



Schedule of Representations and Officer Response

for the Submission Core Strategy
Development Plan Document

March 2010

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Mr Robin Meltzer	K&C Liberal Democrats			Consultation Information		No	Justified	PSubCS30	<p>FLAWED AND INCOMPLETE CONSULTATION</p> <p>We are objecting to the Core Strategy on the basis that it fails the soundness test of whether the plan is 'justified'.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate guidance on Local Development Frameworks states that to be 'justified', "a DPD needs to be founded on a robust and credible evidence base involving evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area."</p> <p>The guidance asks the following question:</p> <p>"Has the consultation process allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties?"</p> <p>The answer, for the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea, must be no. It cannot be said to have held proper and imaginative consultation that would allow this plan to be justified.</p> <p>Firstly, a specific case study, then some generalities:</p> <p>In the second draft of the Core Strategy, the Council slipped into the document an entirely new plan to redevelop Portobello Court, a housing estate owned by the Council of some 160 dwellings. The plan identified the estate as one where "redevelopment" would see shops and market housing built on the site as part of "estate renewal" and "retail need".</p> <p>When this draft was published, not one resident in Portobello Court had been consulted on these plans using any method whatsoever, nor had the estate's own Residents Association been informed or notified about it. The policy had not been present in the first draft of the Core Strategy and it was not raised in any of the consultation sessions held between the first and second drafts. It simply appeared in the second draft, based on no public consultation whatsoever.</p> <p>In the consultation between the second and third drafts of the Core Strategy, residents attending the first of two Portobello 'Places' consultations were expressly told by a member of the Cabinet that the discussion was not allowed to incorporate the (by then published) plans for Portobello Court. This was met with outrage but the rule was enforced. I was there myself and saw this happen and there are many other witnesses who will attest to this, including one Council Officer who demurred saying: "I know we're not supposed to talk about Portobello Court but the residents on my table want to talk about it."</p> <p>The Liberal Democrats and others protested in the local press and in our own literature about the proposed redevelopment of the estate. Residents demanded meetings with the Council leadership and made their feelings known. Subsequently, the plan was quietly dropped by the Council (despite thousands of pounds being spent on a 'retail needs' survey of the area). Had community activists not drawn attention to the flagrant disregard for the future of the homes of the people concerned, this plan could have made its way into the third and penultimate version of the Core Strategy with no consultation having occurred.</p> <p>Other examples of lack of consultation on the Core Strategy abound. The only residents consulted by post or email were i) a select group of (usually 'establishment') associations and ii)</p>		<p>The Council is disheartened by the comments made.</p> <p>Over the course of the past three years, the Council has endeavoured to reach out to as many members of the public as possible.</p> <p>As well as insuring compliance with Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, the Council has done its utmost to engage other groups.</p> <p>During the consultation of Towards Preferred Options, the Council, ran a consultation event for children and young adults and during this consultation, the Council invited local shops and businesses (often overlooked by local authorities) to attend consultation events.</p> <p>Consultation for both this document and previous iterations was made available in Libraries, in all Council offices and online. Advertisement was distributed both in the Council's newspaper, via the LDF newsletter and on posters in prominent community buildings.</p> <p>The Council supports the idea that a stall at Portobello Market may have been a good idea. However, two consultation events (one for businesses and traders, which as noted by the consultee was disrupted) and one for residents were held to help manage the demand for people to comment.</p> <p>The consultee seems to imply that the Council did not want to contact members of the public (specifically with reference to Portobello and Portobello Court) yet then contradicts himself by stating that he and others attended a consultation event. Following this consultation, it was evident that there was no public support for the planned redevelopment and this proposed was withdrawn from the document. This is totally unconnected to the borough-wide Retail Needs Assessment, which is a necessary document forming a key part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council strongly refutes the allegation that officers we merely using consultation as a tick-box exercise. As a Council and indeed as a department we are strongly committed to engaging and interacting with the general public. As has been said at LDF consultation events, public participation is an exercise in democracy, one we are lucky enough to share. The Council takes its role in providing for residents very seriously and comments received are addressed individually in consultation reports. The form of the document has changed dramatically since Issues and Options and many directions have altered specifically following public comment</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>individuals who had already expressed an interest in planning policy.</p> <p>As an example of a lack of notification, the Council failed to put up a notice about the Core Strategy on any of the many notice boards at the Kensington Sports Centre. They did not even inform the reception staff. All this despite the fact that this site features very heavily in the Council's regeneration plans for North Kensington and one could reasonably expect residents who use these public facilities to take an interest in its future.</p> <p>The document is entitled "Core Strategy with a focus on North Kensington", yet no attempt was made to reach out to residents beyond the Council's own very limited mailing list of interested parties occurred in North Kensington. The Council could very easily have taken a stall in Portobello and Golborne markets on a Friday when the footfall is overwhelmingly local rather than tourist.</p> <p>I have never seen so much as one notice in a public place saying "have your say". The document was displayed (though usually not prominently) in the libraries, but footfall there is low for adults.</p> <p>The Council did put something in their own patchily distributed newspaper.</p> <p>Consultation meeting were rigidly controlled and allowed no real discussion. During many (if not all) of the consultation sessions following the first draft, the document in question was not on display, nor available for people to read. Furthermore, no questions relating to specific parts of the document were asked by Officers whatsoever. Instead, consultees (who only knew about the session if they were on the Council's mailing list of previously interested parties, as discussed above) were asked to draw things on maps and to "brainstorm" about their area. This was consultation for children, not for engaged members of the community.</p> <p>The majority of the officers were going through the motions so that they could say they had done it, not to gather ideas and responses. This was tick-box consultation.</p> <p>I would, however, like to end my comments about consultation on one positive note. The final set of consultation meetings about the 'Places' - though subject to the usual problem of attendance only by known interested parties - did result in some noticeable changes to the wording of those sections. In particular, the wording of the Portobello 'place' (the only 'place' which required two sessions because residents were so angry with the Council during the original session) is unrecognisable to the draft originally presented to residents and the improvements are many. This was evidence of the power of residents persuading the Council how wrong they had been originally about their vision for this 'place'. This late effort at listening contrasts starkly with the rest of the process.</p>			
Mr Graham King	Westminster Council			Consultation Information				PSubCS35	I also would like to take this opportunity to remind you that our Core Strategy Publication Draft is a consultation now, and is available on our website at www.westminster.gov.uk /ldf .		Comments are noted.	No changes are recommended.
