on all other existing employment in the borough. A large number of respondents also supported the opportunity for schemes to come forward that could provide alternative benefits to office provision.</p> <p>Some respondents said the policy is too simplistic in its approach and does not provide flexibility where existing office is considered to be no longer feasible. The GLA made further comment on this aspect by suggesting that new mixed use development can facilitate the re-provision, rejuvenation and increase in office provision. On the other hand, the LDA amongst others support the vision to promote the town centres function as a location for small offices and that smaller units provide a more sustainable employment provision than large office buildings.</p>		<p>Taken forward to SP Location of Business Uses, SP Employment Zones and Light Industrial and Offices TPO in Fostering Vitality chapter of July 09 Draft Plan.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Box 5.7a and Box 5.7b, 5.7c of Interim Issues and Options		<p>The Council will protect office uses of all sizes within town centres which will be retained within this plan period unless future demand changes.</p>			<p>Taken forward to SP Location of Business Uses and Offices TPO in Fostering Vitality chapter of July 09 Draft Plan.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Box 5.7a and Box 5.7b, 5.7c of Interim Issues and Options		<p>In addition to the above, the Latimer Road, Kensal Road and Lots Road Employment Zones are protected for employment activity</p>			<p>Taken forward to SP Location of Business Uses, SP Employment Zones and Light Industrial and Offices TPO in Fostering Vitality chapter of July 09 Draft Plan.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Box 5.7a and Box 5.7b, 5.7c of Interim Issues and Options		<p>Affordable business space obtained through the use of planning obligations will be applied to appropriate developments.</p>			<p>Not taken forward.</p>	<p>The Council has chosen not to take forward a policy to require the provision of affordable business space (via s106 agreements) as there was considerable concern from stakeholders that this would create an unlevel playing field - with providers of business premises being unable to compete with these affordable premises. The Council does however support initiatives which give local people a way into the business sector. This includes working with NOVA new opportunities, and the Portobello Business Centre to provide personalised training and support to residents who wish to support their own business.</p>

Box 5.3 New Town Centres					
Box 5.4 c of Interim Issues and Options		Box 5.3 The Council will work towards the creation of two new town centres in the north of the borough, in the Kensal and Notting Barns West areas. The function of a centre at Notting Barns West would be to serve the day to day needs of local resident and visitors. The nature of a centre at Kensal Road would depend on the nature of the development in the area and the proximity of a Crossrail station. If the strategic London-wide campus is preferred, provision is likely to be for a local centre. The alternative of a significant mixed use development would be of a larger scale, possibly a district centre	There was support for the creation of two new town centres in the north of the borough, although a number of consultees noted that the Council will have to be able to demonstrate that there is a "need" for these new centres. Some consultees noted that a new centre in the Kensal area would, in their view, be dependent on the creation of a new Crossrail station, but that the creation of such a station is still very much uncertain. In any case a new centre at Kensal is much more likely to be of a scale appropriate as a "local" rather than a "district" centre.		Taken forward to SP New Town Centres. N/A
Box 5.4 Retail Hierarchy					
Para 5.4.3 Interim Issues and Options		Box 5.4 Confirmation in TPO that support modified version of Mayor's hierarchy.	There was almost universal support for the hierarchy of town centres articulated by the Council in the Towards Preferred Options. This includes support from the GLA for the designation of the Portobello Road and Westbourne Grove as "Special District Centres", the only digression from the GLA's own hierarchy of centres set out within the London Plan. Some consultees, in particular those owning sites adjacent to existing centres, supported the Council's intention to review the boundaries of the higher order centres. There were just two suggested breaks from the hierarchy; the designation of Golborne Road as a Special District Centres and the combining of Knightsbridge and South Kensington to create a single large International Centre		Taken forward to Retail Development within Town Centres of Fostering Vitality section of July 09 Draft Plan N/A
Box 5.5 Changing Retail Demand					
Box 5.4a Interim Issues and Options		The Core Strategy will ensure that the borough's town centres remain competitive and continue to flourish with a lively mix of shops and services. The Council will explore whether existing centres are capable of accommodating the retail growth identified within the retail needs assessment; whether some centres need expanding, or whether entirely new centres would be appropriate.	There is support for the Council's ambition to support for the Borough's town centres. Maintenance of diversity is seen by most consultees to be an integral part of this support. A number of consultees, including the GLA, support the expansion of centres where a need to do so can be demonstrated, although the Kensington Society reiterate their view that Borough's Retail Needs Assessment over estimates retail demand. A number of consultees reject any proposals for the possible redevelopment of Portobello Court on the Portobello Road to provide for additional retail floorspace. There is particular opposition for the creation of a new supermarket with the feeling that this will do little to support the special character of the centre. There is a widely held view that a new supermarket is simply not needed given the number of food stores already in the area, and a concern that a supermarket will harm both the character of the centre and of the street market.		Take forward to SP New Town Centre Uses and SP Successful Town Centres . N/A
Box 5.6 Diversity of uses within town centres					

Para 5.4.5 Interim Issues and Options		Confirms the position that the Council will attempt to maintain the diversity of the borough's centres.	There is strong support for initiatives that support the diversity of the borough's town centres. In particular there is widespread support for the developing of visions for the borough's centres. A number of consultees remind us that the success of a centre does not rely solely on the presence of small independent retailers but that multiple retailers have an important role to play. For a centre to be successful it must contain both a diverse mix of operators and of uses -uses such as banks and restaurants as well as shops. There is concern from one consultee that any initiatives that will lead to an artificial reduction of rents will reduce the economic viability of centres and be counter-productive.		Taken forward to Retail Development within Town Centres of Fostering Vitality section of July 09 Draft Plan	N/A
Box 5.4a Interim Issues and Options		Expansion of centres. Support expansion of existing centres where evidence is provided that would show this would reduce rents , yet that the viability of nearby centres would not be harmed.	Whilst, the majority of consultees, including the GLA, support the provision of affordable shops some consultees are concerned about this initiative. They stress that the provision of affordable units must be carefully managed if the vitality of our centres is to be maintained. Affordable units should only be sought from schemes which include a substantial retail element.		Not taken forward.	The Council does not endorse the expansion of centres to support independent retailers. This would run counter to the town centre first approach enshrined within PPS6 - whereby new retail floorspace should only be supported outside of existing centres where there is a "need" and that the requirements of the sequential test is met. The town centre first approach is also supported by the SA. The expansion of centres where they is no "need" was not supported by the Council's Retail Needs Assessment. The core strategy only endorses the expansion of centres where it can be demonstrated that new retail floorspace will maintain the vitality of a centre or assist in the regeneration of the area. There is not wide spread support from the public or other stakeholders for expansion for centres. To the contrary The GLA strongly oppose this approach.
Box 5.4a Interim Issues and Options		Mix of uses. Allow a degree of diversity within our town centres, whilst protecting their primary function as shopping centres. Designate core areas for shopping uses and outer areas for a greater mix of town centre uses.			Taken forward to Successful Town Centres SP and TPO within Fostering Vitality	N/A
Box 5.4a Interim Issues and Options		Mix of shop types. Promote mix of unit sizes and affordable shops			Taken forward to Retail TPO within Fostering Vitality.	N/A
Introduced at this stage		Town Centre vitality plans			Taken forward to SP Retail Development within Town Centres, and within the individual places	N/A
Box 5.7		Arts and Culture				
Box 5.5a , 5.5c Interim Issues and Options		Box 5.7 The Council will protect an enhance the existing arts and cultural uses within the borough, and endorse new arts and cultural uses, particularly within town centres.	There is general support for the policy direction suggested by the Council. Arts and cultural uses are greatly valued both for their own right and for the contribution they can have to the local economy.		Taken forward to SP Successful Town Centres, SP Arts, Culture and Entertainment Uses and TP Arts and Cultural Uses.	N/A
Box 5.8		South Kensington Museums				
Box 5.5d		Box 5.8 The Council supports the designation of the South Kensington museums as a Strategic Cultural area and work with Westminster City Council to ensure arts and cultural uses within this are protected and enhanced.	Very few responses were received. These indicated that there is some support for the designation of the museums complex as a strategic cultural area.		Taken forward to The South Kensington Strategic Cultural Area SP of July 09 Draft.	N/A
Box 5.9		Leisure and Entertainment				

Introduced at this stage.		The Council recognises the need to not only protect the leisure and entertainment facilities in the borough but also improve the range of services provided. These uses should be focused within town centres to minimise the impact on residential amenity.	There is support for the protection of a range of leisure and entertainment uses. Pubs, theatres and cinemas have been highlighted as facilities of particular value. There is also some support for the provision of new facilities across the borough (but particularly in town centres), although the Kensington Society does suggest that the borough is adequately served by most leisure uses, particularly when one considers the ease of access to these use in neighbouring boroughs. The access that residents have to cinemas and the like in neighbouring borough's is pointed out by a number of consultees.		Taken forward SP Arts, Culture and Entertainment Uses and Arts and Cultural TPO.	N/A
Box 5.10 Active Recreation Provision						
Introduced at this stage.		The Council aims to facilitate access to sport and active recreation which are easily accessible and affordable to borough residents, in order to improve opportunities in sport, health and physical activity	There is support for a policy which seeks to improve opportunities in sport health and physical activity. Respondees noted that access to facilities is patchy, but that the Council should recognise the availability of facilities outside the borough itself. The Kensington Society articulated their view that the real gap in facilities is in public sports provision – there being a good provision of private facilities (gyms etc). The Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU) was concerned that, whilst the ambition was admirable, specific actions to attempt to address the deficiency are required. The GLA reiterated their view that a full Open Space Strategy, more comprehensive than the PPG17 assessment, is required.		The term 'active recreation provision' was not taken forward. However policies which support the provision of new sports facilities have been taken forward into the Social and Community Uses TPO in Fostering Vitality and the SP, Social and community uses.	Polices concerning the provision of new sports facilities have been taken forward.
Box 5.11 Visitors						
From Box 5.5a and 5.5b of Interim Issues and Options		The Council is not seeking to increase visitor numbers to the borough: the aim is to improve the quality of their visit in a way which benefits both visitors and local residents.	Although few responses were received on this topic there was support for the approach that the Council should be looking to improve the existing tourist experience rather than increasing tourist numbers. This could be achieved by improvements to the public realm and the facilities (for example cafes and small shops) that could support tourists. There is a recognition that these improvements will also benefit local people.		Taken forward to SP Arts, Culture and Entertainment Uses, and SP South Kensington Strategic Cultural Area.	N/A
Box 5.12 Hotels						
From Box 5.5b of Interim Issues and Options		Encourage new hotels in highly accessible areas such as Knightsbridge, South Kensington, Notting Hill Gate and Earl's Court.	Little support for the retention of hotels. Concern that the Council should only support high quality hotels.		Taken forward to Hotel TPO in Fostering Vitality chapter of July 09 Draft Plan.	N/A
From Box 5.5b of Interim Issues and Options	Reek to reduce concentration of hotels post 2012, in areas of over concentration	Taken forward to Hotel TPO in Fostering Vitality chapter of July 09 Draft Plan.			N/A	
From Box 5.5b of Interim Issues and Options	Resist conversion of hotels to residential uses in town centres.	Taken forward to Hotel TPO in Fostering Vitality chapter of July 09 Draft Plan.			N/A	
Box 6.2 Better Travel Choices						

Box 5.3b		The Council will support the Chelsea Hackney Line and in particular the provision of a new station, close to the King's Road, as well as other potential connections at Sloane Square and Chelsea Harbour.	There was concern raised in relation to the policy direction for new stations on the Chelsea – Hackney line in Chelsea. The Oakley Street Residents Association in particular believe that it is premature to support the line and new stations without more detailed feasibility work. They believe new stations could have serious impacts on the character of the area. The need and value of smaller scale local improvements to the bus network were highlighted.	Lots Road/World's End, King's Road Sloane Square,.	Taken forward. CT2	N/A
Box 6.3						
Box 8.9		New development must not be allowed to add to existing levels of parking demand and that lower levels of parking should be sought in order to reduce the environmental impact of that development. The Council therefore intends to require that all new residential developments will be permit free. Car parking standards below both the existing UDP levels and those within the London Plan will also be adopted. Developments with further reduced, or zero levels of car parking, will be sought in the majority of locations in the borough. Over the lifetime of this plan the Council will seek levels of car parking significantly below existing levels and will increasingly seek developments with no car parking except for essential users. The Council will assess the potential for further expansion of car clubs within the borough. The Council monitors the use of its on-street parking and will consider alternative uses when demand drops significantly.	There was generally support for the proposed policy direction of seeking reduced levels of car parking and permit-free. However, some larger land owners and property developers were concerned by the potential for a requirement for zero car parking and a blanket approach to permit-free. The KHT were concerned that such policies should not undermine plans for estate renewal.		Taken forward. CT1	N/A
Box 6.4						
Box 9.5		The Council believes that walking and cycling should be promoted through the creation of well designed and maintained spaces that are safe to travel in and where the basics such as good quality lighting and cycle parking are provided. The use of shared space principles should be considered wherever possible. The reduction in the dominance of motorised traffic is key to the promotion of walking of cycling. The Council will continue to require cycle parking in all new developments.	Ten responses received. There was strong support for the promotion of walking and cycling. However, some respondents believed there should be more emphasis on reducing vehicle speeds and cycle lanes. Many suggested that new developments should fund improvements to walking and cycling facilities in the borough.		Taken forward CT1	N/A
Box 7.2a						
		Priorities within the public realm				

Interim Issues and Options Box 6 'Caring for the public realm: Streets'		<p>We shall manage the public realm in an integrated way, delivering improved transport choice, making it easier to walk, cycle and take public transport.</p> <p>We will endorse alternatives to household car ownership and use, such as car clubs.</p> <p>As part of the approach we will deliver streets and squares that are attractive, functional, robust, user-friendly to all, safe and that stimulate civic well-being. This is not a one-size-fits-all approach, but one that is tailored to address local circumstances and support local distinctiveness.</p>	<p>Twelve responses received. There were no objections to the policy direction of managing the public realm in an integrated way, providing a more appropriate balance between cars and other users. The Kensington Society saw this as an opportunity for improving the local distinctiveness and vitality of our shopping areas, but highlighted the problems of clutter, congestion and pollution caused by metro-sized shops with their large delivery lorries. The GLA warned against an approach that simply shifts traffic and its problems to other areas; the need to see buses as an important part of the integrated public realm management and provide good priority bus measures; the importance of tackling servicing, relocating it off-street where possible; and reminded us that the primary objective of its road network is moving traffic through an area</p>	<p>The option was taken forward through to the Publication Draft. However, the Council considered the comments received and decided that this issue needed to be expanded into a number of policies, which have a great level of detail rather than a single policy as there were a number of issues to deal with, such as layout, functioning of the street, accessibility. Therefore we devised the following policies "Street network", "Street form" "Street life" and "Streetscape".</p>	Taken forward	N/A
Box 7.2b		Green Spaces				
Interim Issues and Options Box 6b 'Caring for the public realm: Green Spaces'		<p>We will require large scale developments in designated areas of open space deficiency to provide new public open space on site, where its resultant size and layout is suitable and of high quality. Until local standards are set, this should be provided in accordance with the National Playing Fields Association '6 acre' standard.</p> <p>On smaller scale development where this cannot be achieved, we will expect new private communal open space that offers visual amenity to the public, such as the formation of traditional garden squares, and a financial contribution towards improving near-by public open spaces and streetscape improvements schemes.</p>	<p>On open space all the respondents objected to using the NPFA 6 acre standard for its requirement in new developments, being out of date and unrealistic for this borough. An open space strategy was called for, based on an up-to-date assessment of need and capacity, and identifying areas of deficiency. The Kensington Society called for recognition of the important contribution made by cemeteries, Thames and the canal to open space in the borough.</p>	<p>Great detail was needed within this policy as there were multiple issues that need addressing in relation to open spaces, not just their maintenance but the creation, use and function. There policy has been renamed "Parks, Gardens and Open Spaces" as it was recognised that open spaces that were not always "Green spaces" play a positive contribution to the borough's public realm and needed to be incorporated. There are a number of development management policies that accompany the strategic policy which helps provide clarity and detail.</p>	Taken forward	N/A
Box 7.3		Thames & waterside environments				
This issue had not been raised previously. However, the Council considered the river and waterside environments strategically important to the borough and therefore included it in the 'Towards Preferred Options' stage of the Core Strategy.		<p>We will pay close attention to the special character and environment of the Thames, its environs and other waterways in the borough. We will require any development on the riverside and canalised to preserve or enhance this waterside character and setting, the physical and visual links with the surrounding areas (including views along the river and waterway), and their amenity and use for leisure activities.</p>	<p>Five responses received. All respondents supported the indicative policy direction, with the Environment Agency asking for development to be set back from the riverside to allow buffer zones for biodiversity and flooding, and suggesting that we set out examples of how development can enhance the riverside's special character. British Waterways wanted greater reference to the Grand Union Canal, and English Heritage wanted explicit mention of protecting its heritage value.</p>	<p>Policy included in the 'Contact and Character' policy of 'Renewing the Legacy' Chapter and the 'Parks, Open Space, Gardens and Waterways' policy in the 'An Engaging Public Realm' chapter.</p>	Taken forward	N/A
Box 7.4		Designing & managing the public realm				

Interim Issues and Options
Box 6.4c 'Managing the
Public Realm'

	<p>We shall continue to discourage and remove non-essential street furniture on the public highway and minimise essential street furniture in terms of its provision and visual and physical impact. We shall continue to resist advertising on street furniture and insist on the removal of redundant public utility equipment. We shall look to pursue the most radical approach of shared highway space after careful assessment of where it would be most beneficial.</p>	<p>Nine responses received There was support for the policy direction, with limited comments made regarding supporting the vitality of areas through a more positive approach to pavement cafes, changing mind-sets and seeing local shopping centres as destinations with a 'place function' rather than as an area to move through. It was pointed out that the radical approach of shared highway space must be backed up by good policing and education, making users aware of their rights and risks.</p>	<p>This policy has been covered 'Street Life', 'Streetscape' and 'Parks, Open Space, Gardens and waterways' policies within the 'An Engaging Public Realm' chapter</p>	<p>Taken forward Policy CR1 & CR2</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	--	--	--	---	------------

Box 7.5	Quality of the public realm				
---------	-----------------------------	--	--	--	--

Interim Issues and Options
Box 6.2 'Quality of the
public realm'

	<p>We shall continue to preserve and enhance the public realm through the management of development, our tree planting and maintenance programmes are making targeted improvement grants available. We shall resist the loss of front gardens to off-street parking using the powers currently available, and investigate the recovery of lost front gardens as improvements to the street scene.</p>	<p>Seven responses received. The policy direction was widely supported, with very little comment by English Heritage and the GLA. The Kensington Society offered its support, but stressed the need to secure shop front and townscape improvements through moving beyond the 'no demonstrable harm' approach and adopting stronger initiatives (including grant funding). The Notting Hill Improvement Group called for more street cleansing and maintenance, and the need to refer to the contribution of back gardens was mentioned by several respondents. The one objection came from the Kensington Housing Trust, which believed the policy direction too restrictive where it required new development to adopt or support the traditional urban pattern of the borough and the principles of good urban design, believing it should only be encouraged and have regard to local circumstances.</p>	<p>This has been taken forward in the policies of the 'An engaging public realm' chapter, including 'Street form', 'Street life', 'Streetscape' and 'Parks, Gardens, Open spaces, gardens and waterways' policies.</p>	<p>Taken forward Policy CR1</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	--	--	---------------------------------	------------

Box 7.6	Activities within the public realm				
---------	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Interim Issues and Options Box 6.4b 'Uses in the public realm'		We will work towards a strategy that is location sensitive and focused on good management. Playspace and seating will be directed towards more residential areas; public seating and pavement cafes will be directed towards retail parades and shopping centres; and special events aimed towards civic spaces. this would not preclude the closure of streets for occasional, well-managed special events. There will be a presumption against new markets on public highways unless the benefits associated with the market is considered to be overwhelming and where they fit in with our broader retail strategy and its strategic objectives for town centres.	One response received. The Kensington Society offering its strong support of measures that it sees as revitalising the public realm, in terms of seating, public art, pavement cafes and events.	This policy has been taken forward to the 'Street life' policy within the 'An engaging public realm' chapter.	Taken forward Policy CR3	N/A
Box 8.2 Conserving our heritage assets						
Interim Issues and Options Box 7 'Renewing the Legacy'		We shall ensure that development preserves or enhances buildings and areas of recognised architectural or historic interest and pays positive regard to their settings and to cultural and environmental values. We shall take steps to care for and protect our historic built fabric through the positive management of listed buildings and conservation areas, the use and enforcement under Article 4 and Section 215.	Eight responses received. There was general support for the policy direction, though local residents referred to the need for greater application of planning controls (article 4's, planning conditions) and their enforcement. Thoughts were offered on whether the Council should only preserve existing buildings of the highest quality and whether we should be promoting new uses for listed buildings that best provided for their future rather than their original use.	This issue is a critical issue for our borough and therefore as a result of the comments received we considered that there needed to be great detail in this policy. There was also the issue of not only conservation areas but also other heritage issues that needed to be taken into account such as listed buildings, areas of metropolitan importance, ancient monuments etc. Therefore this policy was split into two, being one dealing with "Historical Environments" and the other dealing with "Historical Assets".	Taken forward Policy CL4 & CL5	N/A
Box 8.3 High quality new design						

Interim Issues and Options Box 7.2 'High Quality Design'		We shall only permit new development where it demonstrates high quality architecture and urban design. Innovative and imaginative designs will be encouraged where they respond well to the existing context or establish a distinctive sense of place.	Eleven responses received. English Heritage and the GLA supported our approach unequivocally, with English heritage particularly favouring the reference to avoiding target hardening measures when dealing with an historic environment. The Kensington Society also supported the policy direction, but wanted more emphasis on high quality architecture and urban design and their positive role in enhancing an area and creating/maintaining a sense of place. Others welcomed our promotion of innovative and imaginative design, but questioned whether this could be achieved effectively given our requirement for a contextual-based design approach within conservation areas.	This option has been taken forward to the Publication Draft document, however; there are now several policies relating to this policy given the importance of this issue to the Royal Borough. These policies are: "Context and Character", "New Buildings" and "Alterations and Additions", all of which have an element relating to high quality design.	Taken forward Policy CL1	N/A
Box 8.4 Density of Development						
Interim Issues and Options Box 7.3 Density of Development		We shall permit only those developments that are within the appropriate levels within the London Plan's Density Matrix and pay specific regard to local context, preserving or enhancing its local distinctiveness, and are within its infrastructure capacity.	Sixteen responses received. The majority of respondents, including the GLA believed the approach to be too restrictive, being weighted too much towards local context. A more flexible approach was preferred: one that is more closely aligned with the London Plan's density matrix and sees density levels as guidelines rather than absolute limits. Similarly, the notion of plot ratios came in for criticism, potentially stifling opportunities for new jobs and homes.	The comments made at Towards Preferred Options stage was taken into account and new policy was created as a result, which put more strength on 'local context' being the determining factor in density, the policy is called "Context and Character".	Taken forward Policy CL2	N/A
Box 8.5 Tall Buildings						
Interim Issues and Options Box 7.4 Tall Buildings		Until such time as the SPD is published the methodology outlined above will be used to guide any dialogue with applicants proposing tall buildings. Tall buildings will be permitted where: they do not harm any valued historic environment they contribute positively to urban legibility and the public realm , public transport and access is good, and they are of outstanding architecture The SPD will provide more detail on suitable areas and the design criteria that will be applied.	Nineteen responses received. This section came in for most comments, though most felt the need for more information, reserving their final judgement until the publication of the Tall Buildings SPD. English heritage offered strong support for the policy direction and local residents saw only disadvantages of tall buildings in the borough. Businesses wanted closer reflection of the London Plan's policy on tall buildings and their contribution as attractive landmarks and to regeneration. This point was also picked up by the GLA, who principally felt the methodology to be too broad brush.	The Council considered that although there was general support for this policy, it would be more appropriate to include a policy on tall buildings within an overall strategic policy relating to 'Context and Character'.	Taken forward Policy CL2	N/A
Box 8.6 The demolition of Eyesores						
Interim Issues and Options Box 7.5 Demolition of Eyesores		We shall develop an approach to the removal of eyesore buildings within our borough. The details of the approach are best developed in the form of an SPD.		Eyesore policy contained within the 'New Buildings and Extensions' policy of 'Renewing the Legacy' chapter	Taken forward Policy CL2	N/A

Box 9.2 Housing Numbers						
Not covered, except in para. 8.2	Box 9.2	<p>Box 9.2 Indicative Policy Direction The housing target is fixed until the next review of the London Plan. The ten year target is for a minimum of 3,500 units to be provided in the borough between 2007/08 and 2016/17. This target may be exceeded if all anticipated developments are implemented. The Council will produce indicative housing figures for the period 2016 – 2026 once the Mayor's guidance on this matter is available. These figures will be rolled forward to 2028.</p>	<p>Seven responses received. It was noted by some respondents that the Council should retain the policy priority for residential development in order to ensure the London Plan 10 year target will be achieved, because over recent years completions have not been very high. It was also stated that the London Plan encourages the targets to be exceeded. One respondent was concerned about loss of housing units as a result of de-conversions.</p>	n/a	Taken forward CH1	N/A
Box 9.3 Providing a mix of housing						
Box 8	Box 9.3	<p>Box 9.3 Indicative Policy Direction The Council is of the view that housing schemes should provide a mix of units of different sizes which satisfy local demand, which also takes account of the London-wide housing mix requirements. The Council will keep the proportions of units under review in the light of new evidence.</p>	<p>Thirteen responses received. The GLA supported the approach set out. One respondent supported seeking a range of unit sizes which reflects and satisfies local demand, and argued that this should be demonstrated at the point of making a planning application. However, a number of other respondents felt the mix proposals were too prescriptive and potentially onerous, particularly the percentage of family housing. It was felt that more account should be taken of viability, and of local site specific circumstances, because different sites will be suitable for different types of housing. Not all sites are suitable for a significant proportion of family housing.</p>	n/a	Taken forward CH2	N/A
Box 9.4 Mix of Affordable homes						
Not covered, except in para 8.3.1	Box 9.4	<p>Indicative Policy Direction The Council is of the view that it is necessary to provide a range of sizes of affordable housing units. In most development proposals the mix should be skewed towards larger, family sized accommodation (units with three or more bedrooms). This is because the greatest shortage, relative to supply, is of properties with four or more bedrooms. The exact mix to be sought will be under review and based on the most up to date evidence available.</p>	<p>Sixteen responses received. There was a mixed set of views, with some respondents supporting the policy direction whilst others argued that it was too prescriptive, arguing similar points to those raised under 9.3. The viability of the mix should also be taken into account. The policy should take into consideration the housing need in the surrounding area and the appropriateness of the type and location of development for the size of housing proposed.</p>	n/a	Taken forward CH2	N/A
Box 9.5 Social rented and intermediate affordable housing units						

Box 8.3

Box 9.5	<p>Indicative Policy Direction</p> <p>The Council is proposing that affordable housing should be provided at a 1:1 ratio on floor area above 500sqm.</p> <p>Applications which trigger the affordable housing requirement will be expected to provide affordable housing, in a 1:1 ratio, unless this level of provision would make a scheme unviable. In such cases, a financial appraisal should be submitted to the Council clearly justifying why a lower percentage is proposed.</p>	<p>Twenty responses received. The proposals for the affordable housing threshold received very little support. The main reasons cited were the following: that the proposals did not take into account viability; the 500sqm is inadequately justified, too low and potentially onerous (particularly for small schemes); the threshold would stifle housing development; and that it should be possible to calculate the amount of affordable housing using units and habitable rooms as alternatives to floorspace. There was also criticism of the need to submit a financial appraisal for small schemes, particularly those below the current statutory planning threshold (i.e. 10 units) and which only trigger the affordable housing threshold because of the Council's particular approach.</p> <p>It was also suggested that a rigid single target for all parts of the borough is inappropriate, and that the targets need to vary across the borough due to viability issues. Indeed, the GLA suggested the Council develop two policies, covering a borough wide target and a site-specific approach. The GLA also noted that an affordable housing target should be set. Overall it was argued that the Core Strategy be revised so that affordable housing provision should be based on scheme viability and other considerations in line with adopted and emerging strategic policy rather than seek to impose a 1:1 requirement on all schemes regardless of individual site characteristics.</p>	n/a	Taken forward CH2	N/A
---------	---	---	-----	-------------------	-----

Box 9.6	Location of affordable housing				
---------	--------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Not covered, except in para 8.3.2	Box 9.6	<p>Indicative Policy Direction</p> <p>The Council is proposing to vary the proportion of social rented and intermediate housing to maximise diversity within neighbourhoods. The exact proportions will be kept under review.</p>	<p>Twenty responses received. There were mixed responses to these proposals. There was some support for box 9.6 i.e. varying the proportions of social rented and intermediate housing to create mixed neighbourhoods. However, some respondents felt that the 70/30% London Plan approach should be applied throughout the borough, including for small schemes. A number of respondents opposed the proposal to seek 100% social rented housing on small schemes of 20 affordable units or less. Some respondents also opposed seeking 100% intermediate on the smaller schemes, although there was some support for seeking more intermediate housing in the north of the borough. Respondents felt that the tenure split should be determined through a strategic housing market assessment. Other comments included that there was a need to determine the tenure mix on a site by site basis, and to take account of viability.</p>	n/a	Taken forward CH2	N/A
-----------------------------------	---------	---	---	-----	-------------------	-----