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services			Consultation Information	Yes	Yes		PSubCS125	<p>General Comments</p> <p>It is important to consider the capacity of water and sewerage infrastructure provision for new development proposals and this is highlighted by paragraph 4.9 of the new PPS12, which states that in preparing Local Development Documents:</p>		Noted. We acknowledge the importance of water and sewerage infrastructure provision for new development proposals. This comment denotes no objections. The Council considers that it has complied with the consultation requirements of Thames Water.	No changes required.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>"LPAs should ensure that delivery of housing & other strategic and regional requirements is not compromised by unrealistic expectations about the future availability of infrastructure, transportation and resources. Annex B sets out further guidance on resources, utilities and infrastructure provision."</p> <p>Paragraphs B3 to B8 of PPS12 also place specific emphasis on the need to take account of infrastructure such as sewerage early on in preparing Development Framework Documents. Paragraph B3 in particular states: "The provision of infrastructure is important in all major new developments. The capacity of existing infrastructure and the need for additional facilities should be taken into account in the preparation of all local development documents."</p> <p>Regulation 25 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004 relates to pre-submission consultation. It states that LPAs must consult " specific consultation bodies" prior to the publication of a first draft Development Plan Document (DPD). The interpretation in Part 1 of the Regulations states that sewerage and water undertakers constitute "specific consultation bodies".</p> <p>Consultation with Thames Water</p> <p>When carrying out the necessary early consultations with Thames Water regarding the capacity of water and sewerage systems, in accordance with the new Regulations, adequate time should be allowed to consider development options and proposals so that an informed response can be formulated. It is not always possible to provide detailed responses within a matter of weeks; for example, the modelling of water and sewerage infrastructure systems will be important to many consultation responses and this can take a long time to carry out (e.g. modelling of sewerage systems can be dependent on waiting for storm periods when the sewers are at peak flows).</p> <p>We also have to consult with the Environment Agency to obtain a clear picture as to possible water abstraction and waste water discharge consent limits prior to undertaking modeling from a treatment perspective. This process itself can take a considerable period of time, especially if it depends on the EA undertaking its own evaluation exercise. Therefore, realistic consultation periods with water and sewerage undertakers will need to be taken account of in the preparation of the LDDs.</p>		Furthermore, there is a constant dialogue with Thames Water that will continue through the planning application stages. No changes required.	
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority			Consultation Information		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS213	<p>Kensal Plan (Diagram O5)</p> <p>London Plan Policy cross ref. 3C.4 Draft London Plan: 6.2</p> <p>Has this matter been raised previously? No (Only general point raised)</p> <p>Although the specific issue has not previously been raised TfL note safeguarded for Crossrail works. See also omission of policy on lan point about safeguarding and has been raised previously.</p>		<p>The diagram as drawn is thematic and deliberately does not show a specific route. It is noted that at present, the land may cross into safeguarded land but is unlikely to come forward without a Crossrail station. The purpose of this route would be to connect the enlarged Kensal site with neighbouring Hammersmith and Fulham.</p> <p>The COuncil's position is such that if Crossrail can be delivered</p>	No change
Government Office for London	Government Office for London			Consultation Information				PSubCS259	<p>Under the test of soundness as set out in PPS12, please note the following comments.</p> <p>i. Justified</p> <p>Founded on a robust and credible evidence base</p> <p>7. It is essential that LDF documents are based on a robust and</p>		Noted. Comments considered in specific sections.	Amendments are made throughout document as appropriate.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>credible evidence base. PPS12 states that ' <i>evidence gathered should be proportionate to the job being undertaken by the plan, relevant to the place in question and as up-to-date as practical having regard to what may have changed since the evidence was collected</i> ' (PPS12, para 4.37, p.15). It is important that there are clear links between the evidence base and policy.</p> <p>8. There are references to the evidence base across the document, usually via footnotes. GOL believes that the most critical elements of this evidence have largely been updated in recent years (2008/9). This includes, for example: the Employment Land Review Update, the Retail Needs Assessment, the Affordable Housing Viability Study and the SHMA (as referenced in Chapter 43). However, we have some questions about specific aspects of the evidence base in particular in relation to housing and retail (see paras 20-27).</p> <p>The most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives</p> <p>9. Earlier stages of the plan preparation process set out the key issues and options for development in the Borough. These were developed within the overall strategy which has the key aim of regenerating the north of the Borough (and included high, medium and low growth options for North Kensington). The Core Strategy policies have been worked up from these options following extensive consultation. In our view, the Council has a clear audit trail of how the document has been shaped.</p>			
Mr Ken Hullock	Brent Council			Consultation Information	Yes	Yes		PSubCS280	<p>The London Borough of Brent puts forward the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, we welcome Kensington and Chelsea's proposed draft strategy for North Kensington regeneration area as it broadly aligns with Brent's strategic objectives • In particular, we support the vision for the creation of a Crossrail station in the Kensal area, as it would be beneficial to Brent as well as other areas outside the K&C administrative boundary. • As such the proposed approach to improving connectivity in the Kensal area is welcomed as it will bring benefits to Brent residents and businesses. In particular to increase pedestrian connectivity between the Gas Works site through Kensal Green Cemetery and to Kensal Green Station by improvements to pedestrian access. • In terms of decentralised energy systems, we welcome any discussions about shared use of such systems to form networks 		Comments noted. The Council is committed to work with its neighbours and are encouraged by these comments.	Noted
Metropolitan Police	Metropolitan Police	C G M S		Consultation Information	Yes	Yes		PSubCS348	<p>Context to Representations</p> <p>The Metropolitan Police Service provide a vital community service to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and policing is recognised within the 2008 London Plan and the emerging London Plan as being an integral part of social infrastructure. Our previous representations have largely been appropriately addressed by the LPA and this is reflected in the Proposed Submission Core Strategy. The MPA therefore welcome the alterations to the document but some minor changes are proposed in order to ensure that the adopted Core Strategy is 'sound' and accurately reflects the most currentMPAestate strategy.</p>		Noted with thanks.	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9		Consultation Information		No	Effective	PSubCS353	<p>p10 Key Diagram</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p> <p>There are a number of factors supporting a future town centre on the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the strategic site allocation for Earls Court (with Capital & Counties' proposed changes) confirms the site as a suitable location for mixed use development cultural, leisure, hotel office and retail uses. These are all town centre uses in terms of PPS6 and draft PPS4 - the strategy refers to the site being able to meet existing retail deficiencies in the area (para 3.3.10) - the Council in its response to Capital & Counties' earlier representations recognises that new development on the site will generate additional demand for town centre uses - the Vision anticipates a cultural destination on the site - the Opportunity Area status of the site means it is a focus for high density mixed used development. The draft London Plan refers to the site having a strategic role - initial assessment work undertaken by Capital & Counties supports up to approx 720,000 sqm of town centre uses (office, retail, hotel, destination) on the Regeneration Area although the proposed quantum will be considered in greater detail as part of the ongoing assessment work including the transport study being carried out for the area and the forthcoming Planning Framework. <p>The location of a new centre within the Regeneration Area will be determined through the Masterplan process and it may potentially be concentrated more within the LBHF part of the Regeneration Area.</p> <p>The Council's response to Capital & Counties' earlier representations advises that designating a new centre would be premature and that a new centre could only be designated if the Council is satisfied it would not have a detrimental impact on existing centres. It also is concerned to avoid an indication that the Council is giving carte blanche for retail uses on the site.</p> <p>However, it is clear that in order to create a sustainable mixed use new community, a new town centre designation will be required. Reference to an "appropriate" centre together with the additional text in the proposed change makes it clear that the designation is subject to further assessment to ensure it is "appropriate". The Council in its response suggests that policy CF1 provides scope to permit out of centre retail development. However, the proposed designation is relevant as a Masterplan for the Regeneration Area will include town centre uses other than retail. The Council recognises that town centres are about more than just shopping, providing important places where people live, work and visit for leisure activities (para 31.3.21). This is reflected in the Strategic Site allocation and inherent in promoting new destination cultural facilities.</p>		<p>The Council does not dispute that an appropriate range of convenience shopping facilities will be required in the Earl's Court site. As discussed above, a reference is added (if supported by the inspector) to the Council's support for a new neighbourhood centre in the area. This reference is in both policy CF1 and the associated supporting text. However, as the consultee duly notes, this neighbourhood centre may be in the neighbouring borough. The Council therefore supports the provision of a new centre, rather than "requires its establishment".</p> <p>The title Earl's Court and West Kensington Regeneration Area is the name given by developers and has not been formally agreed by the Council. As such, the site will remain the "Earl's Court wider site" until further notice.</p>	<p>The Council would be supportive, if so minded by the Inspector, to illustrate a possible new neighbourhood centre within the Earl's Court Opportunity Area on the 'Fostering Vitality' map.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>The proposed change will comply with the "town centre first" approach advocated in para 31.2.1 and advice in PPS6 that boroughs should adopt a positive and proactive approach to planning for the future of centres.</p> <p>The Earl's Court Wider Site should be renamed as Earls Court Regeneration Area to be consistent with the terminology proposed by Capital & Counties in its representations to LBHF Core Strategy and the draft Replacement London Plan.</p> <p>The changes will provide clarity, making the strategy effective and sound.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Include notation on the Diagram referring to an "Appropriate New Centre" on the Earls Court Wider Site</p> <p>Re-name the Earls Court Wider Site as Earls Court Regeneration Area.</p> <p>See map extract attached.</p>			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9		Consultation Information		No	Effective	PSubCS355	<p>p13, 14 What we will do to Enhance the Reputation of our National and International Destinations</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The proposed changes are needed to ensure the text is consistent with chapters 10 and 26, reflecting the potential for the site allocations to realise the strategic vision. The figure for new housing at Warwick Road is amended to be consistent with the allocation specified in para 10.4.2. The revisions make the policy effective and sound.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Page 13</p> <p>Earl's Court will offer an attractive 'urban-village' environment once improvements are made to the one way system [delete is unravelled] and stronger links will be created to the Earl's Court Regeneration Area [delete site] which will remain an important [delete exhibition] or conference cultural venue that will be at least a destination, with at least 1,000 500 new homes in the Borough, and many more in neighbouring Hammersmith and Fulham. Over 1000 1,700 more homes will be built at Warwick Road. Streetscape and pedestrian improvements to the Cromwell Road will transform the environment. We have allocated sites at Warwick Road and the Exhibition Centre to deliver these plans.</p> <p>Page 14</p> <p>Specifically, by 2028:</p> <p>we will have fostered vitality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Earl's Court will remain the location for cultural/ destination uses or attractions [delete: a large convention centre or exhibition function;] Significant office development will have been developed 		<p>It remains the ambition of the Council to maintain the "Earl's Court brand" and as such, the retention of an international convention centre or national cultural destination is considered to be crucial to the redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>The use of "unravelling" will be removed to allow for consistency with the wording in Policy CT1.</p>	Reword "unravelling"

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									in the Earls Court Regeneration Area but small businesses will continue to be the backbone of the employment economy of the Borough;			
Mr Tony Redpath	Policy and Partnerships Unit (PPU) (RBKC)			Consultation Information				PSubCS452	General comment on Keeping Life Local 30.4 Re Post Offices - the reference to the "service improvement department" would be more accurate if it said "economic development team". I know that opportunities to amend the strategy are now limited, but as and when one arises perhaps this change could be made.		Noted and Agree. This text will be changed in line with the comment so as to provide a more accurate corporate action.	Recommend change to the text
Barclays Bank Plc	Barclays Bank Plc	Shireconsulting		Consultation Information	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS480	Points Arising from the Consultation Documents As the Bank also pointed out in its representations regarding the pre-submission draft, the current document remains overly long and does not provide a ready source of information for applicants to use when appraising what will be relevant to a development control decision. Attention is drawn to the Government policy in PPS12, specifically concerning Core Strategies, where it is stated at paragraph 4.1 that the document should focus " <i>on the key issues to be addressed</i> ". Paragraph 4.5 of PPS12 continues " <i>it is essential that the core strategy makes clear spatial choices about where development should go in broad terms.....it also means that decisions on planning applications can be given a clear steer immediately</i> ". It is highly questionable that a document which amounts to 457 pages (an additional 106 pages to the pre-submission draft) would conform to this advice. The Core Strategy should be succinct and sharply focussed upon delivery and necessary infrastructure relating to the Borough itself, but the strategic elements of the draft plan are mostly dealt with in a superficial manner, whereas the rest of the draft plan has a tendency to become overly concerned with minor detail that would be best dealt with under area specific documents. It must also be remembered that the London-wide level is already covered by the Mayor's Spatial Development Strategy ("The London Plan") a lengthy document in itself and so much of the strategic work has been done and does not need to be repeated.		The Council's Core Strategy is considered to contain all the information required to both inform the nature of development within the Borough till 2028, and to provide the necessary detailed development management policies to implement the higher level core policies	No change.
Ms Claire McAlister	British Waterways		1.2.8	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS471	As a key Stakeholder for Kensal Canalside, British Waterways wish to be involved in any future proposals for this area		The comments are noted.	No changes are recommended.