Box 9.8	Estate renewal				
---------	----------------	--	--	--	--

Box 8.4

	Box 9.8	<p>Box 9.8 Indicative Policy Direction The Council believes that estate renewal proposals should ensure that there is no net loss of affordable housing provision with all existing residents being offered new homes on the redeveloped estate. If the re-provided affordable housing is being funded by the sale of new private housing on the estate, then the amount of private housing should be related to the level of funding required to replace the existing amount of affordable housing, and to good design and townscape considerations. Where capacity exists to increase the affordable component, this should take the form of intermediate housing. The Council also recognises that cross subsidy between estates may also be required where proposals involved more than one estate at the same time. The principals set out above for one estate would be applied to two or more estates, taken as a whole.</p>	<p>Thirteen responses received. The Kensington Society argued that it was not convinced the proposals were sufficiently well advanced to warrant being in the Core Strategy. Kensington Housing Trust strongly objected to box 9.8, which stated that the amount of private housing should be related to the level of funding required to replace the existing affordable housing, arguing that the focus should be on maximising the use of the site. Conversely, Colville Ward councillors were very concerned about increasing densities. Box 9.8 refers to 'where capacity exists to increase the affordable component, this should take the form of intermediate housing.' A number of respondents felt this was too restrictive, and extra social rented units should not be ruled out. Some respondents supported providing affordable housing in the form of commuted sums, into a pot to fund estate renewal. A number of respondents referred to specific estates and that they felt the consultation had been insensitive (Portobello Court) or should explore other options besides demolition (Lancaster West).</p>	n/a	Taken forward CH4	n/a
Box 9.9 Supported housing & housing for older people						
Box 8.5	Box 9.9	<p>Indicative Policy Direction, The Council will increase the choice available to older residents by protecting existing facilities, where economically viable and by supporting the development of all forms of housing for older people, including extra care housing. The Council supports the suggestion that extra care housing should be classified as C2, and therefore will not generate an affordable housing requirement, although mixed tenure schemes would be welcomed.</p>	<p>Five responses received. This section was generally supported. Some respondents commented that the loss of homes for older people should be resisted, however another respondent argued that local need and demand for such facilities should be assessed before any facility is required to be protected. It was argued by one respondent that the inclusion of extra care facilities under Use Class C2 requires further justification. Another commentator supported the reference that supported housing and housing for older people should be classified as social and community uses.</p>	n/a	Taken forward CH2	N/A
Box 9.10 Homes for all - lifetime homes						
Not covered	Box 9.10	<p>Box 9.10 Indicative Policy Direction The Council is of the view that all new housing should be built to 'Lifetime Homes' standards as a minimum.</p>	<p>Five responses received. The respondents were split on this issue. However, the indicative policy direction was supported by the GLA and Kensington Society. The GLA stated that there should also be a reference to wheelchair accessible housing in the Core Strategy.</p>	n/a	Taken forward CH2	N/A
Box 9.11 De-conversions						
Box 8.6	Box 9.11	<p>Box 9.11 Indicative Policy Direction The Council believes that de-conversion proposals may be acceptable in certain circumstances, for instance when the proposal involves de-conversion back to a purpose built family house. Further details will be set out in a future Local Development Document.</p>	<p>Seven responses received. There was a mixed response to this issue. Some respondents strongly opposed the policy direction, such as the Kensington Society. They were concerned about the loss of units, and 'gentrification'. However, other respondents supported the approach put forward, arguing that de-conversions provided much needed family units, reduced parking stress, and in some cases restored listed buildings. Some respondents argued that de-conversions regarding HMOs should be referred to.</p>	n/a	Taken forward CH2	N/A
Box 9.12 House extensions						

Not covered, except in para. 8.7	Box 9.12	Box 9.12 Indicative Policy Direction, The Council believes that extensions may be acceptable in certain circumstances. Further details will be set out in a future Local Development Document	Four responses received. The approach was generally supported. However, one respondent noted that the circumstances in which extensions may be acceptable should be set out. The need for developers to go through the proper processes in terms of appropriately assessing and identifying any archaeological resources that might be affected and the potential need to obtain the requisite permission should be made clear.	n/a	Not taken forward.	This issue will be covered in the Development Management Policies DPD.
Box 9.13 Amenity space						
Not covered, except in para. 8.8	Box 9.13	Box 9.13 Indicative Policy Direction. We regard the provision of private amenity space as part of existing and new residential accommodation as highly important, particularly family housing. We will prevent any significant loss of existing amenity space and require the provision of new private amenity space, particularly for families and at ground floor level. Where this is not practical, communal gardens on larger scale schemes and balconies, terraces or roof gardens on smaller scale schemes should be provided.	Ten responses received. There was support for the general policy approach but it was stated that requirements for amenity space should not be overly prescriptive. There should be a design led approach to amenity space, rather than area based standards. Other factors to be taken into account are the proximity of a development to public open space, protecting privacy, the need to refer to play space, and to permit some loss of amenity space in new developments where it results in more usable space that is of a better quality and more accessible. There was some support for green roofs.	n/a	Taken forward CH3	N/A
Box 9.14 Gypsies and Travellers						
Not covered, except in para. 8.10	Box 9.14	Indicative Policy Direction. The Council will include the following criteria in a policy to assess any applications for gypsy and traveller pitches: any site should meet an identified need which cannot be met on the existing Westway site; and there should be adequate on-site services provided for water supply, power, drainage, sewage disposal and waste disposal facilities.	Two responses received. The GLA stated that the Council should address the maximum need for gypsy and traveller accommodation set out in the recent research report published by the GLA.	n/a	Taken forward CH2	N/A
Box 10.1 Respecting Environmental Limits						
Box 9, Options ii of the Interim Issues and Options	Strategic ambition	For the borough to be at the cutting edge of environmental sustainability. We will respect environmental limits by recognising our responsibility of environmental stewardship and finding creative ways to adapt to the new imperatives of the twenty-first century. The remainder of this box introduces those indicative policy directions in Boxes 10.2 to 10.6.	Some respondents thought the new title is still too ambiguous. Protecting and enhancing biodiversity, mitigating and adapting to climate change and the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage were generally very well supported. However, British Waterways would like to see the Blue Ribbon Network (canals and rivers) enhanced and the GLA required greater consideration of noise, especially ambient noise		Strategic Vision (CV1.7) in Respecting Environmental Limits, although this has been amended to remove reference to 'cutting edge' and make it more specific to the policies which follow.	N/A
Box 10.2 Climate change						
Box 9.2, Option ii of the Interim Issues and Options	Option 1	The Council is looking to require that all residential development, including new build, extensions, conversions, change of use, refurbishments and residential led mixed use development, achieves the following levels ⁷¹ in the Code for Sustainable Homes: -Up to 2012: Code Level Four -2013 to 2015: Code Level Five -2016 onwards: Code Level Six In the case of extensions, this does not only apply to the new part of the building, but also the ancillary dwelling which should be retrofitted to achieve these levels.	The requirements to meet specific targets where generally well supported, however these must be realistic, viable, technically feasible, in accordance with London plan policy and consider the impacts on listed buildings, conservation areas and the townscape. The timescales for achieving the various targets are unviable and too short to enable the necessary technologies to develop and should instead be more flexible and aspirational. Thames Water and the Environment Agency (EA) welcome the reference to addressing climate change and support the use of the Code for Sustainable Homes. However, the EA requires greater mention of water efficiency and flood risk.		Climate Change policy (a) in draft Core Strategy	N/A

Box 9.2, Option ii of the Interim Issues and Options	Option 2	The Council is looking to require all non-residential development, including new build, extensions, conversions, change of use, refurbishments and retail or office led mixed use, to achieve BREEAM Excellent, with a significant proportion of credits being obtained from Energy, Transport, Pollution and Management elements of the rating system.			Climate Change policy (a) in draft Core Strategy	N/A
Box 9.2, Option ii of the Interim Issues and Options	Option 3	The Council will also require that all new development is designed to be as energy efficient as possible within any given townscape by maximising natural heating and cooling, through passive solar design, and sufficiently shaded with natural ventilation to minimise overheating in summer;	none		Climate Change policy (a) in draft Core Strategy	N/A
Box 9.2, Option ii of the Interim Issues and Options	Option 4	The Council is also looking to require that major developments will incorporate Combined Cooling, Heat and Power (CCHP) and heat exchangers to provide the heat, cooling and energy needs of the development. These CCHP facilities will need to be capable of connecting into a potential district heating network;	The GLA also requires policies to prioritise linking new schemes into existing heat networks and developments.	Places document, including Kensal, Latimer, Earls Court and Notting Hill Gate.	Climate Change policy (b and c) in draft Core Strategy were the sites are listed, although the text amended to require CCHP or similar.	N/A
Box 9.2, Option ii of the Interim Issues and Options	Option 5	The Council will identify sites which can accommodate district heating, which will also need to be able to accommodate the connection of CCHP, and look into managing these through an Energy Services Company (ESCo) or Multiple Services Company (MuSCo).	The GLA requires greater consideration to be given to broad areas where the development of specific renewable technologies are appropriate, linking in waste management opportunities and decentralised energy.	Places document, including Kensal, Latimer, Earls Court and Notting Hill Gate.	Climate Change policy (b and c) in draft Core Strategy were the sites are listed, although the text amended to require CCHP or similar.	N/A
Box 9.2, Option i of the Interim Issues and Options	Option 6	The Council will ensure that any renewable energy technologies are designed to be discreet, well hidden and generally respect the existing townscape character, especially on listed buildings and conversation areas. This might be achieved by being placed on flat roofs, rear facing roofs or behind parapets.	English Heritage also comment that special consideration should be given to the impact of environmental technologies on listed buildings, conservation areas and townscape.		Not taken forward	GLA advised that heritage issues should not be considered within this section of the Core Strategy, but within Renewing the Legacy.
NEW	Option 7	The Council will also consider ways of making the wealth of information on sustainable development, climate change and renewable energy easily available for applicants and developers.	none		Not taken forward	This information is widely available on the internet.
Box 10.3		Air quality				
Box 9.7 of the Interim Issues and Options	Option i	The Council will take imaginative measures in relation to transport, construction methods and land use to reduce the negative impact new development has on air quality. Owing to the good public transport accessibility in the borough, the Council will continue to promote walking, cycling, public transport and alternatives to individual car ownership, such as car clubs, which will provide choices to allow the reduction in car use, leading to an improvement in Air Quality.	This section was generally well supported, however, the Council should be realistic in improving air quality. The phrase "imaginative measures" is also considered to be too vague.	Places document, including Golborne/Trellick, Latimer, Earls Court, Lots Road/Worlds End, Westway, Notting Hill Gate, Knightsbridge, South Kensington, Kings Road/Sloane Square, Kensington High Street, Brompton Cross and Fulham Road West.	No specific policy requiring imaginative measures, although all the policies in Air Quality (CE5) and Better Travel Choices (CT1 and CT2) in the draft Core Strategy should bring about improvements to air quality.	N/A
NEW	Option ii	The Council considers the provision of green space as very important and will discourage paving of private gardens.	None		Parks, Gardens, Open Space policy in draft Core Strategy.	N/A
Box 10.4		Waste				

Box 10.4	<p>Waste</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Minimised the impact on the environment 2) To allocate waste management facilities in mixed-use development, 3) To reopen Cremorne Wharf as a waste management facility 4) To promote the use of sustainable modes of transport to support the export of waste 5) To meet the waste apportionment 6) To manage construction waste in a sustainable manner 	<p>Four responses received. The future of Cremorne Wharf was questioned as was the ability of the Council to meet the waste apportionment set out within the Mayor of London's Waste Apportionment Study</p> <p>Eight comments received. Policy is broadly welcomed. However, while the GLA were in broad support, they raised a concern with the strength of wording for apportionment. Reference to sustainable transportation of waste is in accordance with regional and national policy are therefore welcomed. However, this support should not only be if locations for waste management facilities cannot be found, but more general and related to the movement of bulk materials.</p> <p>Respondents were also encouraged to note that from 2010/11, the Western Riverside Waste Authority will transport RBKC's non-recyclable municipal waste along the River Thames. British Waterways questioned the feasibility of providing waste facilities on the Kensal Gasworks site. The Kensington Society noted that construction waste should be referred to in the document. English Heritage continues this by noting that the London Plan identifies construction waste as the largest</p>	<p>To manage the development's waste arisings on site is included on Kensal and Earl's Court Strategic Sites (Chapters 2 and 8 of the Strategic Sites documents). The preservation of Cremorne Wharf and its status as a safeguarded site has also been mentioned in Lots Road/World's End Place (Chapter 6 of the Places document)</p>	<p>Options taken forward to section 36.4.3</p>	<p>N/A</p>
----------	--	---	---	--	------------

Box 10.5	Flooding
----------	----------

Box 10.5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Require site specific Flood Risk Assessments for all development in Flood Risk Zone 2 and 3 and for all sites greater than 1 ha and take into account the Environment Agencies comments on these; 2) Resist "highly vulnerable" uses in Flood Risk Zone 3) Ensure that all other development proposals in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 demonstrate how they meet the 'Exception Test'; 4) Ensure that applicants for development in areas at risk of Surface Water or Sewage Flooding are aware of the risks of development in these areas; and 5) The Council will encourage the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage measures and will require sites greater than 1 ha to implement SUDS within the proposed development. <p>In addition to this, the Council will also work with Thames Water in the preparation of the Core Strategy and other LDF documents to ensure that the existing drainage and sewage infrastructure is well maintained and can handle the demands of any new developments.</p>	<p>Nine comments received. The precautionary approach to flood risk and impacts of climate change is welcomed.</p> <p>4.95 Thames Water supported reference to sewer flooding. However, required that the policy on this type of flooding is strengthened. Thames Water also required a specific policy on the Thames Tideway Tunnel. Thames Water also requires greater consideration to identifying land and coordinating development, including its phasing, with utility infrastructure providers, and suggests a policy in this regard whilst also requiring greater flexibility in the LDF policies to enable water supply and wastewater infrastructure to respond to the demand new development creates.</p> <p>4.96 The inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) was supported by several respondents including The Environment Agency. English Heritage, whilst supporting SuDs, asked for caution with regard to their impact on any given townscape.</p>	<p>Potential flooding issues have been included in the Strategic sites that could potentially be affected (i.e Earl's Court).</p>	<p>Options taken forward to section 36.4.2</p>	<p>N/A</p>
----------	--	--	---	--	------------

			<p>4.97 The Environment Agency required sewage flooding be renamed 'surface water and sewage flooding' and greater reference made to the draft Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Subterranean Development Scoping Study. They also raise several objections to bullet points in Box 10.5, suggesting alternatives.</p> <p>4.98 The GLA stated that there was limited reference to the use of Cremorne Safeguarded Wharf and the Thames Tideway Sewer Project, both of which are of strategic importance. The GLA also required greater reference to the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the principles of climate change adaptation, and in particular the efficient use of water.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Box 10.6		Nature Conservation				
----------	--	---------------------	--	--	--	--

Box 9.8 of the Interim Issues and Options	Option i	The Council will explore how developments can best facilitate additional habitat creation by requiring, for example, green / brown roofs, green landscaped areas within developments, planting and discouraging hard standings, especially paving used for on-site parking. The Council will also encourage the integration of development sites through a series of green chains, and the 'Blue Ribbon Network'.	This section is generally well supported. However, the GLA state that the Indicative Policy Direction fails to take forward the Council's position as outlined in the supporting text. The GLA also require that the Core Strategy refers to London Plan policy protecting and promoting 'geodiversity'. The GLA also sought further clarification on integrating development sites through the Blue Ribbon Network. Natural England supports policies that aim to deliver biodiversity enhancements and encourage the use of policies to protect and enhance the Borough's 22 Sites of Nature Conservation Importance. Natural England also encourage the creation of green chains. This is also welcomed by the GLA who generally support the need to have policies which deliver high quality multifunctional and accessible natural greenspace, in particular "wild" open spaces, was also noted. English Heritage also support the contribution of the preservation of gardens to cultural heritage. British Waterways do not necessarily agree that a buffer zone along the watercourse is always appropriate in the redevelopment of some sites and would examine each case on its own merits	Places document, including Kensal, Golborne/Trellick, Lots Road/Worlds End and Fulham Road West.	Taken forward. Biodiversity (CE4) in the draft Core Strategy.	N/A
---	----------	---	--	--	---	-----

Box 12.1		Public Transport				
----------	--	------------------	--	--	--	--

Box 5.3a		The Council believes that the three following strands will need to be pursued in order to improve public transport in the north of the borough: 1. Working with Transport for London, we need to continually improve and extend bus services, such as the extension of existing routes and the provision of new ones where there is a need, and improve infrastructure to overcome barriers to bus services, such as the proposed bus-tunnel to link the north of the borough and White City. 2. We need to continually research the feasibility of new stations on the West London Line at North Pole and for Crossrail, on the Paddington Main Line. 3. Better utilisation of existing public transport facilities, such as the opening up the existing 'backdoor' to Westbourne Park tube station on the south side.	Many respondents were concerned that the proposals for new rail stations in the north of the Borough, particularly a new Crossrail station, were unrealistic and the need to increase densities, again particularly to feed a new Crossrail station, would have an unacceptable impact on the area. The need and potential value of improvements to the local bus network and the Hammersmith and City line were highlighted. There was divided opinion however and some supported new rail stations in the north of the borough, particularly on the West London Line.	Latimer, Kensal	Taken forward. CT 2 - New and enhanced rail infrastructure	N/A
----------	--	---	---	-----------------	--	-----

Box 12.2		Walking and cycling				
----------	--	---------------------	--	--	--	--

Box 9.5		The Council will support any proposals for improved pedestrian and cycle links, particularly where they overcome significant barriers. The Council will work with the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham to ensure good pedestrian and cycle links are made across the West London Line to Westfield London, White City as part of that redevelopment.	There was broad support for the policy direction.	Latimer, Kensal, Golborne	Taken forward. CT 1 - Improving alternatives to car use	N/A
Box 12.3		Land under the Westway				
Box 3.2 NKAAP		The Council supports the mixed vision for the land under the Westway and will work with the Westway Trust and the local community to implement this.	There was support for the this approach.	Place 7, The Westway.		N/A
Box 12.4		Educating our Children				
Box 3.3 (NKAAP)		The Council will search for and allocate a suitable location for the provision of a new secondary school to ensure the community needs for education facilities are met.	The GLA supported the indicative policy as drafted, noting that Council's should reflect demand for school facilities and that any future policy needs to ensure adequate provision in partnership with the education authority. They explicitly refer to the presumption against building on existing open space. The Kensington Society also supported the indicative policy direction as long as the new school is built close to the Hammersmith and City Line stations and along existing and proposed bus routes	Latimer Place and North Kensington Sports Centre Strategic Site	Taken forward CK1 and CF TP2	N/A
Box 12.5		Our stock of housing estates.				
3.4 NKAAP		Along side the Housing Stock Options Review, master plans will be prepared for key sites to assess the potential for regeneration should significant renewal be the recommendation of the Housing Stock Option Review.	Many consultees remained concerns over the loss of social housing and the impact of the Stock Options review upon their homes.		Taken forward CH4.	N/A
Box 12.6		Creating Jobs				
		The Council will work with key stakeholders to plan for and support enterprises including addressing barriers to employment in the North Kensington area through: the provision of good quality, affordable childcare; the provision of flexible job opportunities; improvement of physical access issues, including inadequate public transport links; and the improvement of educational and skills attainment. The Council will investigate further the regenerative potential of options around establishing a Crossrail station	There was general support for the this approach, although some consultees raised doubts over the likelihood of a new Crossrail station in the Kensal area	The Kensal place is considered in section 2 and of the Places and Sites document, and the Kensal site as site 1.		N/A
Box 12.7		Shopping in North Kensington				

	<p>The Council will work towards the creation of two new town centres in the north of the borough, in the Kensal and Notting Barns West areas. The function of a centre at Notting Barns West would be to serve the day to day needs of local resident and visitors. The nature of a centre at Kensal Road would depend on the nature of the development in the area and the proximity of a Crossrail station. If the strategic London-wide campus is preferred, provision is likely to be for a local centre. The alternative of a significant mixed use development would be of a larger scale, possibly a district centre.</p> <p>The Council recognises the need to develop town centre vitality plans to allow the Council and other stakeholders to develop a clear vision for the future of town centres. This will include a vitality plan for the Portobello Road.</p> <p>The Council will support initiatives to maintain the character and diversity of our centres. This will include the designation of the Portobello Road and Westbourne Grove as Special District centres. The Council will explore methods by which visitors can be encouraged to use the length of Portobello Road, from the southern boundary of the centre, up to a new potential station in the Kensal area, throughout the day and into the evening;</p> <p>The Council will work with retailers to establish whether a new supermarket can be provided in the north of the borough, to meet the needs of the areas residents.</p>	<p>Wide support for the creation of two new centres which meet the local shopping needs of borough residents. The nature of these centres was however suggested with some suggesting that the development of Kensal will always be a neighbourhood rather than a local centre.</p> <p>Whilst there was support for initiatives to maintain the character and diversity of the northern centres some consultees were concerned that the Portobello and the Westbourne Grove centres should not be allowed to merge.</p> <p>There was a lot of opposition to a new supermarket in the Portobello Road area.</p>	<p>Portobello and Westbourne Grove is considered as Place 9 of the Places and Sites document. The Kensal place is considered in section 2 and of the Places and Sites document, and the Kensal site as site 1. The new centre in the Latimer areas forms part of the Latimer Place (Place 4).</p>		<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	--	---	---	--	----------------------------------

Box 12.8	Quality built in
----------	------------------

Para 2.2 (KNAAP)	<p>The redevelopment of large scale redevelopment of housing estates in North Kensington should be based on the principles of good urban design, with the reintroduction or reworking of the traditional urban structure, and the provision of high quality contemporary architecture. The development should look to contribute to the existing sense of place or create new spaces of distinctive character.</p>	<p>There was overall strong support achieving high architectural, environmental standards and green spaces in developments not just within North Kensington but for all development. There was general support for redevelopment in North Kensington.</p>	<p>Latimer Place and North Kensington Sports Centre Strategic Site</p>	<p>CL1 - overall quality/built environment policy rather than a specific policy relating to North Kensington.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
------------------	--	---	--	---	------------

Box 13.3a	Kensal Spatial Area
-----------	---------------------

Box 5.1 (NKAAP)

	<p>There is a one-off opportunity for significant regeneration of Kensal and the North Kensington area as a whole, with the 'gas-works' sites holding the key: they must be used to their full regeneration potential. The Council will continue to research the deliverability of this approach including the Crossrail station and other, infrastructure potential and requirements.</p>	<p>Broadly, support exists for establishing a Crossrail station in Kensal. Support comes from variety of sources including landowners and local residents. However, concerns have been raised as to the feasibility of a Crossrail station. There are also requests for a more defined location of any potential station, however, this is not a matter for the Core Strategy.</p> <p>There is also broad support for a mixed use scheme in the area. However, there is a divergence in opinions as to the degree of residential that should be included. Ballymore and Sainsbury's both support Option 2 (mixed use) whilst the National Grid deem Option 1 (residential-led development) as being most appropriate. Only the Labour Group have commented in favour of redevelopment for a Option 3 (London-wide campus).</p> <p>Whilst it is widely acknowledged that the site presents a tremendous opportunity for North Kensington, there are misgivings as to the deliverability of a total redevelopment and the disruption to infrastructure and service provision ancillary to this. Concerns have also been raised regarding the potential Health and Safety implications of developing on and around the gas holders.</p>	Kensal Place	Taken forward. Kensal Vision	N/A
--	--	--	--------------	------------------------------	-----

Box 13.3b	Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site				
-----------	--------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Box 4.2 (NKAAP)	<p>The Council will seek to allocate these four sites for mixed use integrated redevelopment, to high environmental standards and well integrated into the surrounding fabric, to stimulate the regeneration of the area and provide for a Crossrail station, and will work with land owners in preparing a planning and design framework for the site.</p>		Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site	Taken forward. Kensal Strategic Site Allocation	N/A
-----------------	---	--	--------------------------------	---	-----

--	--	--	--	--	--

Para 13.3.16	<p>The initial assessment has concluded that there are three broad alternatives to developing the sites. All alternatives require the land owners to work together to make the best use of the site as a whole.</p> <p>1. Residential lead development. This might achieve up to 5000 houses in a development of up to 7 storeys. While this may be deliverable, it would not generate any significant level of employment and thus not stimulate regeneration in North Kensington. In addition, it is highly unlikely to deliver a Crossrail station. To maximise opportunity to the site, landowners would need to work together.</p>			Not taken forward	This option is unsuitable of the area the potential of Kensal. The area has the potential to be significantly regenerated and this option does not allow for this to be undertaken.
--------------	---	--	--	-------------------	---

	<p>2. A mixed use development containing residential, perhaps 2000 homes, but also a significant amount of commercial floor space, (in the order of 450000 m2). This would take a very different form to the traditional 3-7 storey street architecture of the area, and would almost certainly involve tall buildings. Deliverability is harder because of the need to establish 'Kensal' as a potential destination in the mind of Londoners, although this is by no means insurmountable and has happened elsewhere. It would provide a significant impetus for regeneration, and would require a cross rail station to succeed.</p> <p>3. A strategic London –wide campus for an institution such as a hospital or university. The regeneration benefits would be strong, but deliverability is far less certain because of the need to extract value from the institution's current site once they had relocated. The role of Crossrail is also less clear.</p>		Kensal Place and Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site	Taken forward. Kensal Strategic Site Allocation	N/A
Box 13.4a	Golborne and Trellick Spatial Area				
	<p>Encourage initiatives to support unique retail character if Golborne area.</p> <p>Strengthen links between Portobello and Golborne.</p> <p>Improve pedestrian links north.</p> <p>Redevelopment of Edenham estate as part of longer masterplan for the Golborne Road area, assisting in providing essential funding to refurbish Trellick Tower.</p>	<p>General support for maintaining retail character of Golborne, and concern that the area must not be gentrified. Links to Portobello Road also supported, as was initiatives to strengthen the market. Concerns raised about the loss of the Edenham Care home raised.</p>	Taken forward to the Golborne Place		N/A
Box 13.4b	Wornington Green Estate				
Box 5.3 (NKAAP Issues and Options)	<p>The Council is mindful of the concerns of residents and the case for change made by Kensington Housing Trust and will consider responses to the recent consultation before reaching any conclusions.</p>	<p>The Labour Group reject Kensington Housing Trust's proposals to demolish and rebuild the Wornington Green Estate and are working with local residents to prepare an alternative and more innovative vision for the estate. The Kensington Society and the GLA broadly support the policy direction.</p>	Site 3 of the Strategic Sites and Golborne / Trellick Place	Taken forward	N/A
Box 13.5a	Latimer Spatial Area				

Box 4.3 (NKAAP)

		<p>- The Council will develop a masterplan for the Latimer (<i>nee</i>. Notting Barns West) area which will include a local centre with convenience shops close to the Latimer Road station. It will also cover provision of new market and affordable housing, employment opportunities and new social and community facilities - including sports provision.</p>	<p>The majority of respondents were in favour of a new supermarket/shopping hub at the Latimer Road Station. There was wide ranging support for a Masterplan/Feasibility study to be undertaken to identify opportunities for this area. Many respondents voiced their concern on the lack of market housing in the area.</p> <p>The Westway Development Trust made a number of comments regarding a number of sites that might assist the planning objectives. These include various options for the Maxilla Nursery, Maxilla Social Club and the Bramleys Big Adventure. The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham commented on working with RBKC to establish locations for linkages and synergy between the Notting Barns Spatial area and the White City Opportunity Area. The Labour Group made a number of comments in relation to improved public transport links, incentives to encourage business, the retention of Verity Close and the finger blocks of Testerton, Hurstway and Barandon blocks of the Lancaster West estate. The GLA support the indicative policy direction as laid out.</p>	Latimer Place	Taken forward. Latimer Vision	N/A
--	--	--	---	---------------	-------------------------------	-----

Box 13.5b	North Kensington Sport Centre Strategic Site					
-----------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Box 5.2 (NKAAP)	Option i	<p>The Council will include this site within the Latimer (<i>nee</i>. Notting Barns West) area masterplan and investigate further the feasibility of redevelopment. The masterplan will be likely to cover a number of issues including housing estates, pedestrian access, and provision of shops and local amenities.</p>	<p>There was wide ranging support for a Masterplan/Feasibility study to be undertaken to identify opportunities for this area. The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham commented on working with R.B.K.C to establish locations for linkages and synergy between the Notting Barns Spatial area and the White City Opportunity Area.</p>	Site 5 of the Strategic Sites, June 2009, and included within the Latimer Place (04).	Taken forward. Latimer Vision	N/A
-----------------	----------	---	---	---	-------------------------------	-----

Box 13.6	Portobello and Westbourne Grove Spatial area.					
----------	---	--	--	--	--	--

Box 4.5a of NKAAP Issues and Options		<p>The Council will: - support initiatives to retain the retail character of the Portobello Road;</p>	<p>There was universal support for initiatives to retain the retail character of the Portobello Road. Its diversity and the encouragement of independent retailers were seen as of great importance. The value of maintaining shops which serve a local need (be these independent or not) was also noted.</p>	Taken forward to Chapter 9, The Portobello/ Notting Hill Place	Taken forward.	N/A
		<p>Continue to explore the potential to strengthen the links between Portobello Road and Golborne Road whilst ensuring that the individual character of each centre is not eroded.</p>	<p>Whilst there was general support for strengthening the links between Portobello and Golborne Road, a number of consultees were either sceptical that this could happen or were concerned that the character of the two centres must be maintained</p>	Taken forward to Chapter 9, The Portobello/ Notting Hill Place	Taken forward.	N/A
		<p>Explore the concept of the "active street connection", by which visitors are encouraged to use the length of Portobello Road, from the southern boundary of the centre, up to a new station in the Kensal area, throughout the day and in to the evening.</p>		Term active street connection not taken forward		<p>The Council has ceased to use the term "active street connection". It was not considered to be useful in explaining what the Council's desires for the centre were. The creation of a vibrant and vital centres, based upon shopping - but supporting a mix of other uses - remains integral to the Portobello/Notting Hill Place in the core strategy.</p>

		<p>Continue to explore the possibility of expanding the retail frontage of the eastern side of the Portobello Road between the junctions of Lonsdale Road and Westbourne Grove. Any units provided should be small in scale to suite the niche retailer characteristic of the town centre. This will form part of the ongoing study being carried out on behalf of Property Services considering the future of Portobello Court.</p>	<p>Whilst there was some limited support for creation of new small shops on Portobello Road. A number of consultees also emphasised the need to maintain the separate identity of Portobello Road and Westbourne Grove, with there being very little support for extending the Portobello Road centre to the east towards Westbourne Grove. A number of comments were also received relating to the nature of the consultation concerning the possible future re-development of Portobello Court. There is considerable concern that the views of the residents will not be taken on board, or in fact that the decision is a fait accompli.</p>	<p>Not taken forward.</p>		<p>The Borough Valuer has commissioned a report which explored various options for the redevelopment of Portobello Court. This concluded that redevelopment is not viable at the current time, and therefore reference to any redevelopment of the site has been removed from the document.</p>
		<p>Work in partnership with retailers to establish whether a supermarket can be provided between the Portobello Road and Westbourne Road Special District Centres.</p>	<p>There was an overwhelming rejection of any proposals for a new supermarket on Portobello Court. This rejection was based upon the (unfounded) view that this would result in the loss of homes, but also that a new supermarket would not support the character, diversity and vitality of the Portobello Road and of the market.</p>	<p>Not taken forward.</p>		<p>The Council has decided not to take this option forward given the concern from residents and many members that the introduction of a supermarket is contrary of the desires of the retail commission (endorsed by the Council) which is to support diversity within our centres by supporting independent retailers and existing markets. There is concern that the introduction of a new edge of centre supermarket will harm the fresh fruit and vegetable aspect of the Portobello Market - and integral part of the market and of the whole centre. Furthermore, the Council's retail needs assessment does not endorse the creation of significant amounts of new convenience floorspace (principally food retailing) throughout the borough. It predicts a need for some 2,000 sq m of new convenience retailing across the borough (once one takes the retail in the Lots Road development into account).</p> <p>Much of this will be accommodated within existing centres, with the Council supporting new convenience floorspace in Notting Hill Gate, the Latimer Road area and Fulham Road (East). A new supermarket at the edge of the Portobello Road is simply not "needed".</p>
Box 13.7		Notting Hill Gate				
NEW	vision	<p>To ensure that future development enhances the arts, cultural and bohemian character of the area through its vibrancy, use and exceptional architectural quality to create a centre with a regionally distinctive identity and a high quality, pedestrian friendly public realm</p>	<p>A number of the consultees were of the view that Notting Hill Gate should not be included as part of the North Kensington Plan, but should be a separate spatial area. A number of challenges for the area were identified, the main challenge being impact of Westfield London and the dated / poor quality environment created by the purpose built 1950s and 1960s development. Although different consultees support different futures for the area there was general support for the Kensington Society's ideas of enhancing the vibrancy, improving the architectural quality and creating a high-quality, pedestrian-friendly public realm, by reconfiguring the buildings and public realm.</p>	<p>Place 8, Notting Hill Gate in the Places consultation draft June 2009. However, the retail function of the centre is made more clear and the bohemian character, which no longer exists, has been removed.</p>	<p>Taken forward.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

NEW	Potential outcomes	<p>1) relocate the entrances to the Underground so that they do not restrict pedestrian movement along the footway and may potentially be located within a building or better located in an area with a wider pavement;</p> <p>2) encourage a larger anchor foodstore by building over the car park to the rear of Newcombe House;</p> <p>3) replace Newcombe House, considered as an 'eyesore', with new development which reflects the vision;</p> <p>4) move the library into the centre and provide other arts, cultural and community uses, including studio / exhibition space;</p> <p>5) provide significant public realm improvements, including the removal of clutter, improving pedestrian crossings and general improvements to the pedestrian environment; and</p> <p>6) improve the existing public square outside Newcombe House, or relocate it, with provision of a market for arts, crafts and food.</p>	<p>A new identity could potentially include an iconic building. Other benefits supported include the reconfiguring of the areas public realm, including the relocation of the underground entrances, replacing Newcombe House with a mixed-use office-led tower, the provision of affordable housing and of an anchor foodstore. Other possible benefits identified by a range of stakeholders included the need to identify the Coronet Cinema as a lynch pin of any major improvement, the enlargement of Newcombe Piazza to provide open space for a Farmers' Market.</p>	<p>Place 8, Notting Hill Gate in the Places consultation draft June 2009.</p>	<p>Taken forward.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Box 4.5b of the NKKAP I and O (medium change)	Alternative 1	<p>Predominantly office and retail with some residential. This option retains Newcombe House for office use, which is encouraged in areas of good public transport accessibility, and in particular offers the opportunity to attract arts / media companies consistent with the vision. However, it is not yet known how many of the outcomes listed above could be delivered.</p>	<p>Although different consultees support different futures for the area there was general support for the Kensington Society's ideas of enhancing the vibrancy, improving the architectural quality and creating a high-quality, pedestrian-friendly public realm, by reconfiguring the buildings and public realm.</p>	<p>Place 8, Notting Hill Gate in the Places consultation draft June 2009, where these alternatives have been combined to propose a predominantly retail centre, with offices and some residential, with the redevelopment of the 1950s/1960s architecture.</p>	<p>Taken forward.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Box 4.5b of the NKKAP I and O (significant change)	Alternative 2	<p>Predominantly residential and retail. This option would replace the 'Newcombe House' eyesore with a medium rise high quality building. However, this alternative would also result in a loss of office use in the centre, and as with alternative one, it is not clear how many of the outcomes listed above could be achieved.</p>	<p>Metro Shopping Fund support a vision for the area which sees residential and retail-led town centre, referring to the need to improve the appearance of the town centre and help create a new identity. This is at odds with others who see the area as remaining an office location.</p>		<p>Taken forward.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

June 09 Places and Sites

Where come from (from Towards Preferred Options)	No.	Policies	Summary of response	Is this taken forward to Draft Plan July 09?	Why has option not been taken forward? (NB only include if rejected at this stage. Reason for taking forward will be explained at the end of the process)
Place 2 Kensal					
Box 13.3a		There is a one-off opportunity for significant regeneration in North Kensington – the ‘Gasworks sites’ hold the key: they must be used to their best potential. Along with residential development, there will be job creation and regeneration benefits which would be enhanced by the creation of a Crossrail Station. The borough has a tradition of well-connected high density mixed use developments. The Council expects this successful precedent, along with environmental sustainability (including better use of the canal), to underpin any masterplan for the area.	<p>Almost all the responses were related to the Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site.</p> <p>Broadly, there was support the Council’s ambitions to regenerate Kensal. Objections remain regarding the use of the site for mixed use development with a minority requesting a single use campus. The environmental sentiments for the new development are welcomed and consultees consider that the canal should be promoted to become more of a destination. Both English Heritage and British Waterways support the incorporation of the cemetery as a destination for passive recreation. Of the Landowners, Sainsbury’s and National Grid both support the general direction for their land parcel, however, the National Grid have confirmed that they will continue to require large parts of their site for electricity infrastructure. The amended “Place” will reflect this. Ballymore too have no major concerns over the directions of this chapter. The primary area of concern for GOL was that the Council seem to have no alternative to Crossrail.</p> <p>This however, will be included in the Contingencies section of the Core Strategy.</p>	Taken forward	N/A
Place 3 Golborne/Trellick					
This was not considered at previous stages, although 'Wornington' was, which is encompassed within this 'Place'		Vision Golborne and Trellick will maintain a strong mixed community. Trellick Tower will remain the icon of the area. The Golborne market and retailers will thrive in the future, serving both local people and other Londoners. The Markets of Portobello and Golborne should gain strength from each other but will remain distinct in nature. New housing will be a mix of sizes and tenures. The Grand Union Canal will be seen as a destination, rather than a barrier.	53 responses received. Generally happy with the vision, although requests that the references to the Canal be made more positive, rather than being viewed purely as an access barrier. Stronger references to improving pedestrian links to Portobello Market and the surrounding area. Further investigation needed to ascertain the possibility of a footbridge over the canal. Reference needed to a possible art wall requested	Taken forward	N/A
NKAAP Issues and Options Box 3.2 'Westway Options'		Vision To transform the Westway Flyover from an oppressive negative influence into one which celebrates public art and creativity, using this and the land-assets beneath the flyover to overcome problems of community safety and improve pedestrian linkages to make the area under the flyover into something wonderful.	37 responses received. Stronger references to improving the pedestrian linkages to the surrounding area requested, including better wayfinding. Reference needed to a possible art wall requested. Support for the Council's opposition to advertising boards along the Westway.	Taken forward	N/A
Place 4 Latimer					

Box 13.5a

	<p>Latimer must be a place that focuses on the provision of high quality services through excellent architecture and urban design. It will provide accessible and adaptable spaces that are valued and used the local community. New development , including a new neighbourhood shopping centre, will be located around Latimer Road Underground Station. There will be clear links to Ladbroke Grove and White City. A community leisure centre will be retained in the area and a new secondary school will be established.</p>	<p>A great deal of comments pertain to the relocating of the Sports Centre to Trellick and the potential loss of the swimming pool. Residents are unhappy by the seemingly ambiguous stance taken by the Council in the Core Strategy and are demanding firm answer as to the likelihood of the swimming pool being retained in the area. There are questions at to whether this is the best location for the new school and concerns over security implications, one respondent has even requested more gated communities to protect themselves from the new pupils.</p> <p>Comments proposing the Employment Zone be undesignated were made and certain consultees believe that the area has lost its character. Comments as to what should replace it include an arts and media hub, residential and office/hotel accommodation to support Westfield. However this viewpoint is not universal and comments have also been made for the Council to tighten up its position on Employment Zones, especially in Latimer. Concerns were also raised relating to the potential creation of short cuts through the site.</p>	<p>Taken forward</p>	<p>The is reference made to the reprovision of sports facilities elsewhere in the borough. This was not considered at TPO stage despite having first been put forward as a option in Interim Issues and Options. This direction will not be progressed passed this iteration as the sports facilities (especially the swimming pool) provide an important and indeed, historic community function in Latimer</p>
--	--	---	----------------------	--

Place 5 Earl's Court

		<p>Most of the comments were in support to the document. There was a suggestion that the Warwick Road sites were rather down played in the "Place" text, and their importance should be raised. They also wanted reference to the importance of enhancing shopfronts, streetscape and pedestrian improvements across the area and inclusion of large-scale offices. Some residents where not happy with the unravelling of the One-Way-System as they saw the problem as being the large amounts of traffic and were not sure if the unravelling of the One-Way-System would reduce traffic. Others supported the unravelling of the One-Way-System and wanted to seek highways improvements through section 106. There were also responses acknowledging the difficulty of unravelling the system and the need for a full transport study. GLA supported the work in partnership with LBHF but also wanted reference to partnership working with the GLA/LBHF and TfL as strategic partners and the potential for an opportunity area designation covering the site within the new London Plan.</p> <p>There was a request to recognise that Brompton Cemetery has a Grade II* status on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest.</p>	<p>Option taken forward in chapter 10</p>	<p>Taken forward</p>
--	--	---	---	----------------------

Place 6 Lots Road/Worlds End

		Lots Road/World's End	There was general support. The issues raised were: the feeling of isolation from Lots Road, the importance of the employment zone for small business and light industry and the need for further improvements to pedestrian and cycling links and to the Chelsea Creek if future development would allow it. GLA and Port of London Authority stated the importance of the Safeguarded Chelsea Wharf and the fact that it could be used for river transport.	Option taken forward in chapter 18	Taken forward
Place 7 Westway					
		To transform the Westway Flyover from an oppressive negative influence into one which celebrates public art and creativity, using this and the land-assets beneath the flyover to overcome problems of community safety, to make the area under the flyover into something wonderful	There was general support for this vision, with a recognition that the Council's vision must align with that of the Westway development Trust.	Taken forward to Chapter 8 of Draft Plan.	N/A
Place 8 Notting Hill Gate					
TPO Box 13.7	Vision	Notting Hill Gate will be significantly enhanced as a district shopping centre, providing for day-to-day local needs, and offering high quality local restaurants and 'quirky' community and arts facilities. Boutiques and small independent retailers will also be encouraged, particularly in Kensington Church Street and Pembridge Road. The centre will continue to be a major office location. The street will become less traffic dominated and more pedestrian friendly, with improved crossing facilities, less street clutter and the tube entrances will be relocated within buildings. All development will need to be of the most exceptional design and architectural quality, creating a 'wow' factor that excites and delights residents and visitors. Pedestrian links to Portobello Road Market will also be enhanced through good design, and clear wayfinding.	This place was generally well supported. The Metro Shopping Fund (landowners of a large portion of the centre) suggest a number of amendments, such as raising the importance of strengthening the retail function of the centre acknowledging that it's not the existence of coffee shops and restaurants that contribute to the poor quality of the centre, but the 'down market' quality of some of the operators, such as fast food outlets, which do not cater for the local community; encouraging urban living within the centre, with which we agree. We disagree with their suggestions regarding downplaying the role of the centre for offices and the potential to relocate the tube entrances, and that the built environment issues could be resolved by 'uplifting' rather than redevelopment.	Taken forward. Place 16 in Draft Plan, July 2009	N/A
Place 9 Portobello/ Notting Hill					

Box 13.6 Towards Preferred Options

<p>Vision</p>	<p>As Special District Centres Portobello and Westbourne Grove will both remain internationally known vibrant retail areas. By making better pedestrian links between Portobello Road, Westbourne Grove, All Saints Road and Golborne Road the area as a whole will be strengthened, while the different qualities of the individual centres will be maintained.</p> <p>Portobello Road will remain a jewel in London's shopping crown, a place which has not been over run by identikit multiples. The centre will maintain a rich variety of shops, with a predominance now so rare in the capital, of independent retailers offering "something different". Portobello Road's strengths: the diversity of the retail offer, including both a vibrant antiques trade and cutting edge fashion, will continue to be built upon. Its less glamorous role as the provider of the range of shops and services essential to support of the day-to-day needs of local people is no less important and will also continue to be encouraged.</p> <p>Running up the length of the Portobello Road, the street market will act as both a key driver to achieve this vision and an opportunity to strengthen the links with the Golborne Road Special Neighbourhood Centre to the north.</p> <p>Portobello Road is however more than a shopping street, it will continue to be an inspiration for designers and a seed-bed for new entrepreneurs. Westbourne Grove will retain its position as a specialist shopping destination providing high end fashion retailing.</p>	<p>4.4 Portobello/ Notting Hill: The majority of consultees were generally supportive of the vision that the Council has for the Portobello/ Notting Hill area. There was however some concern that the vital role that the antiques trade has in contributing to the character and to the vitality of the centre had been underplayed. Amendments have been made accordingly. There was also some concern that the Council was looking to rundown the Portobello Market, managing its decline. Again amendments were made to make the Council's position clear. The other main issue concerned the relationship that Portobello has with the centres neighbouring it. Many thought that it enjoyed much stronger links with Golborne to the North than Westbourne Grove to the East. These links were strongly supported and the Council was encouraged to increase these further.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Chapter 12, of Draft Plan, Portobello/Notting Hill.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
---------------	---	---	---	------------

Box 3.3 Towards Preferred Options

	<p>Knightsbridge will continue to enjoy its role as the Royal Borough's international shopping destination and home to some of the most exclusive shopping in London. It will also continue its role as an important residential quarter and a service centre for residents in both Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster.</p>	<p>Concerns were expressed that mentioning that the West End was the other international centre in the capital implied that the intention was to make Knightsbridge more like the West End. The text has been altered to state that the West End has a very different character. There were concerns that Knightsbridge should be up market and not cater for mass market tourists, these comments related particularly to the provision of open space, cafes and restaurants. The text has not been changed as requested because generally it is important to be able to offer customers the full range of services they expect from a shopping centre including places to eat and drink so they can take a break and then continue shopping. There was concern about the statement that it may be appropriate to look for opportunities to expand the boundaries of the centre so this sentence has been removed, although the reference to opportunities to create more retail floorspace by intensification or expansion remains. There was a request for greater clarity about what this expansion actually means. There was concern that the statement under Renewing the Legacy gave Harrods carte blanche to do whatever they wanted, this has been amended to make it clear that this text related to the building fabric</p>	<p>Taken forward. Chapter 13, of Draft Plan, Knightsbridge.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	--	---	------------

Place 11 South Kensington

Box 3.5 Towards Preferred Options

	<p>Prince Albert's vision was of a wide range of world-class institutions connecting the science and art of the past, present and future. This holds true today but now our interpretation of culture is ever richer, embracing more of our everyday lives - entertainment, eating and drinking, and even shopping. South Kensington must continue to develop across this spectrum of cultural activity to remain a local, national and internationally significant destination.</p> <p>The key to our modern world is connectivity, we must ensure that this spirit, so powerfully expressed in the soon to be completed public realm of Exhibition Road, is developed throughout South Kensington – innovative public realm proposals, generous public spaces, unique retailing and cultural experiences. All the facilities developed for residents and visitors alike must be connected to create an inspiring and memorable and thoroughly contemporary re-evocation of the original Victorian vision.</p>	<p>South Kensington Estates wanted RBKC to take responsibility for promoting the area and asked for more public realm improvements like the space opposite the V&A. Imperial College wanted us to promote RBKC as a centre for excellence in education but the college is located in Westminster. They objected to use of the Queens Lawn as an alternative event space and removing cars from Imperial College Road – text has been changed. They asked for recognition of the college's contribution to the vitality and viability of the centre (text changed) and for support for support for growth of the cluster of Imperial College, however this would be a decision for Westminster and a statement that South Kensington is an appropriate location for student housing.</p> <p>The Brompton Association wanted more on the residential character of the area and commitment to preserving this character (text changed), recognition of the village retail character south of Cromwell Rd and recognition of the East Lawn as a green space (which was not changed because high footfall means a hard surface may be more appropriate).</p>	<p>Taken forward. Chapter 14 of Draft Plan, South Kensington</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	---	--	------------

Place 12 King's Road/Sloane Square

Box 3.6 Towards Preferred Options

		<p>The King's Road will not simply be like any other 'successful' high street. It will remain one of London's iconic and vibrant shopping streets, containing a lively and diverse mix of shops, restaurants, and world-class cultural attractions.</p> <p>It will remain a place where one can shop in both independent boutiques and multiples; a place to enjoy, a place which meets the day-to-day needs of our residents; and a place to experience some of the best theatre, concert and gallery space that London has to offer.</p>	<p>4.9 Kings Road/Sloane Square: the comments were disparate in nature. The special character of the King's Road was endorsed. It was seen as a successful centre which retains much of its character despite the large number of multiple retailers that it contains. Some of this character was seen to relate to the built form of the area - the juxtaposition between the bustling shopping street and the quiet garden squares and open spaces which opened up one side of the street or the other. The Council was urged to maintain this balance, and to ensure that the commercial uses do not harm the residential amenity of the neighbouring residential properties. Three responses related to Sloane Square in particular. It was suggested by some that the Council should explicitly recognise the results of the recent consultation on the issue and explicitly state that the solution for the "problem" should relate to "planters" and other relatively minor street improvements rather than to a more radical solution.</p>	<p>Taken forward</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	--	--	--	----------------------	------------

Place 13 Kensington High Street

Box 3.7 Towards Preferred Options		<p>The centre will continue its long tradition as Kensington's High Street serving residents, workers and visitors. It will continue to provide a good range of food retailing and other convenience retailing and remain a destination for fashion and certain niche markets. Ease of pedestrian movement is central to this success. Reuse of the former Commonwealth Institute for a significant public institution represents an opportunity to increase visitor numbers and develop a further niche retail cluster and restaurants at the western end of the High Street. The maintenance of a cinema is essential.</p>	<p>4.10 Kensington High Street: Many of the comments relate to redevelopment of the Commonwealth Institute and reduction of the Circle line service. Chelsfield objected to the text specifying a new public institutional use for the Commonwealth Institute and Northacre wanted to include reference to the contribution that the Commonwealth Institute makes to the High Street and its environment in terms of the appearance of the listed building, views, landscaping and openness. Barclays objected to the protection of retail uses in primary frontages. The Kensington Society proposed some minor text changes, most of these alterations have been made.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Chapter 16 of draft plan, Kensington High Street/</p>	<p>N/A</p>
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	---	------------

Place 14 Brompton Cross / Chelsea

<p>This was not offered at previous stages of the document, however, it was considered a 'Place' as it is a district shopping centre and in-line with PPS6, all town centres should have a vision</p>	<p>Vision</p>	<p>The Council views Brompton Cross as a high quality specialist boutique retail centre with international appeal. The centre will also be enhanced by development which reflects its high quality character and improves pedestrian links to South Kensington Underground Station, the Museums, and Knightsbridge. The Council will encourage the return of long-term vacant retail units to retail use. The hospital facilities in the area will continue to be supported.</p>	<p>18 responses received. General support for the 'Place' vision and supporting text. Request that reference be made the hospitals in the area within the vision and that the hospital be listed in the supporting text.</p>	<p>Taken forward</p>	<p>N/A</p>
---	---------------	--	--	----------------------	------------

Place 15 Fulham Road (West)

<p>This was not offered at previous stages of the document, however, it was considered a 'Place' as it is a district shopping centre and in-line with PPS6, all town centres should have a vision</p>	<p>Vision</p>	<p>Fulham Road West will remain an essential centre providing for the daily needs of local people, while also offering a variety of high quality specialist shopping. The proportion of food and drink uses, together with their hours of operation, will be carefully managed to ensure a complimentary environment with the retail uses and surrounding residential area. The appearance of the centre will be enhanced through improvements to shop fronts. Pedestrian and cycle links to the north and south will be improved. The Council will support the hospital's role in contributing to the centre's vitality.</p>	<p>17 responses received. General support for 'Place' vision and supporting text with only minor wording changes requested. Request that wording be included to state that the Council supports the hospital in the vision.</p>	<p>Taken forward</p>	<p>N/A</p>
---	---------------	---	---	----------------------	------------

Sites					
Site 1 Kensal Gasworks					

<p>Box 13.3b</p>			<p>Almost all the responses were related to the Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site.</p> <p>Broadly, there was support the Council's ambitions to regenerate Kensal. Objections remain regarding the use of the site for mixed use development with a minority requesting a single use campus. The environmental sentiments for the new development are welcomed and consultees consider that the canal should be promoted to become more of a destination. Both English Heritage and British Waterways support the incorporation of the cemetery as a destination for passive recreation. Of the Landowners, Sainsbury's and National Grid both support the general direction for their land parcel, however, the National Grid have confirmed that they will continue to require large parts of their site for electricity infrastructure. The amended "Place" will reflect this. Ballymore too have no major concerns over the directions of this chapter. The primary area of concern for GOL was that the Council seem to have no alternative to Crossrail.</p> <p>This however, will be included in the Contingencies section of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Taken forward</p>	<p>N/A</p>
------------------	--	--	--	----------------------	------------

Site 3 Wornington Green					
--------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

<p>Box 13.4b of the TPO, although this did not contain much detail</p>	<p>Proposed Allocation</p>	<p>Residential – Redevelopment on this site will comprise of a minimum of 538 affordable units and a minimum of 150 private dwellings Leisure and Community Facilities – Replacement Venture Centre and Ball Court – 2,500m2 (GEA) Open Space – Replacement Athlone Gardens – approximately 10,000m2 (GEA) Tertiary education facilities</p>	<p>General support for this site. The results of SPD consultation needs to be included into the final version of this Site.</p>	<p>Taken forward. Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy Taken forward. Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy Taken forward. Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy Taken forward. Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy</p>	<p>N/A N/A N/A N/A</p>
--	----------------------------	---	---	--	--

Site 3 Land adjacent to Trellick Tower					
---	--	--	--	--	--

Box 13.4a of TPO		A minimum of 60 residential units, to fund regeneration including improvements to social and community facilities and housing.	Few representations were received on this strategic allocation. Representations were received from the Golborne Society who were concerned that the allocation excludes re-provision of a care home, although health provision is catered for as a possible use.	Taken forward, Chapter 22 of Draft Core Strategy.	N/A
Site 4 Warwick Road					
		Warwick Road	There was a general support. The respondents wanted other improvements covered in the section 106: pedestrian and cycle improvements, open space and community facilities and the inclusion of policing floor space. The owners of the site provided updated information about the sites. The GLA questioned why the site was considered as strategic as it comprises five sites that are unlikely to be redeveloped as a whole. The four northern sites, however, have been planned as a whole through the SPD, and taken together we would be open to criticism if we did not acknowledge their collective significance to the borough.	Option taken forward on chapter 25	Taken Forward
Site 5 North Ken Sports Centre					
Box 13.5b of TPO	Proposed Allocation	1) A minimum of 60 residential units; 2) New Secondary School with sports facilities – facility large enough to accommodate 1,600 pupils in a site with an area with no less than 6,000m2; 3) Reprovision of the existing sports facilities which may or not be linked to the new school and 4) A site layout that adds to the legibility and permeability of the street network in the area	Significant concern was raised regarding any loss of existing sports facilities, especially the loss of the swimming facilities. Concern was also raised regarding the impacts of a new school and the new road layout to existing residential amenity. The timescales for delivery needed to be more specific, and clarification was needed regarding the loss of open space.	Taken forward. Chapter 23 in Draft Plan, July 2009.	N/A
Former Commonwealth Institute Site					
Introduced at this stage	6 of Sites Doc May 09	Exhibition use, with enabling development	General support for use of site as an exhibition use.	Taken forward. Chapter 24 of Draft Plan July 09	N/A
Earls Court					

	Earl's Court	The comments were generally supportive. Most of the respondents wanted to see other issues covered in section 106: public open space, improvement of pedestrian links, access to the site, transport improvements and help towards the unravelling of the One-Way-System. Further discussions on the practicality of unravelling this have been requested from TfL. Some respondents were concerned due to the allocation of the site to meet the waste apportionment, this has now been changed. The GLA wanted further consideration of the residential-led mixed use capacity, were a large exhibition based use were not to proceed and the need to safeguard operational railway for both the place and the strategic site. A number of respondents commented on the need to make greater reference to the Hammersmith and Fulham part of the site. Now that Hammersmith and Fulham have published a discussion draft on their plan, this information can be included in future editions of our plan.	Option taken forward on chapter 26	Taken forward
Lots Road				
			The existing planning permission was included for information purposes in Chapter 27 of the draft plan	Taken forward

Draft Plan July 09

Where come from (from Places and sites or from TPO)	No.	Policies	Summary of response	If this is taken forward: how and where?	Reasoning
Development Management Polices Social and Community Uses					
Boxes 4.2 and 4.5-4.7 of TPO	CK1	The Council will require social and community uses to be protected and enhanced within the Borough.	Support remains for this. However an objection was raised by Northacre Northacre object to Core Strategy's approach to social and community uses and suggests that the definition of social and community uses (including care homes, places of worship and petrol stations) is too broad. The Council disputes this and will not change its definition, instead a short position paper justifying why each use is included will be produced for the final evidence base.	Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy CK1 in Keeping Life Local	This policy is taken forward as it is considered to be the crux of Keeping Life Local in the borough. Included within the RJ will be a list of uses considered Social and Community Uses.
Local Shopping Facilities					
Box 5.4b of TPO	CK2	The Council will protect local shopping facilities and individual shops through the provision of new facilities particularly in areas of deficiency to ensure that 77% of the borough is within 5 minutes (400m or 440 yard) walk of these facilities during the lifetime of this strategy	Support exists for this policy however comments have been raised stating that there should be more reference to maintaining and strengthening of facilities	Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy CK2 in Keeping Life Local and in Fostering Vitality	Protection of Local shopping facilities aids in the fostering of a local community. The use of a walkable neighbourhood also allow for a greater monitoring of uses and highlight areas for intensification
Walkable Neighbourhoods and Neighbourhood Facilities					
Box 4.3 of TPO	CK3	The Council will seek to maintain the current percentage of access to neighbourhood facilities and work towards increasing these where appropriate opportunities arise. These percentages are: a. General Practitioners - 85% of the borough within an 800m/875 yard walk b. Primary Schools - 95% of the borough within an 800m/875 yard walk	Support exists for the topic. However the measurement The Kensington Society make reference to CK3 being land based instead of population based. We agree with this, but it is virtually impossible to calculate using current technology. As we are very much a "trail-blazing" authority in terms of using walkable neighbourhood deficiencies, there is no best practice. Therefore, at least until technology advances, we will maintain the current system.	Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy CK3 in Keeping Life Local	Walkable neighbourhoods are used as the best means of measuring deficiency in neighbourhood facilities. The use of percentages maintain and enhance the current levels of accessibility and highlight areas for improvements.
Social and Community Uses and Arts and Cultural Uses					

Boxes 4.2 and 4.5-4.7 of TPO	CF10a	The Council will: i) protect land and/or buildings where the current or last use was a social or community use for re-use for the same or for a different social or community use;	Some objections were raised to the draft policy to resist the loss of all social and community uses. Conversely other comments were received which urged the Council to word the social and community policy is such a way as to protect premises for social and community uses even when the original social and community use has no longer requires the building. The GLA did not object to the approach taken.	Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy CK1 in Keeping Life Local	This policy is taken forward as it is considered to be the crux of Keeping Life Local in the borough. A list of social and community uses will be Included within the RJ of the Proposed Submission. The policy has been amended following specific legal advice to ensure that the wording is amended to ensure that the robust approach that the Council intends to be taken on social and community uses will work in practice.
Boxes 4.2 and 4.5-4.7 of TPO	CF10a	ii) protect a social and community use in its existing use if the loss of the facility would result in a significant shortfall in capacity;		No	This policy is not directly taken forward. CK1 in the Proposed Submission draft protects all Social and Community uses. This was the case with this iteration and CF10a ii) effectively repeats this.
Box 5.7 of TPO	CF10a	iii) protect all arts and cultural uses; and		Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy CF7 in Fostering Vitality	The Council took this policy forward as no objections were raised. A reference to enabling development, where the proposal will result in an overall improvement to arts and cultural uses was added.
Box 5.9 of TPO	CF10a	iv) require a replacement of similar capacity upon redevelopment of any cinema or theatre.		Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy CF7 in Fostering Vitality	The Council took this policy forward as no objections were raised. A reference to enabling development, where the proposal will result in an overall improvement to arts and cultural uses was added.
Boxes 4.2 and 4.5-4.7 of TPO	CF10b	The Council will: i) permit new, and the expansion of existing, social and community uses that predominantly serve, or which provide significant benefits to, borough residents;		Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy CK1 in Keeping Life Local	This policy is taken forward as it is considered to be the crux of Keeping Life Local in the borough. A list of social and community uses will be Included within the RJ of the Proposed Submission
Boxes 4.2 and 4.5-4.7 of TPO	CF10b	ii) permit new social and community uses except where the proposal is for the change of use of an individual flat or group of flats within a residential block;		Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy CK1 in Keeping Life Local	This policy is taken forward as it is considered to be the crux of Keeping Life Local in the borough. It is considered that individual non-residential uses within residential blocks are not seen as acceptable as they damage the amenity of residents. No comments were received to the contrary and therefore the policy will be retained

Boxes 4.2 and 4.5-4.7 of TPO	CF10b	iii) permit enabling development on land where the current or last use was a social and community or an arts and cultural use in order to significantly improve that use, or, in exceptional circumstances, in order to provide an alternative social and community or arts and cultural use on site or improve social and community or arts and cultural uses elsewhere within the borough;		Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy CK1 in Keeping Life Local and Policy CF7 in Fostering Vitality	The Council acknowledge that social and community uses do not produce such high land values as others in the borough (primarily residential). Therefore, allowing enabling development is seen as the most appropriate means of attaining social and community uses.
Boxes 4.2 and 4.5-4.7 of TPO	CF10b	iv) require applications including enabling development to submit a financial appraisal toolkit to ascertain the appropriate level of enabling development required. s106 contributions will be reviewed in the context of this financial appraisal;		Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy C1	
Boxes 4.2 and 4.5-4.7 of TPO	CF10b	v) require the applicant to fund the independent assessment of any viability study accompanying an application;		Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy C1	
Boxes 4.2 and 4.5-4.7 of TPO	CF10b	vi) provide a new secondary school for the communities of North Kensington; and		Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy CK1 in Keeping Life Local	A new school is required in North Kensington as a deficiency has been noted. At present, 50% of children attending state schools are commuting out of the Borough
Box 5.7 of TPO	CF10b	vii) permit new arts and cultural uses, or the expansion of these uses, which are likely to generate large numbers of visitors in areas of the borough which have a PTAL score of 4 or above, or will achieve this level through improvements to public transport during the lifetime of the plan. Arts and cultural uses which are likely to attract fewer visitors will be welcomed throughout the borough.		Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy as Policy CF7 in Fostering Vitality	The Council took this policy forward as no objections were raised. A reference to enabling development, where the proposal will result in an overall improvement to arts and cultural uses was added.
CF1 Successful town centres					
Box 5.5 and 5.6 of TPO		The Council will secure the success and vitality of our town centres by protecting and promoting shops and ensuring the centres contain a diverse and varied mix of uses.	There was support for the protection of our centres and ensuring that they continue to contain a diverse and varied mix of uses	Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy, CF1.	N/A
CF2 Retail Development within Town Centres					
Box 5.4 and 5.5 of TPO		The Council will require the scale and nature of development within a town centre to reflect the position of the centre within the hierarchy and to assist in the implementation of the vision for that centre as set out within the <i>Places</i> section.	There was general support for the Core Strategy's 'town centre first' approach to new retail floorspace, and to the Council drawing up place visions for the a number of the Borough's town centres.	Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy, CF2.	No change to policy as the approach put forward has general support and is considered to comply with Government guidance.
CF3 New town centres uses					
Box 5.5, 5.6		The Council will: Direct new large scale retail development to existing higher order town centres. Support new town centre uses in sites adjoining Knightsbridge, King's Road (East and West), Fulham Road (East and West), and South Kensington where no suitable sites can be identified within these centres. Support the new retail floorspace in other areas where applicants can demonstrate need; where the development would meet the requirements of the sequential test and where it will not have an unacceptable impact on existing centres; or where new floorspace would be central to underpinning the Council's regeneration objectives and where the vitality of any existing centre will not be harmed.	There was general support for the Core Strategy's 'town centre first' approach to new retail floorspace, the sequential test and the other requirements of PPS6. No representations were received objecting to the expansion of some of the Borough's southern higher order centres, though there was some concern that expansion should not be at the expense of the amenity of adjoining residents.	CF1 considers the location of new shop uses, and identifies those town centres which may be suitable for expansion.	No change to policy as the approach put forward has general support and is considered to comply with Government guidance.