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		2.2.1	Paragraph	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS246	Para 2.2.1. Para 35.3.1 Policy C 1 Policy CH 1, CH 2 Policy CH 3 Para vi Policy CT 1 Para b HOUSING, ADDED POPULATION, DENSITY AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES The Core Strategy, taking its lead from the GLA and the London Plan, envisages some 6,000 new dwellings over a decade. (Population is forecast to rise by 20,000.) This housing expansion will occupy much of the developable land in the Borough and significantly increase the overall density of the densest local authority in Britain. But many of the ancillary social, medical and commercial services on which residents rely are already over-subscribed, have little of no room in which to expand and are faced by prohibitive K&C land		The Core Strategy is explicit in stating that providing new and improved social infrastructure is essential, to the extent that a whole policy (CK1) has been devised to counter underprovision. The expansion of RBKC and London as a whole is unavoidable. The GLA ask that the borough's address the housing demand on a borough-level. As Kensington, is one of the most desirable borough's in the world to both visit and live and balancing this is a difficult task. The increased population will naturally lead to an increase in traffic but this will be managed by encouraging developers and new residents alike to seek alternative means of transportation. Both these matters are discussed further in Keeping Life Local and Better Transport Choices	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>values if they want to expand.</p> <p>If the Inspector was to talk to residents about this he would find them speaking of surgeries with waiting lists, standing room only on buses, long queues at post offices, lack of on-street visitor parking space, tiny flats and inhuman cramming on the Underground. These are, of course, the views of middle-income residents, not the rich. (But as Figure 8.3 shows, the Borough has a high proportion of residents with incomes of £35,000 and below.)</p> <p>The Society does not suggest that delivering additional houses on what are currently non-housing sites would be ineffective in meeting housing demand. The issue is the relationship between that new housing (and additional population) and the capacity of a wide range of social and physical facilities. There is insufficient evidence on the impact of this increase in population on social and community services. The question never seems to be addressed. It is assumed that higher population density is justified without exploring its side-effects.</p> <p>Policy C1 does, of course, require additional social facilities to be financed via S.106 Agreements. But there is no assessment of the scope for expanding the supply of the Borough's already overstretched infrastructure of public transport and roads, surgeries and post offices, playing fields and parks.</p> <p>How, for instance, will the construction of new flats on the site of the Earl's Court Exhibition solve the problems of acute congestion (due both to District/Circle/Piccadilly line interchanging passengers and heavy local demand) at Earl's Court Underground Station?</p> <p>How, furthermore, does the Plan reconcile all the proposed new residents with Policy CT1 (b). 'Ensure that development will not result in any material increase in traffic</p> <p>congestion.....' ? Additional residents will lead to additional servicing vehicles ranging from refuse collection to plumbers, parcels delivery, computer technicians, lift engineers and building contractors. Additional residents will also generate additional business and family visitors. Even if residential development is 'permit free' it will still contribute to traffic.</p> <p>Increasing the Borough's population will put its social and community infrastructure under even greater pressure. This problem is not assessed. No evidence is advanced to justify the addition of 20,000 residents. The Society considers that the Plan is unsound.</p> <p>The plan needs either to scale down provision for increased population or show how the supply of social and community infrastructure should be expanded - or a mix of the two.</p>			
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		2.2.11	Paragraph	No	No	Justified	PSubCS307	<p>We consider that the chapter does not fully identify the key health conditions and issues facing the royal borough and the spatial distribution of these conditions which manifests itself in significant health inequalities. Although the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment is referred to in the Evidence Base (Chapter 43), para 2.2.11 contains only a limited amount of information and analysis. It points to significant health inequalities, but provides no further details on specific health conditions and causes.</p> <p>Map 4.1 is helpful, but we suggest that a map of the health deprivation and disability domain from the Index of Deprivation 2007 (Map 9.5 from 'A Picture of our Community') is included. This could be mapped against the broad locations for significant</p>		<p>PPS12 seeks to ensure Core Strategies do not needlessly detail reasoned justification (RJ) which exists within its evidence base. The Council is fully aware of the importance of addressing the local health concerns and the role in which the Core Strategy can help. However, it is considered that within the main body of a high level strategic planning document, this should remain implicit so as to keep the RJ as brief (yet effective) as possible. The Health Impact Assessment takes each policy and analyses them against the likely health outputs. This is considered the most appropriate location in which to focus on health within the suite of LDF documents.</p>	<p>Amend document to include Map 9.5 from A Picture of Our Community</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									new housing shown on the Quantum of Development map on page 44. This is likely to show a strong spatial relationship between the deprived areas and the housing growth locations of North Kensington and Earl's Court.		It should be noted that the NHS Kensington and Chelsea, who monitor local health have made no representation on the Core Strategy following a successful series of meetings examining. The suggestion regarding Map 9.5 form A Picture of Our Community is noted and will be added to the document.	
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		2.2.12	Paragraph	No	No	Justified	PSubCS308	Para 2.1.12 refers to 85% of the borough being within 10 minutes walk of a GP. It should recognise that there inequalities in access to healthcare and some areas of the borough may be 'under-doctored' such as Earl's Court.		By the fact that 85% of GPs are in accessible locations. The implication is clear that the remaining 15% is less well served. Adding this would be totally unnecessary. Adding the example of Earl's Court, whilst accurate will detract from the other areas in the borough where this is considered to be an issue.	No change
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		2.2.21	Paragraph	No	No	Justified	PSubCS309	The section includes information on possible determinants or influences on health. Para 2.2.21 refers to walking and cycling 'above the national average'. This statement needs to be clarified		Noted. The Council acknowledge that this statement is ambiguous and will replace this with a more quantifiable response and by identifying the reference. This will add further clarity as identified by the consultee.	Amend text
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		2.2.30	Paragraph	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS455	Paragraph 2.2.30 of the Strategy identifies that demand for private sector housing in the Borough is insatiable, and given the relatively little development land available, can never be met. At a strategic level the London Plan identifies that there is an acute shortage of housing (paragraph 3.7). Policy 3A.1 therefore sets minimum targets at a borough level and states that the Mayor will and Boroughs should promote policies that seek to achieve and exceed this target. As land is a scarce resource, policies within the London Plan also seek to make the most efficient use of land and to maximise intensity of use (Policy 3A.3).		The policy allows for the delivery of the existing target, as per the London Plan, while acknowledging the emerging changes, which will bring about a higher annual target. The Housing Trajectory has been updated to roll forward the known targets, and is monitored annually. This also moves the trajectory to cover the full plan period, to 2028. The revised target takes account of the most up-to-date information contained within the SHLAA, and it is not considered that reference to this renders the policy inconsistent with national policy. It should also be noted that the requirement is to exceed the spatial strategy targets, which, if taken at the 350 dwelling target from table 3.1, the new 600 target will certainly achieve. The Draft replacement London Plan policy 3.3 is, in the opinion of the Royal Borough, seeking to ensure boroughs do not attempt to introduce lower housing targets. The 600 target is based on what is known at present, from the SHLAA, which is likely to be translated into London Plan policy. This would not be included then if it were not taken forward as part of the London Plan. Table 7.1 of the SHLAA is only for 2011/12 to 2020/21. It is for boroughs to assess whether their key housing sites are able to provide for at least the first 10 years of housing supply, taking into account robust evidence of any anticipated contribution from small sites, NSC and long-term vacants returning to use, in light of the above. Boroughs in assessing their land supply may wish to consider releasing information on 'potential' housing sites, if it is not possible to identify sufficient supply from their approved or allocated housing sites to meet their London Plan target	No change.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		2.2.40	Paragraph	No	No	Justified	PSubCS310	Para 2.2.40 and the map of open space accessibility suggests that there are areas lacking in open space and play space, but these areas are not identified.		Naming does not add to the clarity of the document. The purpose of the map is to allow the reader to see where such areas exist.	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		2.2.41	Paragraph	No	No	Justified	PSubCS311	Map 1.4 and para 2.2.41 highlight air quality as a problem, particularly 'canyons' of poor air quality along transport routes. There may be strong correlation between high levels of respiratory disease in these areas.		This correlation is understood and is examined further within the Air Quality SPD which forms part of the LDF's suite of documents.	No change
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		2.3.3	Paragraph	No	No	Justified	PSubCS312	Para 2.3.3 refers to differences between the north and the rest of borough in terms of deprivation and health inequalities as a 'broad spatial pattern'. However, this is not translated into a strategic issue for the core strategy and although para 2.3.19 refers to North Kensington having a 'unique set of issues that require an integrated approach to its regeneration' these issues are not mentioned or explored further. Furthermore, there is no objective which mentions regeneration in north Kensington.		<p>Providing a strategic approach to the borough as a whole, whilst highlighting the areas of need in North Kensington is the key strategic vision of the document as a whole. Places have been split so as to focus on areas of regeneration in the north (such as Wornington and Kensal) and split them from areas of commercial and residential success such as Knightsbridge and Kings Road.</p> <p>As such all objectives in the document as a whole are centred around the principle of regeneration. By delivering an integrated approach, in other words, to apply all Strategic Objectives, one will stimulate regeneration.</p> <p>Regeneration is central to the document. It is for this reason that the borough is promoting a Crossrail station in Kensal, adding and improving to the residential housing stock and community facilities in Wornington, developing a new community Academy in Latimer, turning Earls Court into one of London's prime development opportunities and making a failing retail centre in Notting Hill Gate into a thriving community and shopping centre.</p>	No change
Mr Clive Wilson	Norland Conservation Society		3.3.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS221	In our view, the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.3, and the results of the Vision set out in Section 3.4, contain a potential conflict which is not addressed, let alone resolved. In Royal Crescent and St Ann's Villas, we are not convinced that the legacy objective can be achieved / delivered at the same time as improving north-south public transport (unless some way is found to reduce the volumes using these roads. The HGV/buses problem is already unbearable. The Core Strategy therefore fails the 'effectiveness' soundness test.		<p>Renewing the Legacy is principally based on ensuring the Borough's built heritage in is maintained and protected and that conservation areas remain of the highest quality. Whilst it is understood that a potential conflict has arisen, the increased traffic itself would not overtly damage the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>North-south bus routes, connecting otherwise isolated communities in the north with easy access to the retail, cultural and employment opportunities found in the centre and south of the Royal Borough is considered to be of a great strategic importance.</p> <p>The Council is keen to seek a resolution to the problems faced in Royal Crescent and St Ann's Villas, however, this is not a matter to be detailed within a high level strategic document.</p>	No change.
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		3.3.5	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS126	3.3 Strategic Objectives, Paragraph 3.3.5. Thames Water supports the Strategic Objective for Respecting Environmental Limits.		This comment denotes support for the Strategic Objective for 'Respecting Environmental Limits' chapter.	No change required.
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		3.3.7	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS127	Paragraph 4.3.7. The reference to the Thames Tunnel and the upgrade of the Counters Creek Sewer at paragraph 4.3.7 is supported		This comment denotes support to the text.	No change required.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		3.3.12	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS170	3.3.12 - Last sentence. This is a strategic matter for the Royal Borough, being central to our success as an attractive, healthy and safe place to live, work and visit.		This sentence, whilst obviously true, does not add anything to the document. Which, in line with PPS12 is attempting to be as succinct as possible.	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
English Heritage	English Heritage		3.3.13	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS460	English Heritage is broadly content with the treatment of the historic environment within the Proposed Submission Core Strategy and its Sustainability Appraisal.		Support noted.	No change.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		3.3.14	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS173	Para 3.3.14 should mention the importance of housing design quality and refer to positive impact that good design has on physical and mental health.		It is suggested that the importance of urban design has been referred to in 3.3.16. Whilst the importance of urban design on physical and mental health is known and has been considered, it is unnecessary to add wording in this paragraph.	No change
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	4.3.2	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS357	<p>P42 para 4.3.2 Broad Quanta of development</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p> <p>Changes are proposed to reflect the minimum quantum of housing appropriate for the Earls Court Strategic Site allocation (1,000 units), meaning the overall strategic figure should increase to 5,500. The change reflects Capital & Counties' representations to chapters 10 and 26 and provides consistency across the document and effectiveness of the Core Strategy to meet its vision to diversify housing.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>4.3.2 The Borough has to provide a minimum of 3,500 homes between 2007/8 and 2016/7 - or 350 units a year. This housing target is set out in the London Plan. The revised London Plan, issued for public consultation in October 2009, raises this figure to 585. This is not yet an agreed target, and will not be until the the Examination in Public into the revised London Plan has concluded. The Borough is therefore planning for 600 units a year to allow for some flexibility from 2011/12, the estimated date of adoption of the revised London Plan for a 10 year period. This increase can be accommodated because of significant redevelopment sites. Two sites, Kensal and Earl's Court, are designated as Opportunity Areas in the revised London Plan. Earl's Court also includes land in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. The proposed housing provision on the strategic sites in this Borough allocated in this plan is over 5,5000 [edit to read 5,000] dwellings.</p>		Disagree with proposed changes to the number of residential units, as this is based on a sound calculation of development capacity on the RBKC Strategic Site. However, some of the non-residential land uses might be located on the LBHF part of the site, which may result in higher residential units being proposed. CA7 has been revised to reflect this.	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	4.3.6	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS358	<p>p42 para 4.3.6 broad quanta of development</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>4.3.6 The Retail Needs Assessment identifies a need for just over 25,000m² (269,000 ft²) (gross) of comparison retail floorspace to 2015 for the south of the Borough. Very little of this is forecast to be required in the centre and north of the Borough. A proportion of this would be accommodated by making better use of existing premises and sites and filling vacant units. In terms of new sites, there are no large sites for retail development identified in the plan that could be regarded as 'strategic' although new retail development and other town centre and destination uses are proposed as part of redevelopment within the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area. . Whilst it is thus not appropriate for specific retail sites them to be allocated in the Core Strategy, the Earls Court Regeneration Area is recognised as suitable for an appropriate town centre. [delete However,] In Knightsbridge,</p>		Noted and Agree.	Delete "however"

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									South Kensington, Brompton Cross and the King's Road a number of smaller sites have been identified (not allocated) with the potential for ground floor retail in the <i>Place Profiles</i> (see below). In total, the combined site area amounts to about 21,000m ² (210,000 ft ²). It is therefore envisaged that the identified demand can be accommodated within or immediately adjacent to existing centres and within the Earls Court Regeneration Area..			