Retail "Tactical policies" CF11

Box 5.6 of TPO	CF11	i. protect retail floorspace in primary areas within the higher order centres.	Whilst there was general support that the core areas (the primary shopping frontages) should contain a concentration of shop uses there was concern by a number of consultees that the position taken was too onus, and would not allow sufficient diversity of uses within these areas.	This policy has not been taken forward in this form, although CF3 sets out the approach that the Council has decided to take when determining applications which include the loss of shops in the primary frontages of the Borough's higher order town centres. CF3b considers the appropriate balance of uses in secondary shopping frontages of the Borough's higher order town centres.	A criteria based approach is considered appropriate as allows a degree of flexibility whilst ensuring that the critical mass of shop uses within the primary areas is maintained.
Box 5.6 of TPO	CF11	ii. protect retail floorspace within secondary areas of higher order town centres unless the change is to a town centre use as defined in para 3.2.1 and where 2/3 of the ground floor units in the relevant street frontage will not remain in an A1(shop) use and so long as there are no more than 3 non-A1 uses in a row.	Few comments were received. There was, however, general support for the Council's approach to town centres, as the areas which contain a concentration of shops, supported by a range of other town centre uses.	CF3b considers the appropriate balance of uses in secondary shopping frontages of the Borough's higher order town centres.	A criteria based approach is considered appropriate as allows a degree of flexibility whilst ensuring that a high proportion of shop uses within the secondary areas is maintained.
Box 4.4 of TPO	CF11	iii. protect all shops within the neighbourhood centres, unless the proposal is to change to a social and community use, and where 2/3 of the relevant street frontage Relevant street frontage is the ground floor frontage between successive intersecting vehicular highways remains in an A1 use (shop).	Few comments were received on this subject, although there was a general level of support for the maintenance of a tier of neighbourhood centres which support the day-to-day needs (shopping and social and community) of the Borough's residents.	CF3d considers the protection of shop uses within neighbourhood centres.	This approach allows the Council to maintain the main function of the neighbourhood centres, as shopping centres, but also as centres where serve the residents other day-to-day needs.
Box 4.3 of TPO	CF11	iv. protect individual shops outside designated centres.	There were no objections received to the protection of individual shops outside of town centres.	CK2 protects individual shops outside designated centres.	The Council has chosen to protect isolated shops outside of centres as these shops play a contribution to serving the day-to-day shopping needs of the borough's residents.
Portobello Place, June 09	CF11	v. protect all of the borough's street markets including those at Portobello Road, Golborne Road and Bute Street.	Those consultees who commented supported the protection of the Borough's street markets, as these are considered to play an important role in contributing to the character of the Borough's centres.	CF4 supports the protection of the Borough's street markets.	The Council has created a new policy to bring all previous policies which related to street markets to a single place. This reflects the importance that the Council places upon its street markets, and upon the need to have the necessary storage.
Portobello Place, June 09	CF11	vi. protect existing storage lockups for street traders	Few specific comments were received at this stage concerning the provision of storage for street markets. Those that were received were supportive of its protection.	CF4 supports the protection of the storage for the Borough's street markets.	The Council has created a new policy to bring all previous policies which related to street markets to a single place. This reflects the importance that the Council places upon its street markets, and upon the need to have the necessary storage.

CF11

CF11	i. permit new shop uses (A1) of less than 400msq (gross external) in areas of retail deficiency as shown on plan x within the <i>Keeping Life Local</i> section of this document.	Few specific comments were received, with neither the GLA nor GOL objecting to this approach.	CF1c supports new shops with a floor areas of less than 400 sq m to created outside of existing centres in areas of retail deficiency.	Whilst the Council supports the town centre first approach to retail uses, as endorsed by PPS6, it does recognise that small shops, outside centres, can play a valuable role in serving the day-to-day shopping needs of local residents. 400 sq m (gross) equates to a shop of a size which is likely to be a "local format" which is likely to be considered a small shop with regard the Sunday Trading restrictions (280 sq m net). It is not of a size which is likely to have a detrimental impact on the character of adjoining centres.
CF11	ii. require new large scale retail development or mixed use development with a significant retail element a net increase of retail floorspace of greater than 1000 sq m to provide a range of shop unit sizes and affordable shops to be managed under the Council's Neighbourhood Shopping Policy. Affordable shops can be provided off site within the same centre where appropriate.	Some consultees suggested that the principal of using the s106 system to gain "affordable shops" was both unreasonable and unworkable. Furthermore some were concerned that the provision of a range of unit sizes may also be overly onerous .	Provision of affordable shops and of variety of unit sizes included in CF2.	<p>The creation of affordable shops is one of the few tools in the Council's possession which allows it to take an active role in helping maintain the diversity of our town centres. It was suggested by the Council's Retail Commission, and the Mayor has indicated that it will form part of the forthcoming London Plan. The document has always recognised that affordable shops will not be appropriate in all cases, but is just one of a series of benefits which could be sought under the s106 system for suitable developments.</p> <p>The Council does recognise that the provision of a range of unit sizes may not always be appropriate. A mix of unit sizes will not be sought where this is shown to be the case. There is, however, no need to dilute the policy - as a Council is allowed to consider the particular circumstances of any particular case.</p>
CF11	iii. support new street markets and the expansion of the Portobello Street Market north towards Golborne Road.	Those consultees who commented supported the protection of the Borough's street markets, as these are considered to play an important role in contributing to the character of the Borough's centres.	CF4 supports the protection of the Borough's street markets.	The Council has created a new policy to bring all previous policies which related to street markets to a single place. This reflects the importance that the Council places upon its street markets, and upon the need to have the necessary storage.

		iv. support the provision of additional storage for street traders.	Those consultees who commented supported the protection of the Borough's street markets, and of the necessary storage, as these are considered to play an important role in contributing to the character of the Borough's centres.	CF4 supports the protection of the Borough's street markets.	The Council has created a new policy to bring all previous policies which related to street markets to a single place. This reflects the importance that the Council places upon its street markets, and upon the need to have the necessary storage.
CF12, A3/A4/A5 uses tactical policy					
CF11		<p>i. permit within existing centres where comply with the criteria set up within FV TP3;</p> <p>permit outside centres where will not result in the loss of usable retail space and where there is no material reduction in residential character or any material increase in traffic or parking</p>	<p>Whilst there was general support that the core areas (the primary shopping frontages) should contain a concentration of shop uses there was concern by a number of consultees that the position taken was too onus, and would not allow sufficient diversity of uses within these areas.</p> <p>Whilst there was general support that the core areas (the primary shopping frontages) should contain a concentration of shop uses there was concern by a number of consultees that the position taken was too onus, and would not allow sufficient diversity of uses within these areas.</p>	<p>This policy has not been taken forward in this form, although CF3 sets out the approach that the Council has decided to take when determining applications which include the loss of shops in the primary frontages of the Borough's higher order town centres.</p> <p>This policy has not been taken forward in this form, although CF3 sets out the approach that the Council has decided to take when determining applications which include the loss of shops in the primary frontages of the Borough's higher order town centres. CK2 resists the loss of all shops outside centres, CT1b resists proposals which will result in a material increase in traffic congestion and CE6c, considers proposals which have a noise impact.</p>	<p>A criteria based approach is considered appropriate as allows a degree of flexibility whilst ensuring that the critical mass of shop uses within the primary areas is maintained. The specific policy on A3/A4 and A5 uses has been omitted as all elements are considered to be covered elsewhere within the core strategy.</p> <p>The policy has been removed as all parts are contained in other policies within the document.</p>
CF4 CF4 New Town centres SP					
Box 5.3 of TPO		The Council will support the creation of new centres in the Latimer and Kensal areas to address identified retail deficiency.	Whilst there were no objections to the creation of new centres in these locations concerned was raised that the scale of these centres must be appropriate for the area. In particular there was concern that a new centre in the Kensal area was dependent on a Crossrail station in the area, a development which is not certain.	CF1 d supports new centres in the Latimer and Kensal areas.	<p>The Council fully endorses the creation of two new town centres which will address identified retail deficiency. The centre at Latimer is not dependent on redevelopment of the entire area as already lies in an area of deficiency.</p> <p>A new centre at Kensal is not dependent on a Crossrail station as large scale new development could be supported by other improvements to public transport.</p>
CF5 Location of Business use SP					

Box 5.2 of TPO		The Council will consolidate large scale business uses in areas of high public transport accessibility.	Few comments were received on the issue of consolidation of large scale business uses. One consultee was however concerned about the definition of "high public transport accessibility", suggesting that this should be PTAL5 rather than PTAL4. Furthermore there was concern that the Council has policies which support small offices across the Borough.	CF5 takes this approach forward, seeking to consolidate large and medium offices within town centres and other areas of high transport accessibility. CF5 also considers the protection/support for new small and very small offices.	Consolidation of high trip generators in highly accessible areas is one of the central tenets of sustainable development, and the Council is satisfied that areas with a PTAL level of 4 "Good") should be considered to be well served by public transport. The Council also recognises the important role that small and very small offices place in the Borough, and therefore has been more explicit in their support.
Box 5.2 of TPO	CF13	CF13a The Council will protect all light industrial uses throughout the borough.	No comments were received on this subject.	CF5f protects all new light industrial uses throughout the Borough.	The protection of light industrial uses is considered important as maintains a use which has a particular role in supporting the employment needs of a sector of Borough residents who have fewer employment opportunities.
Box 5.2 of TPO	CF13	CF13b The Council will permit light industrial uses in Employment Zones, predominantly commercial mews and other appropriate areas, and support the provision of a mix of unit sizes suitable for the creative and cultural businesses.	Only a single comment was received on this subject, and this related to those areas which the Council considered to be appropriate, and in particular concern that light industrial uses are not supported at the expense of residential amenity.	CF5f and g protects light industrial uses and new light industrial uses is employment zones and other areas where amenity is not harmed.	A light industrial use, by its very definition, is one considered compatible with residential areas. Impact on amenity of a new light industrial uses is a material consideration across the Borough. A further reference to amenity was however consider to be appropriate.
CF14 CF14 Office tactical policies					
Box 5.2 of TPO	CF14	i. protect small offices (Floor area of 300 sq m or less (when either stand alone or part of large business premises)) across the borough	Objection received to the Council's approach to protecting office stock across the borough, arguing that this will harm ability to meet other objectives, in particular provision of affordable housing.	CF5a concerns the protection of small and very small offices.	Council satisfied that protection of office stock is supported by Employment and Premises Study and that it will not harm the Council's ability to meet its housing targets.
Box 5.2 of TPO	CF14	ii. protect medium sized offices 300 to 1000sq m. within the Employment Zones, within town centres and other accessible areas (PTAL4 of greater) or those areas which will be accessible in the lifetime of the plan.	Objection received to the Council's approach to protecting office stock across the borough, arguing that this will harm ability to meet other objectives, in particular provision of affordable housing.	CF5a considers protection of medium sized offices in certain areas.	Council satisfied that protection of office stock is supported by Employment and Premises Study and that it will not harm the Council's ability to meet its housing targets.
Box 5.2 of TPO	CF14	iii. protect large offices (Greater than 1000 sq. m. in town centres and other accessible areas (PTAL4 of greater)) or those areas which will be accessible in the lifetime of the plan.	Whilst some support or protecting offices in town centres, not shared by all, with some suggesting that this approach is overly restrictive and could stifle regeneration of area, or ability to achieve other objectives, such as the provision of affordable housing.	.CF5a protects large scale offices in higher order town centres and other accessible areas.	Council satisfied that protection of office stock is supported by Employment and Premises Study and that it will not harm the Council's ability to meet its housing targets.
Box 5.2 of TPO	CF14	i. permit new offices in higher order town centres, in highly accessible areas (PTAL4 of greater), now or in the lifetime of the plan, except where the proposal is for the change of use of an individual flat or flats within a residential block. New large offices will not be permitted within the Employment Zones.	No objections received, but some were concerned that the Council needs to consider the impact upon amenity of the introduction of new business uses across the Borough.	CF5 c requires large scale offices to be located in higher order town centres and other accessible areas.	Amenity is a material consideration considered elsewhere in the plan.

Box 5.2 of TPO	CF14	ii. permit small Floor area of 300 sq m or less and medium 300 to 1000sq m. office uses, in employment zones, predominantly commercial mews and other appropriate areas.	No objections received, but some were concerned that the Council needs to consider the impact upon amenity of the introduction of new business uses across the Borough.	CF5c permits small and medium offices in employment zones, predominantly commercial mews and other appropriate areas.	Amenity is a material consideration considered elsewhere in the plan.
Box 5.2 of TPO	CF14	iii require a mix of unit sizes in large scale office developments	A number of consultees state that it was unreasonable to require a mix of unit sizes for all large scale offices and that it was better to ensure that all office buildings are built to be flexible capable of accommodating a range of unit sizes.	CF5e requires business floorspace to be flexible, capable of accommodating a range of unit sizes.	The core strategy has been amended accordingly. Given that large and medium sized offices are only considered appropriate in a limited number of areas (principally town centres for the former and town centres and employment zones for the latter) it is, on reflection, considered unreasonable to require that these units be broken down further. Provision of flexible units is considered more appropriate, and the policy has been amended accordingly.
CF6 Employment zones SP					
Box 5.2 of TPO		The Council will protect the Lots Road, Freston/Latimer Road and Kensal Employment Zones for light industrial uses, for workshops, for small and medium scale offices and other uses which support the function of the zones. The Council will not support the creation of new large scale offices within the Employment Zones.	There was general support for our approach to employment zones, although one consultee want it made clear that surplus industrial land should be released to other uses - in particular social and community uses. Another consultee suggested that the policy needs to be amended to promote light industrial uses, etc, rather than just protecting the existing.	CF5(l) (j) (k) (l) and (m) sets out the Council's specific policies on employment zones. These include the protection and promotion of light industrial, workshops and small and medium offices.	The Council's employment land study supports the protection of the existing light industrial uses and recognises that there is no surplus land as present. This may change in the future, and this will be material when assessing future applications. The policy has been amended to reflect that the Council will promote and well as resist the loss of a number of appropriate uses.
CF7 Creative and Cultural Businesses					
New policy		The Council will promote and protect the work-spaces needed to support the creative and cultural industry across the Borough.	Few comments were received on the issue of creative and cultural businesses, and that those were supportive of the Councils approach.	CF6 sets out the Council's policy on the promotion of premises needed by the creative and cultural industry.	The Council took this policy forward as no objections raised.
CF8 CF8 Arts and culture uses					
Box 5.7 of TPO		The Council supports the Borough's role in world class culture, will welcome new cultural institutions in appropriate locations 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 and Portobello Road area and Kensington High Street. To deliver this, the Council will:	General support for this approach although one major cultural institution suggested that the council need to reflect the changing needs of the cultural institutions.	CF7 continues the Council's approach to arts and cultural uses.	The Council took this policy forward as no objections were raised. A reference to enabling development, where the proposal will result in an overall improvement to arts and cultural uses was added.

Box 5.7 of TPO	CF10	a) protect all land and/or buildings where the current or last land use is/was an arts and cultural use unless that use is re-provided to an equivalent or better standard in the immediate vicinity of the site.	The only comment relating to arts and cultural uses in this section was from an amenity society who suggested that arts and cultural uses should be directed to town centres and other accessible areas.	CF7(a) continues the Council's approach to arts and cultural uses protecting land and/or buildings where the current or last use was in an arts or cultural use.	The Council supports the idea that high trip generating uses, including arts and cultural uses, should be directed to town centres or other highly accessible areas. Smaller scale arts and cultural uses will be supported throughout the Borough.
Box 5.7 of TPO	CF10	b) Permit new arts and cultural uses, or the expansion of these uses, which are likely to generate large number of visitors in areas of the borough which have a PTAL score of 4 or above, or will achieve this level through improvements to public transport during the lifetime of the plan. Smaller scale arts and cultural uses which are likely to attract fewer visitors will be welcomed throughout the Borough;	The only comment relating to arts and cultural uses in this section was from an amenity society who suggested that arts and cultural uses should be directed to town centres and other accessible areas.	CF7(b) permits new arts and crafts uses, directing major trip generators into accessible areas.	The Council supports the idea that high trip generating uses, including arts and cultural uses, should be directed to town centres or other highly accessible areas. Smaller scale arts and cultural uses will be supported throughout the Borough.
Box 5.7 of TPO	CF10	c) permit enabling development on land and/or buildings where the current or last use is/was an arts and cultural use, in order to provide alternative arts and cultural uses on site or improve arts and cultural uses elsewhere within the Borough, where it is successfully demonstrated that there is greater benefit to the Borough resulting from this proposal.	The only comment relating to arts and cultural uses in this section was from an amenity society who suggested that arts and cultural uses should be directed to town centres and other accessible areas.	CF7 (c) considers enabling development for arts and cultural uses.	The Council supports the idea that high trip generating uses, including arts and cultural uses, should be directed to town centres or other highly accessible areas. Smaller scale arts and cultural uses will be supported throughout the Borough.
CF15 Hotels Tactical Policies					
		<p>The Council will protect hotels across the borough except in the Earls Court and Courtfield wards.</p> <p>The Council will permit new hotels within Knightsbridge, South Kensington, Kensington High Street, Kings Road (East) and Notting Hill Gate where they will assist in maintaining the vitality of the centre and where it will not result in the loss of A1 retail uses in primary areas; and will encourage the upgrading of existing hotels.</p>	The GLA were concerned that the draft policy on hotels was inadequate as only sought to protect hotels until 2012 (and the Olympics). They also suggested that there should be a blanket protection of hotels across the borough, including in Earl's Court and Courtfield wards.	CF8 considers new hotels and the protection of existing.	<p>Reference to 2012 has been omitted from the Policy. A footnote notes that the Council will review the policy in 2012. The Core Strategy does not attempt to prejudge the result of this review.</p> <p>Given the impact that the existing concentration of hotels are considered to have had upon Earl's Court, officers still consider that it is not appropriate to protect hotels in this area. Reference to Courtfield has been omitted as the impact of hotels upon this ward is less substantial. This will not jeopardise the Borough's ability to play a full role in providing accommodation for the Olympics.</p>
CF17 Large trip generating uses tactical policy					
		The Council will permit uses which generate a large number of trips within town centres or other highly accessible areas or in areas well located in terms of the place or residence of the potential users.	No comments were received on this subject.	CT1 (a) considers the location of major trip generating uses.	Locating major trip generating uses is considered to be a central tenet of sustainable development.
CF16 Residential					

	<p>The Council will protect residential uses everywhere except in higher order town centres, employment zones, commercial mews or where the proposal is for a new social and community use which predominantly serves, or which provides significant benefits, to borough residents or an arts and cultural use.</p> <p>The Council will permit new residential units everywhere except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. at ground floor level of all town centres, ii. where replacing existing retail uses across the borough, iii. within the Kensal, Latimer Road and Lots Road Employment Zones, iv. where replacing an arts and cultural use or a social and community use which provide significant benefits to borough residents; or v. where replacing any business use within a higher order town centre or a small or medium business use across the borough. 	<p>This policy elaborates the other policies within the fostering vitality section in relation to residential uses. The comments have therefore been considered for each aspect elsewhere in the document. In essence however, a number of consultees were concerned that the removal of the overarching presumption in favour of residential uses (in mot cases) was harmful as could harm the Borough's ability to meet the necessary housing targets.</p>	<p>CH3 considers the protection of residential uses.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the promotion of some uses (in some locations) will not harm the Council's ability to meet its housing targets. Promotion of a variety of uses is considered to be essential in helping achieving the Council's central vision as a diverse borough.</p>
--	---	--	--	---

CF9 South Kensington Strategic Cultural Area.

Box 5.8 of TPO

	<p>The Council will protect and enhance arts and cultural uses in the South Kensington Strategic Cultural Area.</p>	<p>There was support for the South Kensington Cultural Area, although one of the major cultural institutions suggested that the Council should explicitly recognise the commercial reality of these institutions.</p>	<p>CF9 sets out the Council's approach on the South Kensington Strategic Cultural Area.</p>	<p>The rj was amended to explicitly recognise the need to balance the changing commercial reality of the institutions which give the area its raison d'etre with the architectural and historic interest of the area. The policy is un-changed</p>
--	---	---	---	--

Policy CT1 improving alternatives to car use

	<p>The Council will require improvements to the alternatives to car use and restrict car parking in order to increase the proportion of journeys in the Borough that are undertaken on public transport or by walking or cycling.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. require improved access to public transport services across the Borough, particularly where access is less good relative to the rest of the Borough; b. require improved public transport services across the Borough, particularly where services are currently less good, and improve north-south bus connections; c. require high trip generating development to be located in areas of the Borough where public transport accessibility has a PTAL score of 4 or above, or will achieve this level as a result of improvements to public transport; d. require that step-free access be delivered at more underground stations in the Borough; e. significantly reduce the maximum level of off-street car parking permitted in new residential development over the life of the plan, moving towards zero parking except for essential needs; f. require that all new additional residential development will be permit-free; g. require that parking in non-residential development is for essential need only; h. resist new public car parks; i. require that where new on-street parking is created as a result of regeneration schemes it is managed so that parking demand is controlled and the need for off-street parking is minimised; j. require effective Travel Plans for all types of development; k. require improvements to the walking and cycling environment and appropriate facilities in new development to make walking and cycling an attractive option; l. return the streets within the Earl's Court One-Way System to two-way operation, and require developments to contribute to this objective. 	<p>There was some concern from respondents that requiring PTAL 4 was too high and that restricting car parking and requiring permit-free was too restrictive. One response was that PTAL 4 was too low and PTAL 5 was more appropriate. PTAL 4 is considered a good level of public transport accessibility by TfL and is considered appropriate for higher residential densities in the London Plan. There is considered to be sufficient flexibility in the wording of the policy regarding parking levels and permit-free is an established policy that responds to the parking pressure in the borough. Some responses stated that a number of elements were missing from the policy such as detail on coach parking, parking standards, transport assessments, travel plans, cycle parking standards, access for all, car clubs. A number of these points are considered to be too detailed for inclusion in a core strategy or are dealt with elsewhere. In response to the comments additional text has been added regarding parking standards, assessing demand for transport and controlling its impact and step-free access.</p>	<p>The policy has been taken forward with a number of amendments following consultation.</p>	<p>The policy reflects national and regional policy and is generally supported by consultees. It has been taken forward with a number of amendments and reordered following consultation to make it more comprehensive and clearer.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Policy CT2 New and enhanced rail infrastructure

	<p>The Council will require improved access to existing and planned new rail infrastructure in the Borough.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>a) require a Crossrail Station in Kensal near Ladbroke Grove to be established; b) promote the creation of a new station on the West London Line at North Pole Road; c) protect the safeguarded route and associated land for the Chelsea-Hackney underground line including a station at Sloane Square and near Chelsea Old Town Hall on the King's Road; d) promote a station further west, potentially at Imperial Wharf, as part of the Chelsea-Hackney underground line; e) seek improvements to the accessibility of the West Brompton Station and measures to increase the capacity of the West London Line.</p>	<p>There were only two comments related to CT2 in the most recent consultation. The Kensington Society stated that a station and link between the West London Line (WLL) and Earl's Court would be more beneficial than improved interchange from West Brompton Station. The wording of the policy has been amended to reflect a general desire to improve interchange from the WLL to the underground, acknowledging that the redevelopment of the Earl's Court site may provide opportunities for this. Transport for London stated that they do not do not object to Borough aspirations for new stations but that it should be made clear that their Business Plan or the revision of the Mayor's Transport Strategy does not include reference to a new station on the WLL near North Pole Road. No changes have been made to the policy.</p>	<p>The policy has been taken forward with amendments following consultation.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to make it clearer regarding delivery of schemes. It reflects the ambition of BTC and the core strategy more widely as well as being generally supported by consultees.</p>
--	---	--	--	--

TPO Box 7.4 + Box 7.5 **Policy CR1: Street Network**

	<p>The Council will require a well connected and legible network of streets to be maintained and enhanced. In areas of regeneration and large scale redevelopment where the pattern needs to be established, they should be inspired by the Borough's historic street patterns.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>1.require the creation of better links by establishing new links and the removal of barriers that disconnect access for pedestrians and cyclists;</p> <p>2.require new street networks to be established with a clear hierarchy and choice of routes, designed to optimise connectivity, accessibility and legibility, and to reflect the historic and finely grained block structure of the Borough in areas of large scale redevelopment;</p> <p>3.adopt (99) all new streets constructed in the Borough to ensure they compliment the existing street network and are safe and attractive;</p> <p>4.resist the gating of existing streets and new gated communities;</p> <p>5.require new streets to be designed to minimise opportunities for crime.</p>	<p>New policy (f) added in light of Transportation's comments to ensure that existing rights of way were protected as the policy did not previously cover this issue</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

TPO Box 7.4 + Box 7.5 **Policy CR2: Street Form**

	<p>The Council will require that where new streets are proposed, or where development could make significant change to the form of the existing streets, the resultant street form and character must draw from the traditional qualities and form of our existing high quality streets.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.require appropriate street widths to be established with regard to the legibility of the street hierarchy; 2.require the ratio of building height related to street width to give a coherent and comfortable form to the spaces enclosed by new buildings; 3.require building lines and building scales to be consistent and related to context; 4.require a frequency and rhythm of building entrances and windows that support active street frontages and maximise community safety; 5.require a clear distinction to be maintained between public, private and communal space through the retention and provision of characteristic boundary treatments, forecourts and front gardens; 6.require existing street trees to be maintained and to extend the tradition of street trees across the Borough. 	<p>There was some confusion over what was meant by 'street form' and the difference between 'street form' and 'street network'. As a result, 'Street Form' has been renamed 'Three-dimensional Street Form' to ensure greater clarity that street form is more than just about the street, but also the buildings and structures that enclose the street.</p>	<p>Yes, now called 'Three-Dimensional Street Form', still remains Policy CR2</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	--	---	--	------------

TPO Box 7.4 + Box 7.6 **Policy CR3: Street Life**

	<p>The Council will require opportunities to be taken within the street environment to create 'places' that support the full array of outdoor life, adding to their attractiveness and vitality.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.permit new markets on public highways where the benefits associated with the market are considered to be overwhelming and where they fit in with our broader retail strategy and its strategic objectives for town centres; 2.permit new isolated street trading pitches where they contribute to the character and appearance of the street, have no adverse impact on residential amenity and do not impede pedestrian flows; 3.permit the use of pavements for outdoor dining and pavement cafés within our town centres, subject to maintaining their primary function as public footways; 4.permit the occasional use of parks, gardens and open spaces for special events, but only where this is well-managed, has no adverse impact upon local residential amenity, and does not cumulatively impact upon the predominant use as open space; 5.direct temporary private or public events towards existing or new public spaces; 6.require an Events Management Plan and a Management Strategy for repeated use of an open space during the year. 	<p>Several comments were received stating that events also take place in public spaces and not just within the street. Therefore the policy name was changed to 'Street and Outdoor Life' to ensure that the policy is all encompassing. Clarity was also sought on the issues created by temporary events in public spaces. The policy criteria of such events was modified as a result.</p>	<p>Yes. Policy now renamed 'Street and Outdoor Life'. Remains Policy CR3.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	---	---	------------

Policy CR4: Streetscape

	<p>The Council will require improvements to the visual and functional quality of our streets, ensuring they are designed and maintained to a very high standard.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.require all work to, or affecting the public highway, to be carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Streetscape Manual; 2.require all redundant or non-essential street furniture to be removed; 3.require that where there is an exceptional need for new street furniture that it is of high quality design and construction, and placed with great care, so as to relate well to the character and function of the street; 4.permit advertising on buildings only where by reason of size, siting, design, content, materials or method of illumination, it does not harm the appearance of the building or streetscene, and does not adversely affect public safety; 5.resist temporary or permanent advertising hoardings, or freestanding adverts on streets and forecourts, or advertisements attached to street furniture; 6.require new public art as part of all major developments (100) that is of high quality and either incorporated into the external design of the new building or carefully located within the public realm. 	<p>Responses received requested several new sub policies, one in relation to retaining historic street furniture and the was regarding pavement crossovers. The Council incorporated these requests.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	--	--	--	------------

TPO Box 7.2a + Box 7.2b + Box 7.3 **Policy CR5: Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways**