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		4.5.10	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS95	<p><i>4.5.10 Estate renewal is being actively considered at Wornington Green, which is an estate owned by Kensington Housing Trust, just south of the Paddington main line. A planning application for the redevelopment of the estate in a number of phases is expected in the autumn of 2009. The Homes and Community Agency are understood to support the scheme. In addition to the provision of new social rented accommodation and market housing, the redevelopment will reconnect Portobello Road to Ladbroke Grove at the Barlby Road junction</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum wishes to draw attention to the detailed comments which it has previously submitted in relation to Wornington Green, in particular in relation to the need to protect and improve the Venture Community Centre and Athlone Gardens if there is to be a greater housing density on the estate and to ensure that these amenities continue to be available to the whole community in Golborne. Please see the Golborne Forum's detailed comments on the Wornington Green Planning Brief Supplementary Planning Document.</p>		Comments duly noted. The comments raised on the Wornington Green SPD refer to a level of detail not suitable for a Core Strategy, and have therefore been considered as part of the consultation on the SPD. However, the Council can confirm that the re-provision of the park and community facilities at least as large as the existing facilities are a requirement of the planning application as their loss would not be considered acceptable in line with this Core Strategy. The Council's policy currently states that a park and community facilities at least the size of the existing will be required. Policy CA2 makes provision for an enlarged Venture Centre and improved Athlone Gardens, Venture Centre and adventure playground.	No change proposed.
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	4.5.10	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS498	<p>Paragraph 4.5.10</p> <p>KHT notes that paragraph 4.5.10 relates to Wornington Green and states, inter alia, that 'in addition to the provision of new social rented accommodation and market housing, the redevelopment will connect Portobello Road to Ladbroke Grove at the Barlby Road junction.'</p> <p>PPS3 sets out the broad approach to the provision of affordable housing, emphasising the importance of viability, and clarifies the need for flexibility within policies to reflect this. The London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004) (February 2008) notes that affordable housing targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements. The Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (November 2005) notes that estate renewal proposals should be predicated on no net loss of affordable housing, which can be based on habitable rooms rather than units, where the redevelopment of an estate is providing a housing mix more appropriate to the needs of both existing and prospective future residents.</p> <p>KHT considers that having regard to a range of considerations including the need to ensure that the proposed scale of development is appropriate to its context, the balance between seeking to maximise the re-use of the site and ensuring that the scheme is economically viable and ultimately deliverable, the comprehensive redevelopment of Wornington Green would not be of a scale sufficient to provide a net uplift in affordable housing. On this basis, KHT considers that paragraph 4.5.10 should be amended to be more consistent with paragraph 6.3.14 of the Core Strategy. For clarity and to avoid ambiguity, KHT suggests that the reference to 'new social rented accommodation' should be removed from paragraph 4.5.10; KHT considers that the 4th sentence of paragraph 4.5.10 is amended to state 'In addition to the minimum re-provision of the existing quantum of social rented accommodation (floorspace) within the WorningtonGreen Estate, and the provision of additional market housing...'</p>		The reference is to the provision of new social rented accommodation, which is exactly what the SPD, Core Strategy, and the planning application have sought, and what will be provided (in addition to other uses). This provides sufficient detail for the spatial strategy, while detailed places and site allocations confirm in more detail the quanta and provision for delivery on-site.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		4.5.14	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS96	<p>4.5.18 Portobello Road market is home to one of London's most iconic markets. It provides for a rich mix of antique, clothing and fresh produce stalls. Golborne Road Market provides a more traditional local function by nature of its stalls but still has a London-wide appeal.</p> <p>The Golborne Forum continues to promote the concept of 'Golborne Village' and to advocate for improved signage, street lighting and public art to attract visitors to continue up Portobello Road and visit Golborne Road with its vibrant shops, cafes and restaurants as well as the street market.</p>	<p>The Council supports initiatives to promote its markets. The use of wayfinding (possibly using street lighting) and public art are both seen as being positive means of stimulating footfall to Golborne Road and bridging the gap between Portobello Road market to the south.</p> <p>These issues are referred to in greater detail in Chapter 6: Golborne/Trellick</p>	<p>The Council supports initiatives to promote its markets. The use of wayfinding (possibly using street lighting) and public art are both seen as being positive means of stimulating footfall to Golborne Road and bridging the gap between Portobello Road market to the south.</p> <p>These issues are referred to in greater detail in Chapter 6: Golborne/Trellick</p>	No change.
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		4.5.14	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS98	<p>4.5.14 The Council has an ambitious secondary school building programme. The first is under construction in the south of the Borough in the Lots Road area. The second has planning permission at Holland Park School. The third is planned for the north of the Borough. The Kensington Sports Centre site is allocated for a new academy, along with a leisure centre.</p> <p>While the Kensington Sports Centre is not located in Golborne, it provides the only swimming pool in North Kensington and is therefore of great importance to Golborne people. The Golborne Forum requests an assurance that there will be continued public access to swimming facilities. The existing pool should be kept open until any new pool within the proposed leisure centre/academy development is opened. The Forum requests a further assurance that there should be a full-size swimming pool, at least as large as and preferably bigger than the current one, as well as a training pool for children and others learning to swim.</p>		<p>The Council can provide the assurance that a swimming pool of at least the same size as is currently in situ will remain in Latimer as allocated in Chapter 23. However, the exact nature of the facilities provided, and the timescales for provision and phasing, will be set out in a planning document.</p>	No change proposed.