	<p>The Council will protect, enhance and make the most of existing parks, gardens and open spaces, and require new high quality outdoor spaces to be provided where possible.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a.resist the loss of existing Metropolitan Open Land and other public open space; b.resist the loss of private communal open space and private open space that gives visual amenity to the public; c.resist development that has an adverse effect upon the Parks and Gardens that are on the Borough's Register of Special Historic Interest in England, or their setting (101); d.resist development that has an adverse effect on the Borough's garden squares including proposals for subterranean development, and to promote the enhancement of garden squares; e.require all major development outside a 400m radius of the nearest public open space to make provision for new open space which is suitable for a range of outdoor activities and for users of all ages including the provision of external playspace. This may be in the form of communal garden space; f.require all open space that forms part of a proposal to be designed and landscaped to a high standard; g.require opportunities to be taken to improve public access to, and along, waterways, and promote their use for leisure activities. 	<p>Comments from GLA and the Kensington Society requested that the Borough's position on open space and therefore additional wording in the 'reasoning and justification' section was added to ensure clarity. A reference to Metropolitan Open Land was requested, which the Council incorporated and a number of developers requested that greater clarity be given to the reference relating to contributions for open space.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	--	--	------------

Policy CR6: Trees and landscape

	<p>The Council will require development to provide tree planting and landscaping that compliments the existing high quality greenery to deliver amenity and biodiversity benefits.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.require landscape design to be fit for purpose and function; 2.require landscape design to be of a high quality and compatible with the surrounding landscape character; 3.resist development which results in the damage or loss of trees of amenity value; 4.require development to have regard to the existing trees; 5.require landscaping to be clearly defined as public or private space; 6.require landscaping to maximise the benefit to wildlife habitat. 	<p>A number of new policies were requested in relation to the protection of trees, particularly during construction. The Council incorporated these requests and as a result the CR6 changed substantially as a result.</p>	<p>Yes. Taken forward to Publication Draft document, which a number of amended and new policies compared with the Draft Plan version.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	--	---	---	------------

Policy CR7: Servicing

	<p>The Council will require servicing facilities to be well-designed, built to accommodate the demands of new development and sensitively integrated into the development and the surrounding townscape. In particular servicing activities should not give rise to traffic congestion, conflict with pedestrians or be detrimental to residential amenity.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.require sufficient on-site servicing space to accommodate the number and type of vehicles likely to be generated and to ensure that this can take place without manoeuvring on the highway; 2.require a Servicing Management Plan for all sites with on-site servicing space that will control the hours of servicing, include detail on how vehicles will be managed, and include controls on the types and sizes of vehicles to ensure they are appropriate to the local area and are environmentally acceptable; 3.require that where developments cannot provide on-site servicing space that it can be demonstrated that the proposal can function satisfactorily without giving rise to adverse effects on traffic congestion, pedestrian safety and convenience, residential amenity or impacting on bus routes. A Servicing Management Plan will also be 4.require on-site servicing space and entrances to be designed in an attractive, visually unobtrusive manner, which is sensitive to the character and appearance of the building and wider townscape and streetscape. 	<p>No major changes occurred as a result of comments received from the consultation period.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	--	---	--	------------

TPO Box 8.3 + Box 8.4 **Policy CL 1: Context and Character**

	<p>The Council will require development to respect existing context and character, taking all opportunities available to improve the character and quality of the area and the way it functions, including being accessible for all.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. assess development against those aspects of architecture and urban form which contribute to the local distinctiveness of its townscape, such as scale, height, bulk, mass, proportion, plot width, building lines, density, rhythm, roofscape, materials, historic fabric and surrounding amenity; 2. require the analysis of context to be drawn from an area that is proportionate to the size of the development; 3. use density as an indicator of the efficient use of land and not as a determinant in the form of the proposal and design; 4. assess building heights against the context, any impact on street form, amenity and wider townscape, the proportions of the proposal and the use of the building; 5. resist development which interrupts, disrupts or detracts from: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the long-distance view from King Henry's Mound to St Paul's; ii. the views and vistas into, within and out of Areas of Metropolitan Importance within the Borough; iii. local views identified in the Council's Conservation Area Proposal Statements or other adopted documents; vi. permit riverside and canalside development which enhances the waterside character and setting, including opening up views to the waterways. 	<p>A request for stronger references to accessibility was received by two respondents. The GLA requested that the density policy be made clearer. Both these requests were taken on board during the redrafting of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	---	--	------------

TPO Box 8.3 + Box 8.5 + Box 8.6	Policy CL 2: New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to existing buildings
---------------------------------	---

	<p>The Council will only permit new buildings and extensions of the highest architectural and urban design quality.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. require new architecture to be: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Functional - fit for purpose, legible, safe and accessible to all ii. Robust - well built, remain in good condition and adaptable to future changes of use, lifestyle, demography and climate iii. Attractive - pleasing to the mind and eye iv. Locally distinctive - responding to its context v. Sustainable - in the use of resources, construction and operation b. assess architecture style on a site-by-site basis in terms of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the context of the site ii. the building's proposed design and use iii. whether the townscape is of uniform or varied character c. resist proposals that are more than 1.5 times the height of the predominant context, except where the proposal: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. is 2-3 times the height of the predominant context, and not above 45m, whichever is the smaller; and ii. is articulating a point of townscape legibility in relation to views and vistas of significance in the wider Borough landscape and/or providing a pan-London use; iii. is not within any identified linear views; and iv. is of exceptional design quality. d. facilitate the redevelopment of 'eyesores'(113)with buildings more suited to its 	<p>Responses focused on the need for greater clarity in relation to the Tall Buildings policy. There were a number of requests better integrate the issues relating to safety and crime prevention into first policy. Overall there were a number of responses who stated that the policy either needed to be broken down into several policies or include sub-sections so that it was clearer to the reader which policies related to new buildings, extensions and modifications.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>There has been substantial restructuring and rewording of this policy in the Publication Draft to ensure that the policy was clearer in light of the comments received.</p>
--	---	---	--	--

TPO Box 8.3	Policy CL 3: Small-scale Alterations and Additions
-------------	---

	<p>The Council will permit alterations and additions where they do not harm the existing quality and character of the building and its context.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.permit alterations only where the character and appearance of the existing building or the surrounding area would not be harmed; 2.resist unsympathetic small scale development which in itself can cause harm and where the cumulative effect of similar proposals would be detrimental to the character of the building; 3.ensure that telecommunications equipment and other minor additions and alterations are sited as discretely as practicable so that visual amenity is not impaired; 4.only permit development that is of a high quality form, design and materials; 5.permit alterations and additions where they improve the accessibility and safety function of the building and ensure they are sensitive to the character of the building. 	<p>A number of comments received related to amenity issues resulting from small-scale alterations and therefore as a result an additional policy was included in this chapter relating to amenity. It was also considered that this policy should be re-ordered to illustrate the importance of the Historic Environment and Historic Assets in the Borough.</p>	<p>Taken forward to Publication Draft Core Strategy, however, the policy has now been re-ordered so that it is now Policy CL6.</p>	<p>It was considered that this policy should be re-ordered to illustrate the importance of the Historic Environment and Historic Assets in the Borough.</p>
--	---	--	--	---

TPO Box 8.2	Policy CL 4: Historic Environment
--------------------	--

	<p>The Council will require development to preserve historic places, spaces and townscapes and to take opportunities to enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.permit development in conservation areas which preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area; 2.permit developments where the setting of the conservation area has been preserved or enhanced; 3.require full planning applications in conservation areas; 4.permit substantial demolition of buildings in conservation areas where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i.The building or part of the building structure makes no positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area; and ii.a satisfactory scheme for redevelopment has been approved. 5.require planning permission for the demolition or partial demolition of buildings except dwellinghouses (114); 6.require a replacement replica of a building that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of a conservation area if an unforeseen collapse occurs. 	<p>Several responses stated that policy should not include the reference to requiring planning permission for the demolition of dwelling houses as this was not strictly correct, particularly in Conservation Areas. There was general support for the policies regarding historic environments, however, additional detail and clarity was generally requested.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>This policy was considered highly important in helping deliver the Borough's vision and therefore it's location within the chapter was moved up to illustrate its status.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

TPO Box 8.2	Policy CL 5: Historic Assets
--------------------	-------------------------------------

	<p>The Council will permit proposals that preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest of a listed building or scheduled ancient monument and their settings and will conserve and protect sites of archaeology interest and their settings.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.require the preservation of the historic integrity of listed buildings, scheduled monuments or other buildings or places of interest, including building facades, plan form, structure and setting; 2.require proposals to protect the setting of the listed building, scheduled monument or a site of archaeological interest; 3.require the preservation of original internal and external architectural features and later features of interest; 4.require the reinstatement of missing architectural features of the listed building or scheduled monument important to its special character (116); 5.require the removal of inappropriate additions or modifications to the listed building or scheduled monument that detract from its special character; 6.resist development which threatens the conservation, protection or setting of archaeological remains; 7.resist the change of use of a listed building that would materially harm its character; 8.strongly encourage any works to a listed building to be carried out in a correct 	<p>There was general support for this policy</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>Housing Targets Housing Targets The Council will make provision for a minimum of 3,500 net additional housing units to be provided between 2007/8 and 2016/17 (350 units per year). This target will be rolled forward to 2028, until it is replaced. (136)</p> <p>The Council will make provision for the maximum amount of affordable housing with a target of at least 800 units (80 units per annum) from all sources, to be provided in the Borough between 2007/08 and 2016/17, and to be adjusted in the light of the revised housing target (see appendix for further information).</p> <p>The Council will require affordable housing tenures to be provided such that they work towards a Borough-wide target of 85% social rented housing and 15% Intermediate housing.</p>	<p>There were only a limited number of comments on Policy CH1. The Environment Round Table stated that they did not wish to see a new housing target exceed 350-400 units per annum. GOL stated that it is necessary to outline the implications of higher housing targets in terms of demand for land, services and infrastructure. A number of comments reflected concern that the 85% social rented housing / 15% intermediate housing borough wide target was too onerous. One respondent stated that the wording of part (c) should be made more flexible by removing the word 'require' and inserting more flexible wording in relation to the proportions of intermediate and social rented housing to be sought. A number of commentators felt that the emerging London Plan tenure split should be adopted (60% social rented housing and 40% intermediate housing).</p>	<p>Taken forward to Policy CH1</p>	<p>Borough housing targets are set out in the London Plan. This document refers to targets based on the 2004 housing capacity study and has been subjected to examination through the London Plan EIP. The 2009 Strategic Housing Land Assessment has resulted in a new target. This will be tested at the forthcoming London Plan EIP, but has been referred to in the Core Strategy.</p>

Housing Diversity

The Council will ensure new housing development is provided so as to further refine the grain of the mix of housing across the Borough.

To deliver this the Council will:

require new housing developments to include a mix of types, tenures and sizes of homes to reflect the varying needs in the Borough and current evidence;

require homes to be built to lifetime homes standards and a minimum of 10% should be 'wheelchair accessible' (137);

protect existing housing schemes and care homes for older people where they are viable and meet, or are capable of meeting, modern standards of care;

encourage development proposals for extra care housing, particularly in the south of the Borough. The Council would not seek affordable housing from proposals for care homes or extra care housing schemes (138);

require planning permission for proposals which involve the amalgamation of six units or more into a smaller number of units or a single home;

protect houses in multiple occupation except where a proposal concerns conversion into self-contained studio flats. Any such proposal will be subject to a Section 106 agreement to ensure the flats remain as studios in perpetuity;

require the provision of 50% affordable housing (1:1 ratio), on gross residential floor space in excess of 800m² (139);

require provision to be in the form of a commuted sum in lieu of affordable housing where less than 1,200m² of residential floor space is proposed;

require provision of affordable homes on site where more than 1,200m² of residential

Housing Mix & Lifetime/wheelchair homes:

There were no significant comments on lifetime homes / wheelchair accessible homes. The Kensington Society object to the recommended housing mixes set out in the evidence section - particularly the emphasis on larger market units. Older People's Housing: One respondent requested a reference to protecting homes where there is an 'identified need'. Amalgamation of units: The proposal to require that planning permission would be required for proposals involving the amalgamation of six units into a smaller number of units or a single home generated a mixed response. Some respondents felt this policy should not be taken forward (Environment Round Table), whilst others felt there was not enough clarity regarding the current wording. For example, how would an application for 5 units into a single house be treated? Houses in Multiple Occupation: There were no significant comments on this issue. Affordable Housing: There were a number of objections to the affordable housing policies, notably from various developers. One of the main objections related to the floorspace trigger, with a number of respondents stating that units or habitable rooms should be used instead of floorspace. Several commentators objected to the floorspace threshold because they felt it was not justified in terms of viability,

Taken forward to Policy CH2

This policy encompasses a wide range of issues. For example, there is general support for a mix of different types of homes throughout the borough, provision of older persons homes and accessible homes. The affordable housing policies have been amended to reflect some consultation comments and this is one of the reasons why the threshold has been increased. There is an objective to provide affordable housing on-site unless exceptional circumstances exist. There is also an aim to diversify tenures in the borough by achieving more intermediate housing in the north (where it can be provided at the 'usefully affordable point' and more social rented housing in the south. The split between social rented and intermediate housing reflects the latest evidence available. There is a criteria based policy on gypsies and travellers to satisfy govt. policy and the London Plan.

Residential Amenity
The Council will require that existing residential amenity is protected and that new housing achieves high standards of residential amenity including optimising the provision of external space.

To deliver this the Council will:

require good daylight and sunlight conditions for buildings and amenity spaces and that conditions enjoyed by existing adjoining buildings and amenity spaces are not significantly reduced;

require visual privacy of residents and the working population;

require that there is no harmful increase in the sense of enclosure to nearby residential properties;

require that there is no significant impact on residential amenity due to increases in noise, odours or vibration;

require housing schemes include outdoor amenity space, with private gardens or communal gardens at ground level, especially for family housing. Roof gardens or balconies may be acceptable for smaller sized accommodation subject to protecting neighbours' amenity and the architectural quality of the building.

Existing Amenity Space: One respondent suggested the policy should also cover extensions and conversions. This policy has now been moved to the 'Renewing the Legacy' chapter. **New Amenity space:** A number of respondents stated that a requirement for amenity space to be provided for all new housing was too onerous and not practical because some sites, such as town centre sites, may not provide any opportunities for amenity space. One respondent commented on the need for a design-led approach to the provision of amenity space, rather than one based on area based standards for amenity space. This respondent also noted that regard should be had to the substantial areas of parks in the borough and proximity to these when judging if private outdoor space is essential for a particular scheme. There were mixed views on roof gardens with some respondents supporting them without restrictions and others concerned that the policy did not include sufficient conditions to prevent/mitigate against roof terraces and balconies which may create noise or overlooking. There were also internal concerns that the reference to smaller sized accommodation in relation to roof gardens was too limiting.

Taken forward to Policy CH3

There is general support for the provision of external amenity space, as long as the policy is not overly prescriptive. Whilst it is recognised there may need to be flexibility in applying the policy, it was felt necessary to include a policy requiring amenity space - to act as the starting point for negotiations. The part of the policy on sunlight/daylight/privacy, enclosure etc. has been moved into this section from another section.

	<p>Estate Renewal The Council will require that the full redevelopment of estates built for social rented housing will only be permitted where there is a compelling case that the long term benefits outweigh the considerable uncertainty and disruption such projects will cause.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>require that there will be no net loss of social rented housing provision;</p> <p>guarantee all existing tenants a new home, with those wishing to stay in the area being able to do so;</p> <p>ensure that the mix of house sizes for the re-provided social rented housing will be determined by the housing needs of the tenants of the estate at the time of the project taking place, and by the housing needs of the Borough;</p> <p>require that new social rented, intermediate and market housing is integrated across the development with the same external appearance;</p> <p>require the affordable and market housing to have equivalent amenity in relation to factors including views, daylight, noise and proximity to open space, playspace, community facilities, and shops;</p> <p>require that where estate renewal is being funded through the provision of private housing or other commercial development, schemes must be supported by a financial appraisal;</p> <p>the requirement that 50% of the total amount of housing should be affordable, subject to viability, will not apply to the amount of new market housing that is required to fund the newly provided social rented units;</p>	<p>There were a limited number of comments on this issue. The GLA broadly support the policy. Kensington Housing Trust generally supported this policy and only proposed a few minor changes - for example, stating that housing needs should be assessed at the time of submission of the application.</p>	<p>Taken forward to Policy CH4</p>	<p>The estate renewal policy has evolved into a detailed policy which takes account of some of the consultation comments. It includes commitments such as ensuring there will be no net loss of social rented housing in development proposals, integration of affordable housing with the rest of the development, and also refers to cross subsidy.</p>
Policy CV 1.7 Respecting Environmental Limits				
<p>TPO Box 10.1 "What is our ambition?", although the policy has been revised.</p>	<p>Our vision to respect environmental limits is to contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change; significantly reduce carbon dioxide emissions; maintain low and further reduce car use; carefully manage flood risk and waste; protect and attract biodiversity; improve air quality; and reduce and control noise within the Borough.</p>	<p>There was general support for this policy. However, the Environment Agency wanted strategic support for the Thames Tideway Sewer Tunnel which was included as part of the flooding policy.</p>	<p>Taken forward to Policy CO 1.7.</p>	<p>Policy to address the concerns of the Environment Agency has been included in CE2. Following internal consultation, the use of fossil fuels for heating buildings and the impact of these on air quality has been clarified and vibration control has been included as part of the noise policy.</p>
Policy CE1 Climate Change				

TPO Box 10.2, although the policy has been revised.

	<p>The Council recognises DEFRA's targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 26% against 1990 levels by 2020 (160) and will require development to make significant contributions towards this target.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>a. require an assessment to demonstrate that a proportion of the energy supply is secured through energy efficient design, construction and materials; and decentralised, renewable and low-carbon energy sources as part of the Code for Sustainable Homes / BREEAM assessment to achieve the following standards: Residential Development: Code for Sustainable Homes: - Up to 2012: Level Four - 2013 to 2015: Level Five - 2016 onwards: Level Six Non Residential Development: Relevant BREEAM Assessment: - Up to 2015: Excellent - 2016 onwards: Outstanding Policy CE1a will apply to: all new buildings; all extensions and conversions defined as major development; the entire dwelling where subterranean extensions are proposed; and other development identified in due course.</p> <p>b. require development at Kensal, Wornington Green, North Kensington Sports Centre and Earl's Court to provide a Combined Cooling Heat and Power (CCHP) plant or similar;</p> <p>c. require all CCHP plant or similar in the borough to be provided in a manner that allows them to be connected into a district energy network in the future (except for micro CCHP or similar);</p> <p>d. develop mechanisms to allow s.106 contributions to be used to further reduce</p>	<p>The Environment Agency, K&C Environment Round Table and Thames Water support the Council's policy approach to climate change. The GLA also generally welcomed the policy approach, although requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the energy assessments should address the requirements in the London Plan energy hierarchy; • a separate policy requiring development to incorporate the highest standards of energy efficiency, including consideration of passive building design and natural heating and ventilation, reducing the need for comfort cooling; • a separate energy assessment in accordance with London Plan policy; • clarification that proposed decentralised energy should be able to be connected to existing and planned heat networks; • that the Council states its clear intention to play a leading role in developing a decentralised energy masterplan; • a policy requiring development proposals to maximise the opportunities to reduce carbon dioxide emissions through on-site renewable energy; and • consideration of the existing building stock to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. <p>Natural England suggests that the climate change policy should better address</p>	<p>Yes (CE1), although several revisions have been made to reflect findings from consultation and confirmed evidence gathering.</p>	<p>Many of the comments, especially those from the GLA, have resulted in considerable changes to climate change policy CE1. A new policy CE1(c) has been introduced requiring the energy, heating and cooling to be supplied in accordance with the hierarchy of energy efficiency, decentralised energy and renewable energy. Following internal consultation, a new policy has also been included to require development to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM credits from reducing pollution and emissions and requiring development to contribute to producing on-site sustainable food. The Council is not taking forward requirements for energy statements in addition to those required for the Code for Sustainable Homes as these are required in accordance with the London Plan.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

Policy CE2 Flooding

TPO Box 10.5, although the policy has been revised.

	<p>The Council will require developments to adapt to fluvial flooding and to mitigate the effects of and adapt to surface water and sewer flooding.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>a. resist vulnerable development, including self contained basement dwellings, in Flood Risk Zone 3 as defined in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment;</p> <p>b. require a site specific Flood Risk Assessment, including an 'Exception Test' (164), for all development in Flood Risk Zone 2 and 3 as defined in the SFRA, and for all sites greater than 1ha;</p> <p>c. require development at risk from flooding in Flood Risk Zones 2 & 3 or sites greater than 1ha to incorporate suitable flood defence or flood mitigation measures in accordance with the recommendations of the site specific Flood Risk Assessment;</p> <p>d. require development to incorporate sustainable urban drainage, or other measures to reduce both the volume and the speed of water run off to the drainage system that improves upon the current situation ensuring that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible in line with the hierarchy in the London Plan. Major development must make a significant improvement to the current volume and speed of water run off to the drainage system;</p> <p>e. require, in due course, developments known to be at risk of surface water and or sewer flooding to incorporate appropriate adaptation measures;</p>	<p>A resident wanted more information in the LDF regarding how and when further sewer flooding events could be prevented. However, the information available has already been taken on board on the LDF policies. Kensington Society, Thames Water and a resident wanted a stronger policy to reduce potential sewer and surface water flooding. Earl's Court and Olympia Group proposed changes which would result in the weakening of the policies in respect to protection against flooding. Thames Water wanted a policy to support the Thames Tideway Sewer Tunnel which was included.</p>	<p>Yes (CE2), although several revisions have been made to reflect findings from consultation and confirmed evidence gathering.</p>	<p>The policy was amended to include as a stronger requirement for SUDs and the resistance of impermeable surfaces in front gardens. The proposed changes from the Earl's Court and Olympia Group were not accepted. The inclusion of a policy regarding the Thames Tideway Sewer Tunnel tried to address Thames Water comments.</p>
--	---	---	---	--

Policy CE3 Waste

TPO Box 10.4, although the policy has been revised.

	<p>Waste: Options taken forward to section 35.4.3. A separate DPD will also be prepared.</p> <p>1) The Council will meet the waste apportionment set out in the London Plan and ensure that waste is managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy, which is to reduce, reuse or recycle waste as close as possible to where it is produced.</p> <p>2) To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>i. meet the waste apportionment required by the London Plan by: resisting proposals which would result in the loss of current waste management capacity in the borough working in partnership with neighbouring boroughs to meet the apportionment</p> <p>i. require major development at Kensal and Earl's Court to set up waste disposal facilities and meet any short-fall in the apportionment by establishing waste treatment facilities as part of a mixed use development;</p> <p>ii. require that development proposals make use of the railways and waterway network for the transportation of construction waste and other waste;</p> <p>iii. require applicants for major development should prepare and implement Site Waste Management Plans for demolition and construction waste.</p>	<p>The Environment Agency acknowledged that the Council had included their previous comments. British Waterways supported the policy. Port of London Authority wanted the Council to expand the policy related to Cremorne Wharf to maximise its potential use for water transport. A resident mentioned the use of Cremorne Wharf for passenger handling purposes. However, this use would not be compatible with its Safeguarded Wharf Status. GOL wanted reassurance on the timetable for the preparation of the Waste DPD which will be included in the next LDS. Earl's Court and Olympia Group wanted to include text restricting the waste facilities in developments which was too prescriptive to be included. Finally, the GLA wanted to ensure that the DPD identifies new sites suitable for waste management purposes, along with which boroughs will be working with and how much the pooled apportionment of those boroughs would be. They also wanted the Council to clarify how we would deal with applications for waste management facilities until the DPD is formally adopted.</p>	<p>Yes (CE3), although several revisions have been made to reflect findings from consultation and confirmed evidence gathering.</p>	<p>The policy was extended to maximise Cremorne Wharf's potential use for water transport. The GLA comments were taken on board and both the policy and supporting text were subsequently changed to address their concerns. Further information will be covered in the Waste DPD.</p>
--	---	---	---	--

Policy CE4 Biodiversity

TPO 10.6, although the policy has been revised.

	<p>The Council will enhance and improve the biodiversity value of the Borough.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>a. protect Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, or provide significantly improved habitats in accordance with the national, regional and local Biodiversity Action Plans;</p> <p>b. protect Green Corridors and require that development proposals create opportunities to extend or link Green Corridors;</p> <p>c. require a site specific Ecological Impact Assessment for all major developments in or adjacent to Sites of Nature Conservation Importance or Green Corridors;</p> <p>d. require major development proposals to create opportunities for attracting biodiversity and habitat creation, through measures such as green corridors, nest boxes, swift bricks, green / brown roofs, water course enhancements and planting for</p>	<p>Natural England and the Environment Agency support the Council's policy approach to Biodiversity. British Waterways required mention of the biodiversity resource found in the canals and rivers.</p>	<p>Yes (CE4), although several revisions have been made to reflect findings from consultation and confirmed evidence gathering.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to refer to the Blue Ribbon Network. Following internal consultation, the policy has also been revised to provide some control over biodiversity in major development sites not designated as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and remove reference to detailed measures for attracting biodiversity.</p>
--	---	--	---	---

Policy CE5 Air Quality

TPO Box 10.3, although the policy has been revised.		<p>The Council will require that development proposals do not make local air quality worse, including the consideration of pollution from vehicles, construction and the heating of buildings, and where possible improves local air quality.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. resist development proposals which increase the current local air pollution and, where appropriate, require development proposals to create opportunities to improve air quality; b. resist biomass combustion unless its use will not have a detrimental impact on air quality; c. require, in due course, agreements through s.106 to fund improvements to local air quality through action planning and quality monitoring; d. require development proposals to implement the Air Quality Management Plan. 	<p>The Metro Shopping Fund stated that all development will impact on air quality and this policy is therefore unreasonable. Respondents also wanted better provision of electronic changing facilities and discounted residents parking permits for low polluting vehicles.</p>	<p>Yes (CE5), although several revisions have been made to reflect findings from consultation and confirmed evidence gathering.</p>	<p>This policy has been significantly revised to address these comments. A new policy has been added to require air quality assessments for all major development. The existing policy has also been revised to refer to resist development which will have an unacceptable impact on air quality, where unacceptable is defined in the Air Quality SPD.</p>
---	--	--	--	---	--

Policy CE6 Noise

New, following comments from the GLA		<p>The Council will carefully control the impact of noise generating sources likely to affect residential amenity. The Council will also require new noise sensitive developments to mitigate and protect occupiers against existing ambient noise or any existing specific sources of noise.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. resist developments which fail to meet national, regional and local noise standards; b. resist all applications for noise generating development that would have an unacceptable noise impact on residential amenity; c. require that noise sensitive development is located in the most favourable locations and mitigates against existing sources of noise by careful design and materials, such as acoustic glass and insulation. 	<p>The Kensington Society required greater reference to mitigating noise from plant equipment. One respondent also wanted a policy banning air conditioning and where these are necessary to require that they are located indoors, with an air vent, or on the street facing façade. The GLA required reference to late night noise management and the protection of areas of tranquillity.</p>	<p>Yes (CE6), although several revisions have been made to reflect findings from consultation and confirmed evidence gathering.</p>	<p>These comments have resulted in changes to the policy. A new policy has been introduced which refers to the Council's current project to identify areas of tranquillity in the Borough. Internal consultation has also resulted in this policy seeking to control vibration, as well as noise.</p>
--------------------------------------	--	---	--	---	---

Kensal

From Kensal Place in the June 2009 Places document		<p>There is a one-off opportunity for significant regeneration in North Kensington – the 'Gasworks sites' hold the key: they must be used to their best potential. Along with residential development, there will be job creation and regeneration benefits which would be enhanced by the creation of a Crossrail station. The Borough has a tradition of well-connected, high density, mixed-use developments. The Council expects this successful precedent, along with environmental sustainability (including better use of the canal), to underpin any masterplan for the area.</p>	<p>Broadly, support exists for this chapter. Sainsbury's, a key landowner, wants assurances that should a Crossrail Station not be delivered, the area will still undergo redevelopment. The Council supports this view point and alternatives are contained within the "Contingencies and Risks" Chapter.</p> <p>British Waterways and English Heritage continue to support the potential bridging of the canal provided that maintenance costs can be included in the relevant s.106 requirements. GOL and the GLA are now in support of the allocation.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Kensal is one of the borough's key strategic sites and has been identified by the GLA as an opportunity area meaning the allocation of land for 2,500 residential units and a quantum of non-residential floorspace.</p> <p>In order for development to knit into the surrounding townscape, a comprehensive redevelopment is required. This is likely to move the position of Sainsbury's and will lead to a bigger store with improved retail offer.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---

Golborne / Trellick

From Golborne/ Trellick Place in the June 2009 Places document		<p>Golborne and Trellick will maintain its strong mixed community. Trellick Tower will remain the icon of the area. The Golborne market and retailers will thrive in the future, serving both local people and other Londoners. The Markets of Portobello and Golborne should gain strength from each other. New housing will be a mix of sizes and tenures. Golborne Road connects at its southern end to Portobello Road and Ladbroke Grove. Further north, it is cut in two by the Paddington Main line that runs east-west through the area. Beyond the railway, the main landmark in the area is the Grade II* listed Trellick Tower.</p>	<p>Broad support for the vision and the direction for Golborne/Trellick as a place. Kensington Housing Trust, in particular, support the proposals which ensure meeting decent homes targets. Additional support for measures to restore Trellick Tower and those which will benefit the market. British Waterways, among others, seek improvements to transport and movement, including access and enhanced use of the canal. The Golbourne Forum and others objected to proposals to reconnect Portobello Road with Ladbroke Grove, increase the retail provision in the north of Portobello Road and questioned the infrastructure requirements for the redevelopment. These respondents also questioned whether the Wornington Green estate renewal was being used as an experiment or testing ground for future schemes and whether sufficient finances exist to complete the scheme, including the provision of the Venture Centre and Athlone Gardens.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>There is a strong sense of community amongst the retailers in Golborne Road, and Golborne market and is seen as an integral part of the offer of Portobello Road market to the south. At Wornington Green, Kensington Housing Trust are exploring ways to renew the estate. The Edenham site, located next to Trellick, provides opportunities for regeneration including new housing and extra care facilities.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---

Portobello/Notting Hill

From Portobello /Notting Hill in June 2009 Places Document	Chapter 7	<p>As Special District Centres, Portobello and Westbourne Grove will both remain internationally known vibrant retail areas. By making better pedestrian links between Portobello Road, Westbourne Grove, All Saints Road and Golborne Road the area as a whole will be strengthened, while the qualities of the very different individual centres will be maintained.</p> <p>Portobello Road will remain a jewel in London's shopping crown, a place of world class antiques hunting and a place which has not been over run by identikit multiples.</p> <p>The centre will maintain the rich variety of shops with a predominance now so rare in the capital, of independent retailers offering "something different". The existing antiques arcades are a key ingredient of this variety. Portobello Road's strengths: its international antiques trade and the diversity of the retail offer, including both vibrant small shops offering personal service and cutting edge fashion, will continue to be built upon. Its less glamorous role as the provider of the range of shops and services essential to support of the day-to-day needs of its "village minded" local community is no less important and will be maintained.</p> <p>Running up the length of the Portobello Road, the street market will act as both a key driver to achieve this vision and an opportunity to strengthen the existing close links with the Golborne Road Special Neighbourhood Centre to the north.</p> <p>Portobello Road is however more than a shopping street, it will continue to be the international antiques market and an inspiration for designers and a seed-bed for new entrepreneurs.</p>	<p>No representations were received which Officers believe question the soundness of the Place. There was some concern from consultees that the section did not adequately recognise the role that the Portobello Road has as a neighbourhood centre. The relationship between the Portobello Road and Westbourne Grove was also questioned. It was suggested by some respondees that it is not appropriate to consider Westbourne Grove in the same section as Portobello Road.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward as Chapter 7 in the Proposed Submission Core Strategy</p>	<p>Limited changes were made to alley the fears of some consultees and to further confirm that the Council recognises the neighbourhood function of the centre. The Council recognises that the two centres are very different in nature, but that the two are linked. The Council is not looking to gentrify the Portobello Road, as has been suggested, in the way that Westbourne Grove has been. No changes were necessary.</p>
--	-----------	--	--	---	---

		Westbourne Grove will retain its difference from Portobello Road and its position as a specialist shopping destination providing high end fashion retailing.			
Westway					
		<p>In broad terms, the plans focuses on consolidating the sports facilities at the western end, business and retail in the central stretch, and small units for business start-ups towards the east, which would be of particular benefit for cultural related activities. An improved cycle and pedestrian path is also part of the plan, running along the length of the Westway linking Westminster with Hammersmith and Fulham. The Westway flyover was constructed between 1964 and 1970 to relieve congestion at Shepherd's Bush. It also reduced traffic on Ladbrooke Grove. The trauma caused by the creation of this urban motorway flyover is still evident today, despite the passage of time. At Portobello Road the presence of the Westway flyover provides a false signal to visitors to the area that the Portobello Road 'ends' at this point. In addition to the air quality impacts, vehicles using the flyover produce a significant amount of noise, which negatively impacts on the residential amenity of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The Trust has produced a Business Plan for 2008-2013 and a 'Regeneration and property Plan to 2020'. These documents, revised in the light of the changed economic circumstances, set out the way in which the Trust aspires to make better commercial use of some of its property in order to raise funds to put into its community activities.</p>	The Westway Development Trust, and others, support the inclusion of the land along the Westway as unidentified place within the Core Strategy. Objections to ensure the vision and direction of development more closely aligns with the Trust's own strategies have been made, and certain changes have been made.	Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.	These comments have resulted in changes to the Place and vision. Particularly issues to do with advertisements and air quality have been amended, and strengthened.
Latimer					
From Latimer in June 2009 Places Document.		Vision: Latimer will be a place that focuses on the provision of high quality services through excellent architecture and urban design. It will provide accessible and adaptable spaces that are valued and used the local community. New development, including a new neighbourhood shopping centre, will be located around Latimer Road Underground Station. There will be clear links to Ladbrooke Grove and White City. A community leisure centre will be retained in the area and a new community secondary school will be established.	<p>No representations were received which officers believe question the soundness of the Place.</p> <p>A number of residents of Nottingwood House sought clarification as to whether the Council intended to demolish Nottingwood House.</p> <p>A consultee suggested that the Council's proposals for the sports facilities in the area were not sufficiently clear.</p>	Yes, taken forward as Chapter 9 in the Proposed Submission Core Strategy	<p>Nottingwood House was not referred to in the Latimer Road Place, as there are no plans to redevelop it.</p> <p>The section has been amended to reflect what is stated in other parts of the plan – that the Council intends to retain the swimming pool, either in situ or elsewhere in the vicinity.</p>
Earls Court					

From Earls' Court Place in June 2009 Places Document.