Ms Claire McAlister	British Waterways		5.1.3	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS472	<p>As we stated in our previous comments, it is an overriding principle of British Waterways that the waterways can bring communities together, both alongside and on water, and we resist the view that they are boundaries. In their presentation -"The Magic is in the Water"- to the Olympic Delivery Authority, the architects, Farrells, reiterated the role of waterspace as connecting, not dividing communities.</p>		Noted	No Change
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		5.1.7	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS209	<p>London Plan Policy cross ref. 3C11 3C12 Draft London Plan: 6.3 6.4</p> <p>Has this matter been raised previously? yes, Draft Core Strategy</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.7 specifies that a new Crossrail station at Kensal is the council's ambition for the Kensal Gasworks sites although it acknowledges that no Crossrail station is included at Kensal in the Crossrail Act. Crossrail is currently in discussion with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea over a potential station at Kensal. However there is no provision for this station in the current Crossrail scheme, no commitment has been made and Crossrail is still investigating the viability of a station in this location.</p>		<p>The GLA's comment is duly noted, However, the Council believes that a Crossrail Station in Kensal is the best possible means of stimulating wide-scale regeneration in North Kensington and indeed, in neighbouring boroughs. As the GLA is aware, the Mayor has been quite clear in his position that if various hurdles can be overcome (namely that the Crossrail is delivered on time, on budget and without degrading the proposed service), that a station could become a reality. The Council believes that all of these can be overcome and it is for this reason that the Council considers the plan to be more than just a mere aspiration.</p> <p>The delivery of a turnback in Paddington New Yard is already in Crossrail timetable of work and has accordingly will have a funding stream. The Council has been informed that this work is not due to take place in the immediate future which would compromise the viability of relocating the turnback in Kensal.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that additional costs will arise relating to track layout but believes this can be funded</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>through contributions.</p> <p>The use of a turnback would mean that the service would not interfere with the current proposed timetable of the Maidenhead to Shenfield Crossrail trains, as the station at Kensal would extend the central London "shuttle" service west beyond Paddington to where the trains could still adequately be readied to return east whilst still allowing an ingress of passengers. This model is familiar to TfL and is utilised at the end of many Underground and DLR routes.</p> <p>The Council is of the opinion that Crossrail drives forward the Core Vision of the Core Strategy, however contingencies have been prepared in Chapter 39 which the prospect of Crossrail not coming forward have been included to demonstrate that the aims of the Core Vision and indeed the Core Strategy as a whole can still be delivered without Crossrail. As these options are very much "Plan Bs" we have not directly referred to them in the main body of the text for Kensal and Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site as the Council has endeavoured to provide the Inspector with an understandable and transparent set of objectives and positioning its contingencies in a separate chapter where they do not detract from Core Strategy's over-arching vision.</p>	
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		5.1.8	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS211	<p>London Plan Policy cross ref. 3C4 Draft London Plan: 6.2</p> <p>Has this matter been raised previously? No (Only general point raised)</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.8 states that "Improving connectivity to the (Kensal Gasworks) sites through bridges over the railway is critical." Although the specific issue has not previously been raised TfL notes that any proposed bridges would cross land safeguarded for Crossrail works. Crossrail has no plans to construct any bridges within this location as part of its scheme; it may prove very difficult to bridge over the Network Rail railway. See also omission of policy on land for transport (ref. 7) which addresses the general point about safeguarding and has been raised previously.</p>		<p>The comment is noted, however, the Council considers that it does not itself constitute a soundness issue. The Council appreciates the potential difficulty in bridging the network, but it is without question achievable. It is understood that Crossrail themselves are not intending to provide a link over the railway, but this should not itself prevent an independently funded bridge from being constructed. It is likely that the bridge would land in an area safeguarded for Crossrail, however, if this land is of no intrinsic value to Crossrail (as is likely), this should not prevent the linking a poorly connected and isolated community to the south of the railway to a new development at Kensal Gasworks would could aid local regeneration.</p>	No change
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		5.3.3	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS212	<p>London Plan Policy cross ref. 3C4 Draft London Plan: 6.2</p> <p>Has this matter been raised previously? No (Only general point raised)</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.8 states that "Improving connectivity to the (Kensal Gasworks) sites through bridges over the railway is critical." Although the specific issue has not previously been raised TfL notes that any proposed bridges would cross land safeguarded for Crossrail works. Crossrail has no plans to construct any bridges within this location as part of its scheme; it may prove very difficult to bridge over the Network Rail railway. See also omission of policy on land for transport (ref. 7) which addresses the general point about safeguarding and has been raised previously.</p>		<p>The comment is noted, however, the Council considers that it does not itself constitute a soundness issue. The Council appreciates the potential difficulty in bridging the network, but this is achievable. It is understood that Crossrail are not intending to provide a link over the railway, but this should not itself prevent an independently funded bridge from being constructed. It is likely that the bridge would land in an area safeguarded for Crossrail, however, if this land is of no intrinsic value to Crossrail (as is likely), this should not prevent the linking a poorly connected and isolated community to the south of the railway to a new development at Kensal Gasworks would could aid local regeneration.</p>	No change
Ms Pat Cox	London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham		5.3.3	Paragraph				PSubCS458	<p>"Hammersmith and Fulham Council note the Core Strategy vision (CV 5) and priorities for actions (paras. 5.3.3/4) for a Crossrail station at Kensal and for vehicular access to the west onto Mitre Way near Scrubs Lane in LB H&F in order to improve the public transport accessibility of the site. Whilst H&F considers that Kensington and Chelsea's Proposed Submission Core Strategy is sound, it may have to be reviewed in the light of future DfT</p>		<p>The Council wishes to reiterate that stations at Old Oak Common and Kensal will be entirely separate and provide different services. Therefore a station at Old Oak Common will not affect the viability or likelihood of a station at Kensal and the Royal Borough's position on this is clear.</p>	No changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									decisions on HS2 and links to Crossrail."			
Ms Pat Cox	London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham		5.3.4	Paragraph				PSubCS459	"Hammersmith and Fulham Council note the Core Strategy vision (CV 5) and priorities for actions (paras. 5.3.3/4) for a Crossrail station at Kensal and for vehicular access to the west onto Mitre Way near Scrubs Lane in LB H&F in order to improve the public transport accessibility of the site. Whilst H&F considers that Kensington and Chelsea's Proposed Submission Core Strategy is sound, it may have to be reviewed in the light of future DFT decisions on HS2 and links to Crossrail."		The Council wishes to reiterate that stations at Old Oak Common and Kensal will be entirely separate and provide different services. Therefore a station at Old Oak Common will not affect the viability or likelihood of a station at Kensal and the Royal Borough's position on this is clear.	No changes are recommended.