<p>Vision for Earl's Court By unravelling the one-way system and reducing the traffic flow, Earl's Court town centre will be able to blossom, offering an attractive "urban-village" environment which local residents can enjoy. The function of the town centre will be reinforced by a new good direct connection to the Exhibition Centre, which should be developed for mixed uses with a significant convention centre or exhibition use that is at least a national destination at its heart. Earl's Court will therefore retain its important function London-wide.</p> <p>The area will continue to offer a wide range of types of residential accommodation and will include community infrastructure to support local life. Streetscape and pedestrian improvements to Cromwell Road, Warwick Road and Earl's Court Road will transform the environment making it more pleasant for pedestrians and residents and marking the arrival of the A4 in Central London.</p>	<p>Earl's Court: Concerns were raised that the proposed allocation of the site might preclude the proper spatial planning of the whole Earl's Court site and the adjoining land. It was pointed out that the Council had not demonstrated that this quantum and mix of development can be readily achieved in a manner consistent with the relevant design policies or that the Council had taken account of the constraints arising from construction over operational railway and the potential impact on the railway. Some comments received reflected the desire to put a greater emphasis on the improvement of the traffic situation in Earl's Court and the further provision of open space. A number of comments were also received from residents concerned about a scheme presented by Capital and Counties for the Earl's Court area. Capital and Counties proposals do not, however, form part of section. Detailed proposals for the area will be included within a joint Supplementary Planning Document to be produced by the Royal Borough and the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham in the future. This document will be subject of public consultation. Other comments asked for minor changes to the text to reflect the vibrant mixed-use nature of the area and the important role that design</p>	<p>The policy number is CP9</p>	<p>Changes were made to reflect the concerns. This entails showing a more flexible mixed-use allocation on the site.</p>
--	--	---------------------------------	--

Kensington High Street

From Kensington High Street in June 2009 Places Document.

<p>The centre needs to redefine its role in the next 20 years to make sure that it distinguishes its offer from Westfield, Knightsbridge and King's Road. The centre will continue its long tradition as Kensington's High Street serving residents, workers and visitors. It will continue to provide a good range of food retailing and other convenience retailing and remain a destination for fashion and certain niche markets. Ease of pedestrian movement is central to this success. Reuse of the former Commonwealth Institute for a significant public institution represents an opportunity to increase visitor numbers and develop a further niche retail cluster and restaurants at the western end of the High Street. The maintenance of a cinema is essential.</p>	<p>Barclays and the Phillimore Estate objected to the proposed policy which resisted the loss of shops to banks and estate agents and also questioned the suggested policy on cafes and restaurants and cafes.</p> <p>Chelsfield requested that 'new public institutional use' of the Commonwealth Institute was changed to 'new use', and that the site be included within the boundary of the town centre.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward as Chapter 11 in the Proposed Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Policy CF 11 (within the Fostering Vitality section) has subsequently been rewritten to allow more flexibility with regard town centre uses within the town centres. This has been reflected in the text of this section. The request that 'new public institutional use' of the Commonwealth Institute was changed to 'new use', was rejected.</p> <p>The inclusion of the Commonwealth Institute site in the Kensington High Street town centre boundary was also rejected as the site has never been part of a retail centre. It has always been a stand alone use.</p>
---	--	--	---

South Kensington

From South Kensington in June 2009 Places Document.

	<p>Prince Albert's vision was of a wide range of world-class institutions connecting the science and art of the past, present and future. This holds true today but now our interpretation of culture is ever richer, embracing more of our everyday lives - entertainment, eating and drinking, and even shopping. South Kensington must continue to develop across this spectrum of cultural activity to remain a local, national and internationally significant destination.</p> <p>A key to our modern world is social connectivity, we must ensure that this spirit, so powerfully expressed in the soon to be completed public realm of Exhibition Road, is developed throughout South Kensington – innovative public realm proposals, generous public spaces, unique retailing and cultural experiences. All the facilities developed for residents and visitors alike must be connected to create an inspiring and memorable and thoroughly contemporary re-evocation of the original Victorian vision.</p> <p>The centre needs to redefine its role in the next 20 years to make sure that it distinguishes its offer from Westfield, Knightsbridge and King's Road. The centre will continue its long tradition as Kensington's High Street serving residents, workers and visitors. It will continue to provide a good range of food retailing and other convenience retailing and remain a destination for fashion and certain niche markets. Ease of pedestrian movement is central to this success. Reuse of the former Commonwealth Institute for a significant public institution represents an opportunity to increase visitor numbers and develop a further niche retail cluster and restaurants at the western end of the High Street. The maintenance of a cinema is essential.</p>	<p>Imperial College pointed out that they need to secure the Falmouth Gate on Imperial College Road between 11.00pm and 6.00am, so references to remodelling this entrance should be removed. They also expressed concern that the text implied that Imperial College Road would be restricted to cycles and pedestrians and they require vehicle access .</p> <p>The Natural History Museum asked for removal of the reference to the East Lawn as a public open space.</p> <p>The Knightsbridge Association objected to the area outside the Museums being described as 'used as an event space'.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward as Chapter 12 in the Proposed Core Strategy.</p>	<p>References to remodelling the Falmouth Gate entrance to Imperial collages was removed as the Council recognises the need to secure this gate at night. Thee text was amended to ensure that the impression was not given that Imperial Collage Road would be restricted to cycles and pedestrians.</p> <p>The reference to the East Lawn was not removed as the Council is of the view that this is a space which use needs resolving. Reference to the museum's forthcoming Grounds Strategy has been added, and the map has been changed to show the area currently used for events includes the lawns in front of the Waterhouse building.</p> <p>The Knightsbridge Association objected to the area outside the Museums being described as 'used as an event space', however, since this is currently the de facto use and the changes detailed above had been made this change was rejected.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

Brompton Cross

From Brompton Cross/ Chelsea in June 2009 Places Document.

	<p>The Council views Brompton Cross as a high quality specialist boutique retail centre with international appeal. The centre will also be enhanced by development which reflects its high quality character and improves pedestrian links to South Kensington Underground Station, the Museums, and Knightsbridge. The Council will encourage the return of long-term vacant retail units to retail use. The hospital facilities in the area will continue to be supported.</p>	<p>Few comments were made. Minor wording changes were made to the vision for the area to reflect NHS comments regarding the importance of supporting hospitals of an international and national rather than simply a local importance.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward in Chapter 13 of the proposed submission core strategy.</p>	<p>A new policy was created to add additional weight to the 'Place'.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Knightsbridge

From Knightsbridge in June 2009 Places Document.		Knightsbridge will continue to enjoy its role as the Royal Borough's national and international shopping destination and home to some of the most exclusive shopping in London. It will also continue its role as an important residential quarter and a service centre for residents in both Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster.	<p>The Knightsbridge Association requested that all references to Knightsbridge were changed to Brompton Road so as not to give the impression that the whole of the area was suitable for commercial development.</p> <p>The Knightsbridge Association also requested the needs of residents to be given at least equal consideration with those of other stakeholders.</p>	Yes, taken forward as Chapter 14 in the Proposed Core Strategy.	Reference to Brompton Road rather than Knightsbridge was rejected because the centre is identified as Knightsbridge in the Mayor's London Plan retail hierarchy, and it includes the top part of Sloane Street and side streets like Beauchamp Place. The requests from residents to remove all references to expanding commercial activities in the centre beyond the main artery of Brompton Road which were similarly rejected. This was resisted because Knightsbridge is one of only two international centres in the Mayor's London Plan retail hierarchy, so while the needs of residents are explicitly recognised in the vision for Knightsbridge CV14 any further emphasis on residents' interests would neglect the reality of the role of the centre.
--	--	---	--	---	---

King's Road/Sloane Square

From Kings Road in June 2009 Places Document		The King's Road will not simply be like any other 'successful' high street. It will remain one of London's iconic and vibrant shopping streets, containing a lively and diverse mix of shops, restaurants, and world-class cultural attractions. It will remain a place where one can shop in both independent boutiques and multiples; a place to enjoy, to promenade, a place which meets the day-to-day needs of our residents; and a place to experience some of the best theatre, concert and gallery space that London has to offer.	<p>A number of comments were received which related to the Council's proposed policy on affordable shops. These have been answered above. No changes were made.</p> <p>Two other main issues were raised</p> <p>A Residents Association suggested that the Council was prejudging the results of the studies necessary to assess the impact on the new Crossrail 2 stations on the Kings Road and the surrounding area.</p> <p>The Council has omitted a Renewing the Legacy section from this section. These section reflects on the quality some of the buildings in the King's Road and the need to ensure that new buildings are of the highest quality.</p>	Yes, taken forward in Chapter 15 of the proposed submission core strategy.	<p>The wording within the section has been amended to ensure that this impression is no longer given that the Council has prejudged future studies assessing the impact of Crossrail 2 stations.</p> <p>The omission of the renewing the legacy section was done in error and has been rectified. The section was also amended to elaborate what characteristics have given the King's Road its special character.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

CV16 **Notting Hill Gate**

Place 8 in the June Places consultation		Notting Hill Gate will be significantly strengthened as a District Shopping Centre, with enhanced shops and restaurants that reflect the needs of the local catchments, with premium-quality brands and outlets. Boutiques and premium-quality retailers will become a feature of the area, as they are in Kensington Church Street and Pembridge Road. The centre will continue to be a major office location.	Metro Shopping Fund supports the revised vision, although objects to NHG being a major office location and the clause which promotes the provision of affordable shops via the s106 system. MSF also objects to reference that NHG comprises of large and small office space. MSF supports the provision of a mix of retail unit sizes, but requires this to be based on retailer requirements and new	Yes, Place CV16 of Proposed Submission, with minor amendments.	N/A
Place 8 in the June Places consultation		Notting Hill has a long-standing reputation for arts and culture; Notting Hill Gate will capitalise on this in developing the arts and cultural offer.			

Place 8 in the June Places consultation		The street will become more pedestrian-friendly, with improved crossing facilities, fewer barriers, less street clutter, reduced vehicle impacts and station entrances relocated within buildings. All development will be of the most exceptional design and architectural quality, creating a 'wow factor' that excites and delights residents and visitors. Pedestrian links to Portobello Road Market will also be enhanced through good design, legibility and clear way finding.	On retailer requirements and new development should 'lift the appearance' of the area. MSF also supports Newcombe House being identified as an 'eyesore', although objects to relocating the tube entrances through s106. Several respondents raised detailed issues, such as there being too many bureau de change and estate agents, proliferation of signage and boarding up of vacant units. A respondent also suggested that 'enhanced shopping' in the vision is vague and there is insufficient space available to widen pavements and create informal crossing points. GOL required greater consideration of how the place will be delivered through policy.		
---	--	--	--	--	--

Fulham Road West

From Fulham Road West in June 2009 Places Document.		Fulham Road West will remain a centre providing for the daily needs of local people, while also offering a variety of high quality specialist shopping. The proportion of food and drink uses, together with their hours of operation, will be carefully managed to ensure a complimentary environment with the retail uses and surrounding residential area. The appearance of the centre will be enhanced through improvements to shop fronts. Pedestrian and cycle links to the north and south will be improved. The Council will support the hospital's role in contributing to the centre's vitality.	No comments which questioned the soundness of the place were made and significant changes were made.	Taken forward to No: 17 within 'Places'	A new policy was created to add additional weight to the 'Place'.
---	--	---	--	---	---

Lots Road / World's End

From Lots Road in June 2009 Places Document.		<p>Vision for Lots Road/World's End</p> <p>The opening of the new secondary school will bring people into the area. Improvements to the built and natural environment will transform the area into a place people choose to visit. Investigating the designation of a conservation area in the Lots Road area is an important part of this. The Lots Road Power Station site development will play a vital role in improving the vitality of the area by providing mixed-uses including housing and mooring facilities. Better pedestrian links from Lots Road to the World's End shops will help overcome the isolation with the wider townscape of Lots Road and reintegrate World's End. Connectivity with the riverside will be supported by completing the Thames Path.</p>	The GLA wanted Cremorne Wharf to be identified in Key Issues and Potential Opportunities Map (18) and a clear reference to protection of its function in relation to redevelopment opportunities around it. Natural England wanted the "Respecting Environmental Limits" section of all the places to include further reference to protecting and increasing biodiversity and the need to adapt to climate change. Some residents provided information about the late Victorian housing stock, the importance to the area of the Design Centre, the Heatherley Art School and the Cremorne Gardens. Some did not agree with the "industrial" feeling of the area, and wanted further references to the Thames Path, pedestrian links, improvements to the built and natural environment, social and community facilities and flood risk. They wanted a reference to be added supporting the use of Cremorne Wharf for passenger handling. A resident queried what was left of the employment zone, the approval of the Lots Road Power Station planning application, the quality of the design of the new school, the creation of new open space and the unravelling of the one-way system. Some	The policy number is CP17	Minor changes were made to reflect the comments.
--	--	--	--	---------------------------	--

Strategic Sites
Kensal Gasworks

Site 1 in June 2009 Strategic Sites document	<p>It is clear that if constraints can be overcome, the site has considerable potential. This is reflected in the commitment from the GLA to designate Kensal as an Opportunity Area in the revised London Plan.</p> <p>The site is therefore allocated for upwards of 2,500 new dwellings and an excess of 12,000m² of non-residential floorspace including social and community facilities to provide for local needs. The sites have the potential to deliver a high-density development which meet a high standard of environmental sustainability.</p>	<p>General Support for this allocation was noted. Most significantly, GLA and GoL are fully behind the allocation. However, concerns are still raised by Sainsbury's, a key landowner, who want greater commitment to the regeneration of the area irrespective of a Crossrail station coming forward. British Waterways required further references to the role and preservation of the canal.</p>	<p>Yes, Chapter 20 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy</p>	<p>Kensal is one of the borough's key strategic sites and has been identified by the GLA as an opportunity area meaning the allocation of land for 2,500 residential units and a quantum of non-residential floorspace.</p>
Site 1 in June 2009 Strategic Sites document	<p>A renewed Sainsbury's supermarket which provides a better relationship with Ladbroke Grove would form the basis of a new town centre and enhanced shopping offer to support a larger residential population.</p>		<p>Yes, Chapter 20 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy</p>	<p>In order for development to knit into the surrounding townscape, a comprehensive redevelopment is required. This is likely to move the position of Sainsbury's and will lead to a bigger store with improved retail offer.</p>
Site 1 in June 2009 Strategic Sites document	<p>Whilst a Crossrail station in Kensal is not included in the Crossrail Act, the railway tracks have been 'plain lined' to allow for station to be built in this location. Further work is currently being undertaken but there would seem to be no technical reasons why this cannot be achieved. It is most likely to provide the 'turn back' facility which is currently planned for Paddington New Yard. This would be moved to Kensal and allowing its simultaneous use as a station. Additional costs incurred in this would fall to the developers of the site. Additional improvements to bus services will also be required.</p>		<p>Yes, Chapter 20 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy</p>	<p>To stimulate wide-scale regeneration throughout north-west London, a Crossrail station in Kensal is required. This would benefit both future</p>
Site 1 in June 2009 Strategic Sites document	<p>Development is also likely to require substantially improved infrastructure including a new road and other public transport links. The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham would be a partner in improving access to the west.</p>		<p>Yes, Chapter 20 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy</p>	<p>In order to fully integrate the development and provide an street network and infrastructure to sustain a new community of in excess of 2,000 new residents, improvement to access will be necessary</p>
Site 1 in June 2009 Strategic Sites document	<p>Improved connections over both the railway lines and the canal and a usable public realm around the canalside will be developed to connect the site into its surrounding context, aid permeability, create a legible street network and make best use of the site's assets. A responsive public realm around the canal-side will be developed.</p>		<p>Yes, Chapter 20 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy</p>	<p>Knitting the Gasworks site with the surrounding townscape by using legible and well designed street networks and connections is essential to the success of the Gasworks site and the manner by which it fits with the surrounding townscape in the wider Kensal area.</p>
Site 1 in June 2009 Strategic Sites document	<p>The facilities currently provided by Canalside House and the Boathouse Centre should also be reprovded elsewhere on the site in improved accommodation. Relocation of these facilities together with the demolition of the Water Tower will be required so as to achieve a comprehensive redevelopment.</p>		<p>Yes, Chapter 20 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy</p>	<p>The Council is committed to protecting social and community uses such as those provided by the Boathouse Centre and Canalside House. However in order to comprehensively redevelop the Gasholders site, the facilities may need to be reprovded elsewhere on site.</p>

Site 1 in June 2009 Strategic Sites document		On-site waste management facilities should be provided to deal with the development's waste arisings; which should include a recycling sorting facility. The site is not expected to include waste facilities which deal with the Borough's wider waste needs. Development must also achieve a high environmental standard in terms of construction, building materials, waste management and energy usage/retention and low levels of car use.		Yes, Chapter 20 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy	On-site waste treatment facilities will be required as part of the development to handle waste arising from the new uses of the site (this could include recycling facilities and anaerobic digestion). This facilities will help towards the Borough's waste apportionment figure set out in the London Plan.
Site 1 in June 2009 Strategic Sites document		The Memorial site of the victims of the Paddington rail disaster has been included in the strategic site. This is to ensure that the redevelopment will not disadvantage visitors to the memorial in the future.		Yes, Chapter 20 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy	The safeguarding of the memorial site ensures that development responds to this location in order to maintain access for people visiting the memorial
Site 1 in June 2009 Strategic Sites document		Provision must be made for Combined Cooling, Heating and Power (CCHP) plant or similar to serve the new development, with the potential to form part of a wider network in future.		Yes, Chapter 20 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy	The development has the potential to become an exemplar of sustainable urban development and is encouraged in the Pre-feasibility Study which states that development should balance social benefit and economic value without environmental harm to achieve that bring benefit to all.

Wornington Green

Site 3 of the Strategic Sites	Potential Allocation	Residential – Redevelopment on this site will comprise of a minimum of 538 affordable units and a minimum of 150 private dwellings	Kensington Housing Trust questioned the boundary, stating that some of the area falls outside of their responsibility. Although supporting reference to the bid for funding from the Homes and Communities Agency, KHT required amendments to reflect funding from market housing will help fund a proportion of the affordable housing and requiring the deletion of the minimum number of market dwellings. KHT also supported the redevelopment priorities and committed to continue working with RBKC in the preparation of a phasing plan. However, KHT stated that they wouldn't be providing the cooling element of the Combined Cooling, Heat and Power network. The Golbourne Forum and others objected to proposals to reconnect Portobello Road with Ladbroke Grove, increase the retail provision in the north of Portobello Road and questioned the infrastructure requirements for the redevelopment. These respondents also questioned whether the Wornington Green estate renewal was being used as an experiment or testing ground for future schemes and whether sufficient finances exist to complete the scheme, including the provision of the Venture Centre and Athlone Gardens.	Chapter 21 in the Proposed Submission	N/A
Site 3 of the Strategic Sites		Leisure and Community Facilities – Replacement of the Venture Centre, including the Adventure Playground and Ball Court – 2,500m2 (GEA) (27,000 sq ft)		Chapter 21 in the Proposed Submission	N/A
Site 3 of the Strategic Sites		Open Space – Replacement Athlone Gardens – approximately 10,000m2 (GEA) (108,000 sq ft)		Chapter 21 in the Proposed Submission	N/A
Site 3 of the Strategic Sites		Tertiary education facilities		Not taken forward	This part of the site is unlikely to come forward for development and therefore the use is unlikely to change.
New, although mentioned in REL in the TPO New		Provision of CCHP or similar, which serves the estate and which can, in future, be adapted to serve a wider area Replacement of storage used by market traders in Munroe Mews		Chapter 21 in the Proposed Submission Chapter 21 in the Proposed Submission	N/A N/A

Land adjacent to Trellick Tower

Strategic Sites June 2009 Consultation.	Proposed Allocation	<p>In the Core Strategy 14 places have been identified in the Borough to which particular attention will be paid. One of these is for Golborne and Trellick and the site falls within this study area. Site of former Care Home (Class C2), garages/ parking area and multi use gaming area.</p> <p>Proposed Allocation: A minimum of 60 residential units, to fund regeneration including improvements to social and community facilities and housing. It is likely that there is capacity for further dwellings subject to detailed design considerations</p> <p>Leisure facilities could be accommodated</p> <p>New studio workspace units (Class B1) in small formats up to 100m2 would be beneficial</p>	<p>The Golbourne Forum and others objected to proposals to reconnect Portobello Road with Ladbroke Grove, increase the retail provision in the north of Portobello Road and questioned the infrastructure requirements for the redevelopment. These respondents also questioned the lack of a replacement care provision, and its explicit reference within the strategic site.</p>	<p>Yes, taken forward to the Draft Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>The importance of the site, and of the restoration of the Trellick Tower is recognised in its allocation. The comments received have resulted in a number of small changes to the allocation.</p>
---	---------------------	---	---	--	--

North Kensington Sports Centre

Site 5 of the Strategic Sites	Proposed Allocation for	<p>A new secondary school with an area no less than 6,000m2 (65,000 sq ft). The school will include its own sports facilities, including external sports pitches with green turf, planting and landscaping to contribute to the visual amenity of the surrounding properties.</p>	<p>The provision of a new secondary school in this location was generally well supported, although several respondents reiterated requirements for the sports centre to provide the same facilities as existing, including the provision of existing swimming facilities. Several respondents raised detailed comments, including clarification on the funding and phasing arrangements and measures to improve the wider amenity of the area, such as CCTV.</p>	<p>Yes, Chapter 23 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy, although the Council has got approval from the government for a Academy</p>	N/A
Site 5 of the Strategic Sites		<p>The existing public sports centre will be refurbished or replaced. If replaced, the new sports centre will offer equivalent sports facilities to the existing centre, including a swimming pool and facilities based on demand, built in a way that is flexible for the future. The public and school sports facilities could be located next to one another, making the school facilities more easily accessible by the community out of hours, and aiding in the management of both facilities.</p>		<p>Yes, Chapter 23 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy</p>	N/A
Site 5 of the Strategic Sites		<p>The inclusion of external recreation facilities similar to the existing ball court and play area.</p>		<p>Yes, Chapter 23 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy, although this will be provided as part of the school.</p>	N/A
Site 5 of the Strategic Sites		<p>A site layout that significantly improves the legibility and permeability of the street network in the area.</p>		<p>Yes, Chapter 23 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy</p>	N/A
Site 5 of the Strategic Sites		<p>An element of residential development depending on the layout of the site. This development would be regarded as enabling the provision of the school.</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>It is very unlikely that additional residential will be accommodated on the site given its size, although there is provision for some residential as part of the funding</p>
NEW		<p>Given the size of the site, there will be limited incidental open space.</p>		<p>Yes, Chapter 23 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy, although some open space will be provided as part of the school</p>	N/A
NEW		<p>Incorporation of CCHP or similar that can form the starting point for a district network should wider housing estate renewal take place in the area.</p>		<p>Yes, Chapter 23 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy</p>	N/A

The former Commonwealth Institute

	<p>Re-use of the Commonwealth Institute as a high trip-generating arts and culture use, preferably an 'exhibition' use. If this favoured use does not prove possible an appropriate alternative would be an assembly and leisure or theatre use. 9,300 m2 (net) (100,100 sq ft) of exhibition or assembly and leisure floorspace is likely to be appropriate in the 'tent' building. The main requirement for any development on the site is to find a suitable use and preserve the tent building now and in the future. A limited amount of residential or commercial development may be necessary to enable the re use of the 'tent' building for a public institutional use. The design of any development must consider community safety.</p>	<p>Few representations were received on this site. The main representations were received from the Chelsfield and the Ilchester Estate. They were concerned that the allocation was overly inflexible, and that, as a listed building, the imperative should be to ensure that the building is occupied –rather than it standing empty as the Council holds out for an arts and cultural use. Furthermore they suggested that, as a point of law, the authorised use of the site was sui generis –and that this use has now expired. This should give even greater flexibility for appropriate reuse of the site.</p> <p>The consultee was also concerned that the appropriate uses should mirror those in the recently adopted SPD – and that the Council should explicitly recognise that a hotel or office use may be an appropriate uses if a commercial use is necessary to enable the re-use if the tent building for a public institutional use.</p> <p>The consultee is concerned that the Council has been overly restrictive in the delivery milestone section in stating that the enabling residential/commercial development must follow the refurbishment of the tent building.</p>	<p>Yes, Chapter 24 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy.</p>	<p>The Council feels that it is essential that the building is used for an appropriate arts and cultural uses. Recognition that some enabling development may be necessary is considered to offer the sufficiently flexibility, which also ensures that the allocation supports the SPD.</p> <p>The Council has amended the allocation accordingly, as agree that it is appropriate that the SPD and allocation say the same thing.</p> <p>This reference to the order of development has been removed as is unnecessary. The allocation itself notes that a limited amount of enabling development may be necessary to enable the re-use of the tent building. The detailed mechanics of this do not need be included within the allocation.</p>
Warwick Road				
<p>From Sites</p>	<p>Warwick Road: Proposed Allocation: Charles House: application submitted but yet to be determined. However, it provides a good guide to an acceptable indicative development for this site with an estimated capacity of up to 500 residential units. TA Centre: as permitted shown above. Empress Telephone Exchange: as permitted shown above. Homebase: 400 residential units and up to 400sqm of commercial floor space to support residential use. 100 West Cromwell Road: 330 residential units (approximately 24,000sqm) with 3,000sqm of social and community uses (Class D1) and provision of open amenity space. Site Potential: as for proposed allocations.</p>	<p>K&C Chamber of Commerce and a resident wanted inclusion of further health and community facilities as s.106 requirements. Some of these facilities were included. Northacre Plc wanted small hotel serviced apartments and residential institutions (Class C2) to be included in the proposed allocation. Brookfield Development also wanted changes on the allocation of 100 West Cromwell Road for a marginal increase in the number of dwellings and additional floorspace for leisure, social and community uses, car parking and open amenity space.</p>	<p>Yes, in policy CA6</p>	<p>Minor changes included.</p>
Earl's Court				

From Sites

	<p>Earl's Court: Proposed Allocation and Site Potential: It is clear that if the constraints can be overcome (see below), the site has considerable potential. This is reflected in the commitment from the Greater London Authority (GLA) to designate it as an Opportunity Area in the new London Plan. Over the wider Earl's Court site a minimum of over 2,500 dwellings and further non-residential floorspace may be envisaged along with a convention or exhibition function. However, the distribution of these uses across the wider site is not clear at this stage and needs to be the subject of further detailed consideration through the preparation of an Area Action Plan. The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea is allocating the portion of the site within the borough for a minimum of 500 dwellings as part of a mix-use development. The proposed allocation is: Continuing use as Exhibition Centre (Class D1) and/ or Convention Centre use: estimated area 31,000 sqm, with additional potential as part of the wider site for Offices: 10,000sqm and Residential: 500 residential units The site potential is: Significantly more residential and possibly more office space could be delivered subject to overcoming transport constraints and improving access to the site. The site has a long tradition of exhibition related uses. The use as the London International Convention Centre as part of a mixed use development would therefore be an appropriate use for the site and would contribute to London's role as a leading World city. On-site waste management facilities should be provided to deal with the development's waste arising which could include a recycling sorting facility.</p>	<p>The GLA welcomed the joint partnership approach, which should include reference to the GLA as well as other key stakeholders. They were concerned that the proposed allocation of the site might preclude the proper spatial planning of the whole Earl's Court site and the adjoining land. They pointed out that the Council had not demonstrated that this quantum and mix of development can be readily achieved in a manner consistent with the relevant design policies or that we had taken account of the constraints arising from construction over operational railway and the potential impact on the railway. They wished a more flexible mixed-use allocation on the site that would allow its future development to be informed by the proper spatial planning of the whole Earl's Court site and the adjoining land and could accommodate development scenarios that do not rely on continued exhibition centre and/or an International Convention Centre use on the site beyond 2012 and optimizing the development potential for other uses such as residential and commercial. They welcomed the recognition that the site could achieve significantly more residential development, subject to overcoming transport constraints. They also wanted a clear reference to the sites contribution to housing and affordable housing targets and a stronger reference to energy infrastructure for the whole of the framework area. The Environment Agency wanted reference to the sequential and exception tests in the constraints which was agreed. Earl's Court Society wanted the majority of the housing development to go in the LBHF and objected to a high rise development in the site. They also proposed some potential improvements to the links between the West Brompton and Earl's Court stations. They wanted the allocation to include the need for local community facilities and objected to the inclusion of a waste facility</p>	<p>Yes, in policy CA7</p>	<p>Changes were made to reflect the concerns. This entails showing a more flexible mixed-use allocation on the site.</p>
--	---	---	---------------------------	--

		<p>Cllr Terence Buxton wanted to remove the reference to a exhibition or convention centre that is a national destination. However, this change could not be done as would undermine the vision for the place and a facility of that importance should be retained. He also wanted further reference to the importance of the design in terms of conservation and residential amenity and updated information on the area and the need for health facilities. English Heritage wanted a reference of the upgraded Grade I Registered Park and Garden of Historic Interest, which was included.</p> <p>The Earl's Court and Olympia Group proposed several changes to the text such as a new name for the wider Earl's Court site, putting less emphasis on the unravelling of the one-way system and the inclusion of a possible cultural use for the exhibition centre.</p> <p>They commented on the reference to the design and height of the new development asking to remove the negative reference to the Empress State Building. They wanted to increase the minimum amount of dwellings in the wider Earl's Court site up to a maximum of 10,000 depending of master planning. They also wanted changes to the map.</p>		
Lots Road Power Station				
	<p>Permission was granted in 2006 for:</p> <p>Shops (A1): 1,198m2 (12,900 sq ft) Financial and Professional Services (A2):82m2 (883 sq ft) Food and Drink (A3): 528m2 (5,700 sq ft) Non-Residential Institutions (D1): 877m2 (9,500 sq ft) Business (B1): 4,904m2 (43,000 sq ft) Housing: 420 dwellings Open Space</p>	<p>Circadian Ltd supported the inclusion of the site although wanted the recognition of a tall building on the site. As the existing granted permission is already fully explained on the text in the same format as other strategic sites, this change was not made.</p>	<p>Yes, in Chapter 27</p>	<p>No changes made as the text explained the existing permission. There is no policy in this chapter.</p>

Proposed Submission

Where come from	Policies/options
Policy C1 - Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations	
C1 of July draft Plan	<p>New development will be coordinated with the provision of appropriate infrastructure to support the development. The Council will require that there is adequate infrastructure to serve developments, including through the use of planning obligations.</p> <p>In determining applications for planning permission, the Council will take into consideration the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, and where the need arises from the development either because of its individual or cumulative impact, will seek prescriptive, compensatory or mitigatory measures to secure the necessary social, physical, green or environmental infrastructure, or improvements to the proposals submitted to enable the development to proceed, in accordance with advice in national guidance. Planning obligations will be negotiated taking account of the proposed development, and in determining which area measure receives priority, account will be taken of the individual characteristics of the site, and the infrastructure needs of the site and the surrounding area, viability considerations and the London Plan.</p>
Policy CK1 - Social and Community Uses	
CK1, CF10a and CF10b of the July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will ensure that social and community uses are protected or enhanced throughout the Borough and will support the provision of new facilities.</p> <p>To deliver this, the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. provide a new academy for the communities of North Kensington; b. permit new, and the expansion of existing, social and community uses which predominantly serve, or which provide significant benefits to, Borough residents, except where the proposal results in a shared or communal residential / social and community entrance; c. apply the following sequential approach: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. protect land and/or buildings where the current or last use was a social or community use, for re-use for the same, similar or related use; ii. permit the change of 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 successfully demonstrated that there is a greater benefit to the Borough resulting from this change of use; iii. permit enabling development on land and buildings where the current or last use was a social and community use in order to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - significantly improve that use; - provide another social and community use on site; - improve social and community uses elsewhere within the Borough.
Policy CK2 - Local Shopping Facilities	
CK2 of the July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will ensure opportunities exist for convenience shopping throughout the Borough.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will protect individual shops outside of designated town centres.</p>
Policy CK3 - Walkable Neighbourhoods and Neighbourhood Facilities	
CK3 of the July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will maintain the current percentage of access to neighbourhood facilities and work towards increasing these where appropriate opportunities arise.</p>
Policy CF1 - Location of New Shop Uses	

CF1, CF3, CF4, CF11
of July Draft Plan

In order to promote vital and viable town centres the Council endorses a town centre first approach to new retail floorspace, whilst recognising the role that new shops outside centres can have in serving the day-to-day shopping needs of residents.

To deliver this the Council will

- (a) support the creation of new shop floorspace within town centres;
- (b) require new retail development with a floor areas of more than 400 m2 (4,300 sq ft) (gross external) to be located within existing higher order town centres or within sites adjoining Knightsbridge, King's Road (East and West), Fulham Road Brompton Cross and South Kensington where no suitable sites can be identified within these centres;
- (c) permit new shops (A1) of less than 400 m2 (4,300 sq ft)(gross external) in areas of retail deficiency as shown in the plan within the Keeping Life Local section of this document;
- (d) require the establishment of new centres in the Latimer and Kensal areas to address identified retail deficiency; and
- (e) where new retail development does not comply with parts (a) to (d) of CF1, require applicants to demonstrate the need for the proposal; that the development would meet the requirements of the sequential test; and that the development will not have an unacceptable impact on existing centres; or that the new floorspace would underpin the Council's regeneration objectives and the vitality of any existing harm will not be harmed.

Policy CF2 - Retail Development within Town Centres

CF2, CF11 of July
Draft Plan

The Council will ensure that the character and diversity of the Borough's town centres is upheld.

To deliver this the Council will

- (a) require the scale and nature of development within a town centre to reflect the position of the centre within the retail hierarchy and to assist in the implementation of the vision for that centre as set out within the Places section;
- (b) require a range of shop units sizes in new retail development as appropriate, and where possible, resist the amalgamation of shop units, where the retention of the existing units contributes to achieving the vision for the centre; and
- (c) require, were appropriate, new large scale retail development or mixed use development with a significant retail element, to provide affordable shops to be managed under the Council's Neighbourhood Shopping Policy. Affordable shops can be provided off site within the same centre where appropriate.

Policy CF3 - Diversity of uses within Town Centres

CF1, CF11 of July Draft Plan

The Council will secure the success and vitality of our town centres by protecting, enhancing and promoting a diverse range of shops and by ensuring that these uses will be supported, but not dominated by, a range of complimentary town centre uses. To deliver this the Council will:

- (a) protect shops and shop floorspace at ground floor level in primary retail frontages of the Knightsbridge, King's Road (East and West), Fulham Road Brompton Cross, South Kensington and Kensington High Street town centres unless the change is to another town centre use and where 80 % of the ground-floor units in the relevant street frontage will remain in an A1(shop) use and the non shop use is not adjacent to another non-A1 use;
- (b) protect shops and shop floorspace at ground floor level in primary retail frontages of Notting Hill Gate unless the change is to another town centre use, but not an estate agents, bureaux de change (Class A2) or hot food takeaway (Class A4) use and where 80 % of the ground-floor units in the relevant street frontage will remain in an A1(shop) use and the non-shop use is not adjacent to another non-A1 use;
- (c) protect all shops at ground floor level in the primary retail frontage of the Portobello Special District Centre;
- (d) protect retail floorspace at ground floor level within the secondary retail frontages of Knightsbridge, King's Road (East and West), Fulham Road, Brompton Cross, South Kensington and Kensington High Street and Portobello Road town centres, unless the change is to a town centre use and where 2/3 of the ground-floor units in the relevant street frontage will remain in an A1(shop) use and there are no more than 3 non-A1 uses in a row;
- (e) protect shops and shop floorspace at ground floor level in secondary retail frontages of Notting Hill Gate District Centre unless the change is to another town centre, but not an estate agents, bureaux de change (Class A2) or hot food takeaway (Class A4) and the change is to a town centre use and where 2/3 of the ground-floor units in the relevant street frontage will remain in an A1(shop) use and there are no more than 3 non-A1 uses in a row;
- (f) protect retail uses above or below ground floor level within town centres unless the applicant can successfully demonstrate that their loss will not adversely affect the essential shopping character and function of the centre; and
- (g) protect all shops within neighbourhood centres, unless the proposal is to change to a social and community use, and where 2/3 of the relevant street frontage

Policy CF4 - Street Markets

CF11 of July Draft Plan

The Council will ensure that street markets remain a vibrant part of the Borough's retail offer. To deliver this the Council will:

- (a) protect of all of the Borough's street markets including those at Portobello Road, Golborne Road and Bute Street;
- (b) support new, or the expansion of existing, street markets where this fits in with our broader retail strategy and our strategic objectives for the town centres in which they would be located within or adjacent to; and
- (c) require the protection of existing storage lockups for street traders, or their equivalent re-provision.

Policy CF5 - Location of Business Uses

CF5, CF6 and CF14
of July Draft Plan

The Council will ensure that there are a range of business premises within the Borough to allow businesses to grow and thrive; to consolidate large scale businesses within town centres and areas of high transport accessibility; and protect and promote employment zones for a range of small and medium business activities which directly support the function and character of the zone.

To deliver this the Council will

- (a) protect very small and small offices (when either 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 mews; large offices in Higher Order Town Centres and other accessible areas; except where:
 - (i) the office is within an employment zone and is being replaced by a light industrial use, workshop or other use which directly supports the character and function of the zone; or where
 - (ii) the office is within a town centre and is being replaced by a shop or shop floorspace;
- (b) permit very small offices anywhere in the Borough save from ground floor level of town centres;
- (c) permit small offices anywhere in the Borough; and require medium offices to be located in town centres, in other accessible areas and in commercial mews; require large offices to be located in higher order town centres and other accessible areas; and not to:
 - (i) result in shared communal residential/ business entrance;
 - (ii) result in the net loss of any residential units or floorspace; or
 - (iii) in the case of a town centre, harm the retail function of that centre;
- (d) permit business centres at upper floor levels of higher order town centres, within accessible areas and within Employment Zones;
- (e) require all new business to be flexible floorspace, capable of accommodating a range of unit sizes;
- (f) protect all light industrial uses throughout the Borough;
- (g) require light industrial uses to be located within Employment Zones, predominantly commercial mews and other areas where residential amenity is not harmed;
- (h) require the provision of a mix of unit sizes suitable for the creative and cultural businesses, as appropriate; and
- (i) in Employment zones the Council will:
 - (i) require there be no net loss of business floorspace unless to uses which directly support the function and character of the zone;
 - (ii) protect light industrial uses, workshops, small and medium offices, and business centres;
 - (iii) promote employment zones as for locations for small businesses, workshops (whether stand alone or part of large business centres).

Policy CF6 - Creative and Cultural Businesses

CF7 of July Draft Plan

The Council will promote and protect the work-spaces needed to support the creative and cultural industries across the Borough.

Policy CF7 - Arts and Culture Uses

CF8 of July Draft Plan

The Council supports the Borough's role in world-class culture and will welcome new cultural institutions 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 and Portobello Road area and Kensington High Street.

Policy CF8 - Hotels

CF15 of July Draft Plan

The Council will ensure that the visitor economy is supported through appropriate hotel provision. To do this the Council will:

- a. protect hotels across the Borough except in the Earl's Court and Courtfield wards;
- b. require new hotels to be located within, or immediately adjoining, the Borough's higher order town centres, and in particular Knightsbridge, South Kensington, Kensington High Street, King's Road (East), Brompton Cross and Notting Hill Gate and within the the Earl's Court Strategic Site; and
- c. encourage the upgrading of existing hotels; where:
 - i. this will assist in maintaining the vitality of the centre;
 - ii. will not result in the loss of A1 retail uses in primary areas;
 - iii. where will not result in the loss of any residential accommodation; and
 - iv. there will be no material harm on residential amenity.

Policy CF9 - The South Kensington Strategic Cultural Area

CF9 of July Draft Plan

The Council will protect and enhance arts and cultural uses in the South Kensington Strategic Cultural Area.

Policy CT1 - Improving alternatives to car use

CT2of July Draft Plan

The Council will require improvements to the alternatives to car use and restrict car parking in order to increase the proportion of journeys in the Borough that are undertaken on public transport or by walking or cycling. To deliver this the Council will:

- (a) work to ensure that public transport services, and access to them, are improved. North-south bus links and areas that currently have lower levels of accessibility will be our priorities.
- (b) require high trip generating development to be located in areas of the Borough where public transport accessibility has a PTAL score of 4 or above, or will achieve this level as a result of improvements to public transport;
- (c) work to ensure that step-free access is delivered at more underground and rail stations in the Borough;
- (d) ensure that any car parking provided in new residential development does not exceed the adopted car parking standards, these standards will be reduced over the life of the plan. Notwithstanding our maximum standards, we will seek zero or very limited levels of car parking, that meets only essential needs;
- (e) require that all new additional residential development will be permit-free;
- (f) require that parking in non-residential development is for essential need only;
- (g) resist new public car parks;
- (h) require that where new on-street parking is created as a result of regeneration schemes it is managed so that parking demand is controlled and the need for off-street parking is minimised;
- (i) require effective Travel Plans for all types of development;
- (j) protect existing footways and require improvements to the walking and cycling environment and cycle parking, showering and changing facilities in new development to ensure walking and cycling is an attractive option;
- (k) require that new developments incorporate measures to improve road safety, and in particular the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Developments that will result in any decrease in road safety will be resisted;
- (l) 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 and walking and cycling alongside it;
- (m) work with TfL to improve the streets within the Earl's Court One-Way System by seeking two-way operation, and by requiring developments to contribute to this objective

Policy CT2 - New and enhanced rail infrastructure

CT2 of July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will require improved access to existing and planned new rail infrastructure in the Borough. To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. work to ensure that require a Crossrail Station is established in Kensal near Ladbroke Grove to be established; b. promote the creation of a new station on the West London Line at North Pole Road; c. protect the safeguarded route and associated land for the Chelsea-Hackney underground line including a station at Sloane Square and near Chelsea Old Town Hall on the King's Road; d. promote a station further west, potentially at Imperial Wharf, as part of the Chelsea-Hackney underground line; e. seek improvements to the accessibility of the West Brompton Station, and measures to increase the capacity of the West London Line and improvements to its interchange with the underground network.
Policy CR1 - Street Network	
CR1 of July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will require a well connected, inclusive and legible network of streets to be maintained and enhanced. In areas of regeneration and large scale redevelopment where a new street network needs to be established, it should be inspired by the Borough's historic street patterns to ensure optimal connectivity and accessibility.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will: (a) require new links and the removal of barriers that disconnect access for pedestrians, cyclists and persons with limited mobility; (b) require new street networks to be established with a clear function, hierarchy and choice of routes, designed to optimise connectivity, accessibility and legibility, and to reflect the historic and finely grained block structure of the Borough (c) adopt all new streets constructed in the Borough to ensure they compliment the existing street network (d) resist the gating of existing streets and the development of new gated communities; (e) require new streets to be designed to be attractive, safe, minimise opportunities for crime, and be inclusive to all; and (f) protect existing rights of way.</p>
Policy CR2 - Three-Dimensional Street Form	
CR2 of July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will require that where new streets are proposed, or where development could make significant change to the form of the existing streets, the resultant street form and character must draw from the traditional qualities and form of our existing high quality streets.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will: (a) require appropriate street widths to be established with regard to the legibility of the street function and hierarchy; (b) require the ratio of building height to street width to give a coherent and comfortable scale to the street (c) require building lines and building scales to be consistent and related to context (d) require a frequency and rhythm of building entrances and windows that support active street frontages and optimises community safety; (e) require a clear distinction to be maintained between public, private and communal space through the retention and provision of characteristic boundary treatments, forecourts and front gardens; (f) maintain existing street trees and extend the tradition of street trees across the Borough.</p>
Policy CR3 - Street and Outdoor Life	

CR3 of July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will require opportunities to be taken within the street environment to create 'places' that support the full array of outdoor life, inclusive to all, adding to their attractiveness and vitality. To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) require new markets on public highways to: i. maintain pedestrian and vehicular access; ii. maintain residential amenity; iii. submit waste management plans as part of a planning application (b) require new isolated street trading pitches to contribute to the character and appearance of the street, have no adverse impact on existing shops and residential amenity and to not impede pedestrian flows; (c) require the use of pavements for outdoor dining and pavement cafés to be located within our town centres, where it maintains the primary function as public footway allowing for the free, safe and secure passage of pedestrians; (d) require the occasional use of parks, gardens and open spaces for special events, to demonstrate that they are well-managed, and where the event duration, frequency and scale has no adverse impact upon: i. local residential amenity; ii. the setting of historic listed buildings; iii. the setting of registered Parks and Gardens; iv. the character and appearance of conservation areas; v. the predominant use as open space, taking the cumulative impact into account; vi. traffic generation; and (e) require an Events Management Plan and a Management Strategy for repeated use of an open space to be submitted as part of a planning application
Policy CR4 - Streetscape	
CR4 of July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will require improvements to the visual, functional and inclusive quality of our streets, ensuring they are designed and maintained to a very high standard. To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) require all work to, or affecting the public highway, to be carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Streetscape Guide (2006); (b) require all redundant or non-essential street furniture to be removed; (c) retain and maintain historic street furniture, where it does not adversely impact on the safe functioning of the street; (d) require that where there is an exceptional need for new street furniture that it is of high quality design and construction, and placed with great care, so as to relate well to the character and function of the street; (e) require advertising on buildings only to demonstrate that by reason of size, siting, design, content, materials or method of illumination, it does not harm the appearance of the building or streetscene, and does not adversely affect amenity or public safety; (f) resist temporary or permanent advertising hoardings, or freestanding adverts on streets, forecourts, roadsides or advertisements attached to street furniture where these negatively impact on our high quality townscape or on public safety; (g) resist pavement crossovers and forecourt parking; and (h) require new public art as part of all major developments that is of high quality and either incorporated into the external design of the new building or carefully located within the public realm.
Policy CR5 - Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways	
CR5 of July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will protect, enhance and make the most of existing parks, gardens and open spaces, and require new high quality outdoor spaces to be provided where possible. To deliver this the Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) resist the loss of existing: i. Metropolitan Open Land; ii. public open space; iii. private communal open space and private open space where the space that gives visual amenity to the public (b) resist development that has an adverse effect upon the environmental and open character or visual amenity of Metropolitan Open Land and the Parks and Gardens on the Borough's Register of Special Historic Interest in England, or their setting (c) resist development that has an adverse effect on garden squares including proposals for subterranean development, and to promote the enhancement of garden squares; (d) require all major development outside a 400m radius of the closest entrance to the nearest public open space to make provision for new open space which is suitable for a range of outdoor activities and for users of all ages. This may be in the form of communal garden space; where this is not possible for justified townscape reasons, that a contribution is made towards improving publicly accessible open space; (e) require all open space that forms part of a proposal to be designed and landscaped to a high standard; and (f) require opportunities to be taken to improve public access to, and along the Thames and the Grand Union Canal and promote their use for education, tourism, leisure and recreation, health and well-being.

Policy CR6 - Trees and landscape

CR6 of July Draft Plan

The Council will require the protection of existing trees and the provision of new trees that compliment the existing or create new, high quality green areas which deliver amenity and biodiversity benefits. To deliver this the Council will: (a) resist the loss of trees unless they are dead, dying, potentially dangerous or causing an actionable nuisance; (b) require landscape design to be fit for purpose and function; (c) require landscape design to be of a high quality and compatible with the surrounding landscape, and townscape character; (d) require existing street trees to be maintained and to extend the tradition of street trees across the Borough; (e) resist development which results in the damage or loss of trees of townscape or amenity value; (f) require new trees to be suitable species for the location; (g) require that trees are adequately protected throughout the course of development; (h) serve Tree Preservation Orders or attach planning conditions to protect trees of townscape or amenity value that are threatened by development; (i) require the planting of new trees that are compatible with the surrounding landscape and townscape; (j) require landscaping to be clearly defined as public or private space; and (k) require landscaping to optimise the benefit to wildlife habitat.

Policy CR7 - Servicing

CR7 of July Draft Plan

The Council will require servicing facilities to be well-designed, built to accommodate the demands of new development and sensitively integrated into the development and the surrounding townscape. In particular servicing activities should not give rise to traffic congestion, conflict with pedestrians or be detrimental to residential amenity. To deliver this the Council will: (a) require sufficient on-site servicing space to accommodate the number and type of vehicles likely to be generated and to ensure that this can take place without manoeuvring on the highway; (b) require a Servicing Management Plan for all sites with on-site servicing space that will control the hours of servicing, including detail on how vehicles will be managed, and controls on the types and sizes of vehicles to ensure they are appropriate to the local area and are environmentally acceptable; (c) require that where developments cannot provide on-site servicing space that it can be demonstrated that the proposal can function satisfactorily without giving rise to adverse effects on traffic congestion, pedestrian safety, residential amenity or impacting on bus routes. A Servicing Management Plan will be required in these instances; (d) require on-site servicing space and entrances to be sensitive to the character and appearance of the building and wider townscape and streetscape.

Policy CL1 - Context and Character

CL1 of July Draft Plan

The Council will require all development to respect the existing context character, and appearance, taking opportunities available to improve the quality and character of the area and the way it functions, including being inclusive and accessible for all. To deliver this the Council will: (a) require development through its architecture and urban form to contribute positively to the context of a townscape, addressing matters such as scale, height, bulk, mass, proportion, plot width, building lines, street form, rhythm, roofscape, materials, and historic fabric (b) require the analysis of context to be drawn from an area that is proportionate and relevant to the size of the development; (c) require the density of development to be optimised, taking into account the appropriate density range, whilst closely reflecting its context (d) permit riverside and canalside development where this enhances the waterside character and setting, including opening up views and securing access to the waterway

Policy CL2 - New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings	
CL2 of July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will permit new buildings, extensions and modifications to existing buildings that are of the highest architectural and urban design quality. To deliver the Council will, in relation to:</p> <p>Architectural Design (a) development to be: (i) Functional - fit for purpose and legible (ii) Robust - well built, remain in good condition and adaptable to future changes of use, lifestyle, demography and climate (iii) Attractive - pleasing in its composition, materials and craftsmanship (iv) Locally distinctive - responds well to its context (v) Sustainable - in the use of resources, construction and operation (vi) Inclusive - accessible to all (vii) Secure - designs out crime (b) require an appropriate architectural style on a site-by-site basis, in response to (i) the context of the site; (ii). the building's proposed design form and use; (iii). whether the townscape is of uniform or varied character. (c) facilitate the redevelopment of 'eyesores' by offering flexibility in relation to policies which make redevelopment with buildings more suited to their context demonstrably unviable; Extensions and modifications (d) require extensions and modifications to respect those aspects of the building's character and integrity that contribute to local distinctiveness, such as height, building line, visual subordination, symmetry, rhythm, materials, detailed design, important gaps and sense of garden openness (e) require additional storeys and roof level alterations, to be sympathetic to the architectural style and character of the building and to either assist in unifying a group of buildings or, where there is a detached building to be below the prevailing building height. (f) require subterranean extensions to meet all the following: (i) the proposal does not involve excavation underneath a listed building; (ii) the stability of the existing or neighbour buildings is demonstrated; (iii) there is no loss of trees of townscape or amenity value; and (iv) adequate soil depth and material is provided to ensure sustainable growth. Tall</p>
Policy CL3 - Historic Environment	
CL4 of July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will require development to preserve historic places, spaces and townscapes, and to take opportunities to enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas. To deliver this the Council will: (a) require full planning applications in conservation areas; (b) require development in conservation areas (c) to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and its setting; (c) resist development which interrupts, disrupts or detracts from local views identified in the Council's Conservation Area Proposal Statements; (d) require substantial demolition of buildings in conservation areas to demonstrate: (i) the building or part of the building or structure makes no positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area; and (ii) a satisfactory scheme for redevelopment has been approved. (e) require, in the event of a collapse of a structure in a conservation area, a replacement replica of the structure building where the original it made a positive contribution to the character and appearance of that conservation area</p>
Policy CL4 - Historic Assets	
CL5 of July Draft Plan	<p>The Council will permit proposals that preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest of a listed buildings or and scheduled ancient monuments and their settings, and the conservation and protection of sites of archaeological interest. To deliver this the Council will: (a) resist the demolition of listed buildings in whole or in part, or the removal or modification of features of architectural importance (both internal and external); (b) require the preservation of the special architectural and historic interest of listed buildings, scheduled monuments or other buildings or places of interest. In particular the integrity, plan form and structure of the building including the ground and first floor principal rooms, original staircases and such other areas of the building as may be identified as being of special interest should be preserved; (c) require the preservation of the original architectural features, and later features of interest, both internal and external; (d) require internal or external architectural features of listed buildings or scheduled ancient monuments, commensurate with the scale of the development, to be: (i) reinstated where the missing features are considered important to their special interest; (ii) removed where the additions to or modifications are considered inappropriate or detract from their special character. (e) resist the change of use of a listed building which would materially harm its character; (f) strongly encourage any works to a listed building to be carried out in a correct, scholarly manner by appropriate specialists; (g) require proposals to protect the setting of listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments or sites of archaeological interest; (h) resist development which would threaten the conservation, protection or setting of archaeological remains; (i) require desk based assessments and where necessary archaeological field evaluation before development proposals are determined, where development is proposed on sites of archaeological significance or potential</p>

Policy CL5 - Amenity

CH3 of July Draft Plan

The Council will require that existing levels of amenity are protected and that new development, extensions and modifications, achieves high standards of amenity To deliver this the Council will: (a) require good daylight and sunlight amenity for buildings and amenity spaces, and that the conditions of existing adjoining buildings and amenity spaces are not significantly reduced or, where they are already substandard, that there should be no worsening of the conditions; (b) require reasonable visual privacy; (c) require that there is no harmful increase in the sense of enclosure to existing buildings and spaces; (d) require that there is no significant impact on the use of buildings and spaces due to increases in traffic, parking, noise, odours or vibration.

Policy CL6 - Small-scale Alterations and Additions

CL3 of July Draft Plan

The Council will require that alterations and additions do not harm the existing character and appearance of the building and its context.
To deliver this the Council will:
(a) resist small-scale development which:
 (i) harms the character or appearance of the existing building, its setting or townscape;
 (ii) results in a cumulative effect which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area; are not of high quality form, detailed = design and materials;
 (iii) do not improve the accessibility and security of the building in a sensitive manner in relation to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.
(b) require telecommunications, plant, micro-generation and other mechanical equipment to be sited as discretely as practicable so that visual amenity is not impaired.

Policy CH1 - Housing Targets

CH1 of July Draft Plan

The Council will ensure that sufficient housing sites are allocated in order to ensure the housing targets are met.
To deliver this the Council will:
(a) make provision for a minimum of 350 net additional dwellings a year until the London Plan is replaced (estimated as 2011/12). From this date the Council is planning to make provision for a minimum of 600 net additional dwellings a year, until c. 2021/22. The exact target will be set through the London Plan process.
(b) make provision for the maximum amount of affordable housing with a target of 90 units per annum until the new London Plan is published (c. 2011/2012) and thereafter 200 units per annum from 2011/2012 until 2021/22 from all sources.
(c) require affordable housing tenures to be provided such that they work towards a Borough-wide target of 85% social rented housing and 15% Intermediate housing.

Policy CH2 - Housing Diversity

The Council will ensure new housing development is provided so as to further refine the grain of the mix of housing across the Borough.
To deliver this the Council will, in relation to:

Housing Mix and Type

- (a) require new residential developments to include a mix of types, tenures and sizes of homes to reflect the varying needs of the Borough, taking into account the characteristics of the site, and current evidence in relation to housing need;
- (b) require new residential developments to be built to lifetime homes standards, and a minimum of 10% to be 'wheelchair accessible';
- (c) encourage extra care housing, particularly in the south of the Borough;
- (d) protect houses in multiple occupation except where a proposal concerns conversion into self-contained studio flats. Any such proposal will be subject to a Section 106 agreement to ensure the flats remain as studios in perpetuity;
- (e) resist the loss of residential hostels except where the site will be utilised as a different form of affordable housing;
- (f) resist development which result in the net loss of five or more residential units.
- (g) require development that results in the amalgamation of residential units to be subject to a section 106 agreement to ensure the resultant units are not further amalgamated in the future.
- (h) require housing schemes to include outdoor amenity space.

Affordable Housing

- (i) require the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing with the presumption being at least 50% provision on gross residential floor space in excess of 800m²;
- (j) require provision to be in the form of a commuted sum in lieu of affordable housing where less than 1,200m² of gross residential floor space is proposed;
- (k) require affordable housing provision of affordable homes on site where more than 1,200m² of gross residential floor space is proposed, unless exceptional circumstances exist;
- (l) require any off-site affordable housing to be provided in any wards except the following: Golborne, St.Charles, Notting Barns, Colville, Norland, Earl's Court and Cremorne;

CF16 of July Draft
Plan

The Council will ensure a net increase in residential accommodation.
To deliver this the Council will:

- (a) protect market residential use and floorspace except:
 - in higher order town centres, where the loss is to a town centre use;
 - (i) in employment zones, where the loss is to a business use, or other use which supports character and function of the zone;
 - (ii) in a predominantly commercial mews, where its loss is to a business use;
 - (iii) where the proposal is for a very small office; or
 - (iv) where the proposal is for a new social and community use which predominantly serves, or which provides significant benefits, to Borough residents or an arts and cultural use;
- b) resist the net loss of affordable housing floorspace and units throughout the Borough;
- c) permit new residential use and floorspace everywhere except:
 - at ground floor level of all town centres;
 - (i) where replacing existing retail uses across the Borough;
 - (ii) where replacing an existing light industrial use across the Borough;
 - (iii) within the Kensal, Latimer Road and Lots Road Employment Zones;
 - (iv) where replacing an arts and cultural use;
 - (v) where replacing a social and community use, which predominantly serves, or provides significant benefits to, Borough residents (unless as part of an enabling development);
 - (vi) where replacing offices within a higher order town centre; a large or medium office in a highly accessible area (PTAL 4 or above); or a very small or small office use across the Borough.

Policy CH4 - Estate Renewal

CH4 of July Draft Plan

The Council will require that the full redevelopment of estates built for social rented housing demonstrates a compelling case that the long term benefits outweigh the considerable uncertainty and disruption such projects will cause.

To deliver this the Council will:

- (a) require the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, with the minimum being no net loss of existing social rented provision;
- (b) guarantee all existing tenants a new home, with those wishing to stay in the area being able to do so;
- (c) require that the mix of house sizes for the re-provided social rented housing will be determined by the housing needs of the tenants of the estate and by the housing needs of the Borough, at the time that an application is submitted;
- (d) require that where estate renewal is being funded through the provision of private housing or other commercial development, schemes must be supported by a financial appraisal;
- (e) recognise that cross subsidy between estates may also be required where proposals involve several estates. The principles set out above for one estate would be applied to two or more estates, taken as a whole.

SO CO1.7 Respecting Environmental Limits

Draft Core Strategy
CV 1.7

Our strategic objective to respect environmental limits is to contribute to the mitigation of, and adaption to, climate change; significantly reduce carbon dioxide emissions; maintain low and further reduce car use; carefully manage flood risk and waste; protect and attract biodiversity; improve air quality; and reduce and control noise within the Borough.

Policy CE1 - Climate Change

The Council recognises the Government's targets to reduce national carbon dioxide emissions by 26% against 1990 levels by 2020 in order to meet a 60% reduction by 2050 and will require development to make a significant contribution towards this target.

To deliver this the Council will:

a. require an assessment to demonstrate that all new buildings and extensions defined as major development achieves the following Code for Sustainable Homes / BREEAM standards:

i. Residential Development: Code for Sustainable Homes:

Up to 2012: Level Four;

2013 to 2015: Level Five;

2016 onwards: Level Six.

ii. **Non Residential Development: Relevant BREEAM Assessment**

Up to 2015: Excellent;

2016 onwards: Outstanding;

b. require an assessment to demonstrate that conversions and refurbishment defined as major development achieves the following relevant BREEAM standards:

i. **Residential Development:** EcoHomes Very Good (at design and post construction) with 40% of credits achieved under the Energy, Water and Materials sections, or comparable when BREEAM for refurbishment is published;

ii. **Non Residential Development:**

Up to 2015: Very Good (with 40% of credits achieved under the Energy, Water and Materials sections);

2016 onwards: Excellent (with 40% of credits achieved under the Energy, Water and Materials sections);

c. require an assessment to demonstrate that the entire dwelling where subterranean extensions are proposed achieves Code for Sustainable Homes Level Four;

d. require that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions, including those from energy, heating and cooling, are reduced to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards in accordance with the following hierarchy:

i. energy efficient building design, construction and materials, including the use of passive design, natural heating and natural ventilation;

ii. decentralised heating, cooling and energy supply, through Combined Cooling Heat and Power (CCHP) or similar, whilst ensuring that heat and energy production does not result in unacceptable levels of air pollution;

iii. on-site renewable and low-carbon energy sources;

e. require the provision of a Combined Cooling, Heat and Power plant, or similar, which is of a suitable size to service the planned development and contribute as part of a district heat and energy network for:

i. strategic site allocations at Kensal, Wornington Green, North Kensington Sports Centre and Earl's Court; and

ii. significant redevelopment and regeneration proposals at Notting Hill Gate and Latimer as set out in the places section of this document;

f. require all CCHP plant or similar to connect to, or be able to connect to, other existing or planned CCHP plant or similar to form a district heat and energy network;

g. require development to connect into any existing district heat and energy network, where the necessary service or utility infrastructure is accessible to that

Policy CE2 - Flooding

Draft Core Strategy
Policy CE2

The Council will require development to adapt to fluvial flooding and mitigate the effects of, and adapt to, surface water and sewer flooding.

To deliver this the Council will:

- a. resist vulnerable development, including self-contained basement dwellings, in Flood Risk Zone 3 as defined in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment;
- b. require a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, including an 'Exception Test' for all development in Flood Risk Zone 2 and 3 as defined in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and for all sites greater than 1 hectare;
- c. require development at risk from flooding in Flood Risk Zones 2 & 3 or sites greater than 1ha to incorporate suitable flood defence or flood mitigation measures in accordance with the recommendations of the site-specific Flood Risk Assessment;
- d. require sustainable urban drainage, or other measures, to reduce both the volume and the speed of water run off to the drainage system ensuring that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible in line with the hierarchy in the London Plan. In particular, major development must make a significant reduction in the current volume and speed of water run off to the drainage system;
- e. resist impermeable surfaces in front gardens;
- f. require development adjacent to the Thames to be set back from the Thames flood defence to enable the sustainable and cost-effective upgrade of flood defences over the next 50 to 100 years;
- g. require works associated with the construction of the Thames Tideway Tunnel to:
 - i. preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cheyne, Royal Hospital and Thames Conservation areas;
 - ii. preserve the setting of listed buildings and Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest (i.e. the Royal Hospital grounds);
 - iii. not adversely impact on amenity;
 - iv. not compromise the future of Cremorne Wharf which is a Safeguarded Wharf.

Policy CE3 - Waste

Draft Core Strategy
Policy CE3

The Council will meet the waste apportionment figure as set out in the London Plan and will ensure that waste is managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy, which is to reduce, reuse or recycle waste as close as possible to where it is produced.

To deliver this the Council will:

- a. prepare a specific waste DPD to show how the waste apportionment figure of 309,000 tonnes per annum by 2020 required by the London Plan will be met. This will include:
 - i. identifying suitable sites for the purpose of managing the waste;
 - ii. identifying which boroughs the Council will be working with and how much the pooled apportionment of those boroughs will be so that the apportionment figure can be met;
 - iii. working in partnership with the GLA and neighbouring boroughs to meet the apportionment figure;
 - iv. safeguarding the existing waste management sites along with Cremorne Wharf, maximising its use for waste management, water transport and cargo-handling purposes;
- b. require on-site waste treatment facilities as part of development at Kensal and Earl's Court to handle waste arising from the new uses on the site (this could include recycling facilities and anaerobic digestion);
- c. require provision of adequate refuse and recycling storage space which allows for ease of collection in all developments;
- d. require that development proposals make use of the rail and the waterway network for the transportation of construction waste and other waste;
- e. require applicants for major developments to prepare and implement Site Waste Management Plans for demolition and construction waste.

Policy CE4 - Biodiversity

Draft Core Strategy
Policy CE4

The Council will protect the biodiversity in, and adjacent to, the Borough's Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and require opportunities to be taken to enhance and attract biodiversity.

To deliver this the Council will:

- a. protect Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and/or require the provision of significantly improved habitats to attract biodiversity in accordance with the national, regional and local Biodiversity Action Plans;
- b. protect the biodiversity value of Green Corridors and the Blue Ribbon Network and require that development proposals create opportunities to extend or link Green Corridors and the Blue Ribbon Network;
- c. require a site specific Ecological Impact Assessment for all major developments in or adjacent to Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, Green Corridors, open space and the Blue Ribbon Network;
- d. require other development proposals to create opportunities, where possible, for attracting biodiversity and habitat creation, having regard to the national, regional and local Biodiversity Action Plans.

Policy CE5 - Air Quality

Draft Core Strategy
Policy CE5

The Council will carefully control the impact of development on air quality, including the consideration of pollution from vehicles, construction and the heating and cooling of buildings. The Council will require development to be carried out in a way that minimises the impact on air quality and mitigate exceedences of air pollutants.

To deliver this the Council will:

- a. require an air quality assessment for all major development;
- b. resist development proposals which would materially increase exceedences of local air pollutants and have an unacceptable impact on amenity, unless the development mitigates this impact through physical measures or financial contributions to implement proposals in the Council's Local Air Quality Management Plan;
- c. require that the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM assessments obtains all credits available for reducing pollution and emissions, and improving air quality;
- d. resist biomass combustion unless its use will not have a detrimental impact on air quality.

Policy CE6 - Noise and Vibration

Draft Core Strategy
Policy CE6

The Council will carefully control the impact of noise and vibration generating sources which affect amenity. The Council will require new noise and vibration sensitive developments to mitigate and protect occupiers against existing sources of noise and vibration.

To deliver this the Council will:

- a. require that noise and vibration sensitive development is located in the most appropriate location and protected against existing sources of noise and vibration, through careful design, layout and use of materials, to ensure adequate insulation from sound and vibration;
- b. resist developments which fail to meet local noise and vibration standards;
- c. resist all applications for noise and vibration generating development and plant that would have an unacceptable noise and vibration impact on surrounding amenity;
- d. require that development protects, respects and enhances the attributes of the special significance and tranquillity of tranquil quiet areas.

Places

Kensal

Kensal Place in July 2009 Draft Plan

CV5 - The Gasworks sites will have realised their potential and developed into a thriving and valued community in North Kensington. Along with residential development, there will be job creation and regeneration benefits which will be enhanced by a Crossrail station. Kensal will connect North Kensington with Central London and beyond. Well-connected, high density, mixed-use and environmentally responsive developments will have populated the sites. Better use will have been made of the canal and its towpath and over new 2,500 dwellings, with offices and a range of community facilities will have been delivered.

The area will also have been knitted into the surrounding urban fabric and the development, taken as a whole, will have provided a successful precedent of the remainder for the Borough. Development in the employment zone will support its function as a vital and valued asset for small and medium industries and the cultural and creative sector in particular

CP4 - The Council will ensure the long term regeneration of Kensal by requiring development to positively contribute to the regeneration and environmental sustainability of the area, and resisting development which prejudices long term regeneration opportunities and which undermines the role of the employment zone.

Golborne and Trellick

Kensal Place in July 2009 Draft Plan

CV6 Golborne and Trellick will have maintained a strong mixed community and Trellick Tower will remain the icon of the area. The Golborne Road Market and retailers will be thriving, serving both local people and other Londoners. The Portobello Road and Golborne Road Markets will have gained strength from each other, but will remain distinct in nature. New housing will be a mix of sizes and tenures. The Grand Union Canal will be seen as a destination rather than a barrier.

CP5 The Council will ensure the long-term regeneration of Golborne/Trellick by requiring development to positively contribute to the regeneration of the area, and resisting development which prejudices long-term regeneration. Proposals which increase footfall that would aid the viability of the market will be supported.

Portobello/ Notting Hill

Portobello/ Nottinghill Place in July 2009 Draft Plan

CV7 As Special District Centres, Portobello Road and Westbourne Grove will both remain internationally known vibrant retail areas. By improving pedestrian links between Portobello Road, Westbourne Grove, All Saints Road and Golborne Road, the area as a whole will be strengthened, while the qualities of the very different individual centres will be maintained.

Portobello Road will remain a jewel in London's shopping crown, a place of world class antiques hunting, of cutting edge fashion, and a place which has not been over run by identikit multiples. The centre will maintain the rich variety of shops with a predominance now so rare in London, of independent retailers offering 'something different'. The existing antiques arcades are a key ingredient of this variety.

Portobello Road's strengths: its international antiques trade and the diversity of the retail offer, including vibrant small shops offering personal service, will continue to be built upon. Its less glamorous role as the provider of the range of shops and services essential to support of the day-to-day needs of its 'village minded' local community is no less important and will be maintained.

Running the length of the Portobello Road, the street market, with its antiques, fashion, crafts, and fruit and vegetables will act as both a key driver to achieve this vision and an opportunity to strengthen the existing close links with the Golborne Road Special Neighbourhood Centre to the north.

Portobello Road is, however, more than a shopping street, it will continue to be the international antiques market, and an inspiration for designers and a seed-bed for

Westbourne Grove will retain its difference from Portobello Road and its position as a specialist shopping destination providing high end fashion retailing.

CP6 The Council will ensure the long term success of Portobello Road, with its antiques and street market, and Notting Hill as unique local and international centres by promoting their retail character and supporting small format retail units, more suitable for independent businesses and antiques arcades, and by improving wayfinding and access.

The Westway

Westway Place in July 2009 Draft Plan	<p>CV8 The Westway Flyover will no longer be an oppressive negative influence, but one which celebrates public art and creativity, using this and the land assets beneath the Flyover. Problems of community safety have been overcome, and improved pedestrian linkages have made the area under the Flyover into something wonderful.</p> <p>CP7 The Council will ensure the negative impacts of the Westway are ameliorated by requiring development to include appropriate measures to improve the quality of the environment.</p>
Latimer	
Latimer Place in July 2009 Draft Plan	<p>CV9 Latimer will have been rebuilt, in a phased way, to a new street pattern. It will be a place that focuses on the provision of high-quality services through excellent</p> <p>CP8 The Council will ensure the long term regeneration of Latimer by requiring development to positively contribute to the regeneration of the area, and resisting development which prejudices long term regeneration opportunities and which undermines the role of the employment zone.</p>
Earls Court	
Earls Court Place in July 2009 Draft Plan	<p>CV 10 By unravelling the one-way system, reducing the traffic flow, and improving the pedestrian environment, the western edge of the Borough will be reintegrated and Earl's Court town centre will be able to blossom, offering an attractive 'urban-village' environment which local residents can enjoy. The function of the town centre will be reinforced by a new good direct connection to the current Exhibition Centre, which should be developed for mixed uses with a significant convention, exhibition or cultural use that is at least a national destination at its heart. Earl's Court site will therefore retain its important function London-wide and will be transformed into a new vibrant urban quarter.</p> <p>The area will continue to offer a wide range of types of residential accommodation and will include community infrastructure to support local life. Streetscape and pedestrian improvements to Cromwell Road, Warwick Road and Earl's Court Road will transform the environment, making it more pleasant for pedestrians and residents and marking the arrival of the A4 in Central London.</p> <p>CP 9 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 and resisting proposals which prejudice the realisation of the full potential of opportunities in the area.</p>
Kensington High Street	
Kensington High Street Place in July 2009 Draft Plan	<p>CV11 Kensington High Street will have redefined its role to ensure that it distinguishes its offer from Westfield, Knightsbridge and King's Road. The centre will have continued its long tradition as Kensington's High Street, serving residents, workers and visitors. It will continue to provide a good range of food and other convenience retailing and remain a destination for fashion and certain niche markets. Ease of pedestrian movement will be central to this success. Re-use of the former Commonwealth Institute for a significant public institution will have attracted increased visitor numbers and developed a further niche retail cluster at the western end of the High Street. The cinema will have been maintained.</p> <p>CP10 The Council will ensure the continued success of the High Street as a high quality shopping street serving residents, workers and visitors by paying close regard to the need to enhance the character of the area, support existing retail niches, attract new trip generating uses and improve access to the centre.</p>
South Kensington	
South Kensington Place in July 2009 Draft Plan	<p>CV12 Prince Albert's vision of a wide range of world-class institutions connecting the science and art of the past, present and future will have been taken forward to reflect how our interpretation of culture is ever richer, embracing more of our everyday lives - entertainment, eating and drinking, and even shopping. South Kensington will continue to develop across this spectrum of cultural activity to remain a local, national and internationally-significant destination.</p>

The spirit of social connectivity, so powerfully expressed in the soon to be completed public realm of Exhibition Road, will be developed throughout South Kensington through innovative public realm proposals, generous public spaces, unique retailing and cultural experiences. All the facilities developed for residents and visitors alike will be connected to create an inspiring, memorable and thoroughly contemporary re-evocation of the original Victorian vision

CP11 The Council will ensure the continued success of South Kensington as a premier public cultural destination, and as a local shopping centre, by securing good quality public open spaces and significantly improving accessibility to cater for the very large number of visitors the area receives, and supporting proposals to uplift the quality of the retail offer, especially proposals likely to favour local and niche markets.

Brompton Cross

Brompton Cross Place in July 2009 Draft Plan

CV13 Brompton Cross will remain a high quality specialist boutique retail centre with international appeal and will have a stronger sense of identity as a place. The centre will be enhanced by development which reflects its high quality character and it will have benefited from improved pedestrian links to South Kensington Underground Station, the Museums, and Knightsbridge. The return of long-term vacant retail units to retail use will have been achieved. The hospitals to the west, which provide health care and medical research of both national and international significance will have been maintained and improved.

CP12 The Council will ensure Brompton Cross has a stronger sense of identity by supporting small format retail units to protect and promote the high quality specialist boutique retail nature of the centre and improve the pedestrian links between South Kensington Underground station and the Museums.

Knightsbridge

Knightsbridge Place in July 2009 Draft Plan

CV14 Knightsbridge will continue to enjoy its role as the Royal Borough's national and international shopping destination and home to some of the most exclusive shopping in London. It will also continue its role as an important residential quarter and a service centre for residents in both Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster.

CP13 The Council will ensure the continued success of Knightsbridge as the Royal Borough's international shopping destination, and as an important residential quarter and service centre for residents, by resisting proposals which are aimed at mass tourism and supporting proposals likely to favour independent and high end retail and to maintain the area's high residential quality of life.

King's Road

Kings Road Place in July 2009 Draft Plan

CV15 The King's Road will not simply be like any other 'successful' high street. It will remain one of London's most iconic and vibrant shopping streets, containing a lively and diverse mix of shops, restaurants, and world-class cultural attractions.

CP14 It will remain a place where one can shop in both independent boutiques and multiples; a place to enjoy, to promenade, a place which meets the day-to-day needs of our residents; and a place to experience some of the best theatre, concert and gallery events that London has to offer.

CV16 Notting Hill Gate

Notting Hill Gate Place in July 2009 Draft Plan

CV16 Notting Hill Gate will be significantly strengthened as a District Shopping Centre, with improved shops and restaurants that reflect the needs of the local catchment. Boutiques and premium-quality retailers will become a feature of the area, as they are in Kensington Church Street and Pembridge Road. The centre will continue to be a major office location.

Notting Hill has a long-standing reputation for arts and culture; Notting Hill Gate will capitalise on this in developing the arts and cultural offer.

The street will become more pedestrian-friendly, with improved crossing facilities, fewer barriers, less street clutter, reduced vehicle impacts and station entrances relocated within buildings. All development will be of the most exceptional design and architectural quality, creating a 'wow factor' that excites and delights residents and visitors. Pedestrian links to Portobello Road Market will also be enhanced through good design, legibility and clear wayfinding.

CP15 The Council will ensure Notting Hill Gate's role as a District Centre is strengthened by supporting high trip generating uses, with some anchor retail and, resisting developments which prejudice the opportunities for wider regeneration of the area and do not deliver a new distinctive identity for Notting Hill Gate.

Fulham Road

Fulham Road Place in July 2009 Draft Plan	<p>CV17 Fulham Road will continue to be a centre providing for the daily needs of local people, while also offering a variety of high quality specialist shopping. The proportion of food and drink uses, together with their hours of operation, will be carefully managed to ensure a complimentary environment with the retail uses and surrounding residential area. The appearance of the centre will be enhanced through improvements to shop fronts. Pedestrian and cycle links to the north and south will be improved. The Council will support the hospital's role in contributing to the centre's vitality.</p> <p>CP16 The Council will ensure the local retail and residential character of Fulham Road is maintained by limiting new food and drink uses.</p>
---	---

Lots Road

Lots Road Place in July 2009 Draft Plan	<p>CV18 The opening of the new secondary school will bring people into the area. By 2028, improvements to the built and natural environment will transform the area into a place people choose to visit. Investigating the designation of a conservation area in the Lots Road area is an important part of this. 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 shops, offices, and social and community facilities including mooring facilities. Better pedestrian links from Lots Road to the World's End shops will help overcome the isolation with the wider townscape of Lots Road and reintegrate World's End. Connectivity to the riverside will be supported by completing the Thames Path and the use of the Cremorne Railway Bridge by pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>CP17 The Council will maintain, protect and enhance the character of the area by supporting better local shopping facilities, social and community uses, small cultural and creative uses and requiring improvements to connectivity and integration within the place, the wider area, and the river.</p>
---	--

Strategic Sites

Kensal Gasworks

Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site in July 2009 Draft Plan	<p>CA1 - The Council allocates development on the site to deliver, in terms of :</p> <p>Land Use Allocation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. upwards of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. 2,500 new dwellings; ii. 10,000m² of new offices; and, iii. 2,000m² of new non-residential floorspace, including social and community and local shopping facilities; b. a Crossrail station, subject to approval by Crossrail Limited; c. the relocation and reprovision of the existing Sainsbury's supermarket in a location which provides a better relationship with Ladbroke Grove; d. a Combined Cooling, Heating and Power (CCHP) plant or similar, of a suitable size to serve the site with the potential to contribute to the heat and energy demand of the wider community as part of a district heat and energy network; e. the provision of on-site waste management facilities to deal with the development's waste arisings from the new uses of the site (including recycling facilities and/or anaerobic digestion);
--	---

Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site in July 2009 Draft Plan	<p>Principles</p> <p>f. a high-density development with a high environmental standard in terms of construction, building materials, waste management and energy usage/retention and low levels of car dependency and ownership;</p> <p>g. improved infrastructure including new pedestrian and cycling links, new roads which connect the site into its surrounding context and other public transport links, including improved connections over both the railway lines and the canal;</p> <p>h. a usable, vibrant and responsive public realm around a mixed-use canalside which as well as residential, attracts leisure, education and business uses;</p> <p>i. the improvement and relocation of the facilities currently provided by Canalside House and the Boathouse Centre on-site if relocation of these facilities is required to achieve a comprehensive redevelopment along the canalside and Ladbroke Grove;</p> <p>j. the retention of the area west of the gas holders for the provision of electricity infrastructure. Part of this site may also be required for a gas pressure reduction station, replacing the gas holders. Any buildings must be of a high architectural standard and in keeping with the overall redevelopment of the site;</p> <p>k. the ongoing access to the memorial site of the victims of the Paddington rail disaster through a redevelopment which will maintain its dignity;</p>
Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site in July 2009 Draft Plan	<p>Infrastructure and planning obligations</p> <p>l. a Crossrail station (subject to agreement in principle and detail with Crossrail Limited);</p> <p>m. social and community uses (including health, education and police);</p> <p>n. affordable housing;</p> <p>o. construction and maintenance of bridges over the canal and railway;</p> <p>p. improvements to Little Wormwood Scrubs and Kensal Green Cemetery (subject to access through the cemetery and linking bridge over the canal);</p> <p>q. improved transport infrastructure including better bus links and new roads;</p> <p>r. landscaping and amenity improvements to the Grand Union Canal;</p> <p>s. Other contributions as set out in the Planning Obligations SPD and the site specific SPD</p>
Wornington Green	
Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy	a minimum of 538 affordable dwelling units;
Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy	a minimum of 150 private dwellings;
Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy	the replacement of an improved Athlone Gardens, measuring 9,186m ² (GEA);(including the area of the existing Ball Court)
Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy New	<p>the refurbishment or replacement of an improved Venture Centre and scope for its enlargement, including the provision of the existing community and leisure facilities currently provided;</p> <p>A1 to A5 Uses in the order of approximately 2,000m², providing these animate the street frontage, extend the retail offer along Portobello Road and help reconnect the link from Portobello Road and/or Wornington Road to Ladbroke Grove with no one unit being over 400m²·</p>
Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy	a Combined Cooling, Heating and Power (CCHP) plant or similar, of a suitable size to serve the site with the potential to contribute to the heat and energy demand of the wider community as part of a district heat and energy network;
Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy	replacement of the storage used by market traders in Munro Mews;
Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy (site potential)	an integrated community, where current tenants who want to remain at Wornington Green will be guaranteed a new home on the new development and the vast majority of residents should only have to move once;

Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy (site potential)	a phasing scheme to minimise disruption to residents and adjoining neighbours during the construction period;
Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy (site potential)	a good quality open space at least half the size of Athlone Gardens (4,593m ²) must be available for public use throughout the construction period;
New	the reconnection of Portobello Road and Wornington Road to Ladbroke Grove and the re-establishment of the traditional street pattern in the area;
Chapter 21 of the Draft Core Strategy (S106)	Infrastructure and Planning Obligations including affordable housing; a site management plan; the reinstatement of an improved Athlone Gardens, Venture Centre and adventure playground; play space and play equipment; healthcare facilities; education facilities; construction training contribution; Safer Neighbourhood Police base, should one be required; mitigation for any negative transport impacts; improvements to public transport arising from the development, including improvements to the bus infrastructure; walking, cycling and public realm improvements; arrangements for on-street residents' permit-free parking; sustainable development measures set out in the Wornington Green Supplementary Planning Document; public art; and other contributions identified in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and site specific Supplementary Planning Document.

North Kensington Sports Centre

Chapter 23 of the Draft Plan (Proposed Allocation)	a new academy with an area no less than 6,000m ² , including its own sports facilities with external sports pitches;
Chapter 23 of the Draft Plan (Proposed Allocation)	a refurbished or relocated sports centre on site, with equivalent sports facilities to the existing centre, including a swimming pool and other facilities identified through a demand assessment, built in a way that is flexible for the future;
Chapter 23 of the Draft Plan (Proposed Allocation)	open space in the form of external sports facilities for the school, which should be shared with the sports centre;
Chapter 23 of the Draft Plan (Proposed Allocation)	a Combined Cooling, Heating and Power (CCHP) plant or similar, of a suitable size to serve the site with the potential to contribute to the heat and energy demand of the wider community as part of a district heat and energy network;
Chapter 23 of the Draft Plan (Proposed Allocation)	green turf, planting and landscaping at the external sports facilities to contribute to the visual amenity of the surrounding properties;
Chapter 23 of the Draft Plan (Proposed Allocation)	improvements to the legibility and permeability of the street network in the area, through a new road connecting Grenfell Road and Lancaster Road;
New	improved public transport infrastructure;
New	other contribution's as identified in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and site specific Supplementary Planning Document.

Land adjoining Trellic

Land adjoining Trellic, Strategic Site of Draft	Land use allocation:
---	----------------------

Strategic Site of Draft
Core Strategy

- a. a minimum of 60 residential units to fund regeneration;
 - b. improvements to social and community facilities and housing;
- Principles:
- c. the restoration of the Grade II* listed Trellick Tower;
- Infrastructure and Planning Obligations:
- d. additional social and community uses, including health provision to be included as part of any redevelopment;
 - e. other contributions may be required, as identified in the Planning Obligations and the Site Specific Supplementary Planning Documents.
- It would be possible to establish a trust fund to ensure that the profits from redevelopment are reinvested in the restoration of Trellick Tower and/or other social, community and regeneration benefits.

Former Commonwealth Institute

Former
Commonwealth
Institute, Strategic Site
of Draft Core Strategy

- Land use allocation:
- a. 9,300 m² (net) of exhibition or assembly and leisure floorspace within the 'tent' building;
 - b. the re-use of the Commonwealth Institute as a high trip-generating public institutional use;
- Principles:
- c. the preservation of the 'tent' building now and in the future;
 - d. include the creation of an active public space on High Street Kensington frontage;
 - e. the development should positively relate the 'tent' to Kensington High Street, whilst integrating with and enhancing the parkland setting;
- Infrastructure and Planning Obligations:
- f. other contributions as identified in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and site specific Supplementary Planning Document.

Warwick Road

Warwick Road,
Strategic Site of Draft
Core Strategy

- The Council allocates development on the site to deliver, in terms of:-
- Land use allocation:
- a. 1,700 total combined residential units across all 5 sites, with a minimum of:
 - i. 500 residential units on the **Charles House** site;
 - ii. 250 residential units on the **Former Territorial Army** site;
 - iii. a minimum of 150 residential units on the **Empress Telephone Exchange** site;

- iv. a minimum of 450 residential units on the **Homebase** site;
 - v. a minimum of 350 residential units on the **100 West Cromwell Road** site;
 - b. On the northern four sites:
 - i. a primary school on-site, and
 - ii. on-site public open space, including outdoor play space;
 - c. On the 100 West Cromwell Road site leisure, social and community uses (Class D1), provision of car parking and open amenity space;
- Principles:
- e. sufficient non-residential uses on the northern four sites to provide active frontages to the ground floor of Warwick Road;
 - f. four northern sites to be developed to a single masterplan;
- Infrastructure and Planning Obligations:
- g. affordable housing as part of residential development on all the sites to ensure a mixed and balanced community;
 - h. social and community facilities;
 - i. community sports hall;
 - j. health facilities;
 - k. crèche and education facilities;
 - l. landscape improvements to the West Cromwell Road in connection with 100 West Cromwell Road site;
 - m. streetscape improvements to Warwick Road in connection to all development sites;
 - n. pedestrian and cycle improvements;
 - o. floorspace for Safer Neighbourhoods unit;
 - p. a contribution to facilitate the unravelling of the Earl's Court One-Way system;
 - q. other contributions as identified in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and site specific Supplementary Planning Documents.

Earl's Court Strategic
Site of Draft Core
Strategy

The Council allocates development on the site to deliver, in terms of:-

Land use allocation:

a minimum of 500 homes within the Royal Borough;

a minimum of 10,000m² (108,000 ft²) of office floor space;

small scale retail and associated uses (within the A Classes of the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended)) to serve the day-to-day needs of the new development;

a cultural facility to retain Earl's Court long-standing role as an important cultural destination within the locus of Earl's Court;

on-site waste management facilities to handle waste arising from the new uses of the site (including recycling facilities and/or anaerobic digestion);

low or carbon neutral developments and a Combined Cooling, Heating and Power (CCHP) plant or similar, of a suitable size to serve the site with the potential to contribute to the heat and energy demand of the wider community as part of a district heat and energy network;

Principles:

a new urban quarter which links well with its surroundings, especially to the west and east;

a design of the on-site road pattern and connections which significantly improve traffic 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 facilitating the unravelling of the Earl's Court One Way System;

inclusion of an open urban square to Warwick Road frontage together with associated social and community uses;

Infrastructure and Planning Obligations:

community and health facilities;

additional new public open space, including considering opportunities to create biodiversity;

securing highway contributions including measures to facilitate the unravelling of the Earl's Court One-Way system;

improvements to tube and rail access, including accessibility from the West London Line to the underground network;

improved pedestrian links from the site and the surrounding area, to public transport facilities;

affordable housing as part of residential requirement;

education facilities;

other contributions as identified in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and site specific Supplementary Planning Document.