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		5.3.6	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS100	5.3.6 <i>A mix of sizes and tenures will be expected to create a balanced and mixed community. Included within this mix, might be the potential to cater for some of the Borough's student population.</i> The Golborne Forum supports the proposal for a mixed community on the Gasworks site but would wish to see a substantial proportion of social and affordable housing in view of the housing need in the Borough		The Council strongly endorses a mix of tenures and an over provision of social housing is no more beneficial to an integrated, socially connected community than an over-provision off market housing. The precise mix of unit sizes and tenures is not included, as this is a high level strategic document and further detailing will be included as part of more detailed masterplanning.	No change
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		5.3.8	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS97	5.3.8 <i>The Council will address local retail and social and community needs in Kensal, especially around Ladbrooke Grove¹. Kensal is one of two places in the Borough that has been identified as having a deficiency in local shopping provision. A Neighbourhood Shopping Centre may be needed depending on the scale of any future development on the Gasworks sites. A new primary school as well as police and health facilities will also be desirable to ensure that the needs of the community are delivered locally.</i> The Golborne Forum is committed to the development, enhancement and success of Golborne Road as a local shopping street and urges caution in providing more retail units which may not be let. The retail units on Ladbrooke Grove near the Harrow Road which continue to stand empty illustrate this point.		The Council notes this point and is also committed to the continuing success of the Golborne Road Neighbourhood Centre. However, the increased population in Kensal arising from the development on the Gasworks site will necessitate the need for additional retail floorspace within a 5 minute walk of properties in line with Policy CK3. The Council is aware of the high vacancy rates in Harrow Road, however, due to the increased connectivity and improved north-south connections created by development in both Wornington and Kensal and anchored by a high footfall rate from Sainsbury's, the lower perception of crime in Kensal and increased population, it is considered that an increased provision in this area would not result in a damaging vacancy rate. The extent of the new retail provision will be determined by the size of the Gasworks development.	No change
Ms Claire McAlister	British Waterways		6.1.1	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS474	The canal is again referred to here as a boundary (as well as at 33.3.3 and 33.3.27), although we are pleased that within the CV6 Vision of Golborne/Trellick in 2028, the canal is mentioned as a destination rather than a barrier.		Irrespective of the environmental and leisure benefits of the canal, it remains a physical barrier.	No change proposed
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		6.1.3	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS164	6.1.3 <i>There is a strong sense of community amongst the retailers in Golborne Road, and Golborne Road Market is seen as an integral part of the Portobello Road Market offer to the south. The Golborne Road Market provides for the local community through the selling of hot food, fruit and vegetables, as well as antiques and bric-a-brac, which also attracts people from across London, particularly at weekends.</i> The Golborne Forum continues to promote the concept of 'Golborne Village' and to advocate for improved signage, street lighting and public art to attract visitors to continue up Portobello Road and visit Golborne Road with its vibrant shops, cafes and restaurants as well as the street market.		Support noted. The Council agrees with this and supports improved way-finding as well as public realm improvements in Golborne Road as stated in the Golborne/Trellick chapter.	No change proposed
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		6.1.5	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS166	6.1.5 <i>At Wornington Green, the Kensington Housing Trust are exploring ways to renew the Estate. The need for renewal is driven by a number of factors. Amongst these are the Government's Decent Homes agenda which means that the 538 homes on the Wornington Green Estate will need to be brought up to 'decent homes' standards by 2014.</i>		Noted. The Wornington Green SPD was adopted in 2009. The representation is not considered to go to the issue of soundness of the overall plan.	No change proposed

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									Please see the Golborne Forum's detailed comments on the Wornington Green Planning Brief Supplementary Planning Document.			
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		6.1.6	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS169	<p>6.1.6 <i>The Edenham site, located next to Trellick, also provides opportunities for regeneration including new housing and extra care facilities.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum urges the Council to look seriously at the regeneration plans for the Edenham site which have been drawn up with local people by architects Novarc Studio Ltd.</p>		The Council does not consider that this impacts on the test of soundness. The concept scheme prepared by Novarc Studios is not considered to be financially viable development. The Council, through the preparation of a planning brief for the site, will consider the introduction of uses, for example residential dwellings and a new health facility (refer to paragraph 22.2.6), at the site.	Noted. No change proposed
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	6.3.2	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS499	<p>'Key Issues and Potential Opportunities' diagram (page 58)</p> <p>KHT supports the reference within the 'Key Issues and Potential Opportunities' diagram on page 58 that a high quality Athlone Gardens and Community Centre is reprovided as part of any redevelopment, however, considers that this needs to be qualified to ensure that it is clear that this would only apply in the event that the land currently accommodating Athlone Gardens and the Community Centre form part of the comprehensive redevelopment of Wornington Green. KHT suggests that this is clarified within the Core Strategy.</p>		Noted. The detailed arrangements for accommodating Athlone Gardens and the Community Centre are, more appropriately, considered in the SPD, and through the planning process rather than the Core Strategy which sets the principles overall.	No change.
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		6.3.4	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS171	<p>6.3.4 <i>The Council envisages the Golborne and Trellick area developing in a way which maintains and enhances its function of a neighbourhood centre whilst preserving and enhancing the setting of the Grade II* listed Trellick Tower.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum wishes to draw attention to the substantial threat posed to the environmental heritage of the Golborne/Trellick area by the proposals from Urban Eye to put glass reinforced polyester cladding on the Victorian iron railway bridge and urges the Council to consider the alternative design from Bownbaby for refurbishing the bridge in a way which respects its integrity.</p>		The issue is one of detail and does not render the Plan, nor part of the Plan as unsound.	No change proposed
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		6.3.7	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS174	<p>6.3.7 <i>The market breathes life into this area and has a unique character, which differs from the Portobello Road Market. It is currently separated from the Portobello Road Market by a 300m (328 yard) section of Portobello Road that is flanked by blank walls which significantly reduce the number of pedestrians that walk up to Golborne Road. Different ways to enliven this stretch of road, which 'close the gap' are being explored. These initiatives may include the provision of electricity points in this part of Portobello Road for use by market traders and their customers. A well designed scheme of street lighting could also prove useful in the creation of a visual linkage between the two centres, a linkage which could further encourage visitors to continue north. Other possible initiatives to inject more life into the area could include the development of a speciality market in this area or the use of the blank wall opposite the Spanish School as an ever-changing 'Art Wall' or outdoor exhibition space for artists. Collaboration with the Spanish School will be encouraged.</i></p>		No changes proposed to what was written in 6.3.7	No change proposed
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		6.3.8	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS176	<p>6.3.8 <i>The Council will support initiatives which will help unify the Portobello Road and Golborne Road markets and which will draw visitors north up the Portobello Road, past the Spanish School, to Golborne Road¹.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum continues to promote the concept of 'Golborne Village' and to advocate for improved signage, street lighting and public art to attract visitors to continue up Portobello Road and visit Golborne Road with its vibrant shops, cafes and restaurants as well as the street market.</p>		Support noted. The Council agrees with this and supports improved way-finding as well as public realm improvements in Golborne Road as stated in the Golborne/Trellick chapter	No change proposed
Ms Susie	Golborne Forum		6.3.12	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS178	<p>6.3.12 <i>Locating a destination use - such as a leisure facility on the Edenham site, might also encourage footfall and stimulate trade</i></p>		The Council does not consider that this impacts on the test of soundness. The concept scheme prepared by	No change proposed

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Parsons									<p><i>along the Golborne Road.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum urges the Council to look seriously at the regeneration plans for the Edenham site which have been drawn up with local people by architects Novarc Studio Ltd.</p>		Novarc Studios is not considered to be financially viable development. The Council, through the preparation of a planning brief for the site, will consider the introduction of uses, for example residential dwellings and a new health facility (refer to paragraph 22.2.6), at the site.	
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		6.3.13	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS180	<p><i>6.3.13 The method by which the Government funds social housing and the ongoing need for capital investment means that the Council is carrying out a review of various housing stock options. One way of raising funds to provide good quality homes for existing tenants is through the provision of additional private housing on existing Council owned housing estates. Before making any long term investment decisions, the Council is examining what this might mean in practice with smaller re-development proposals, one of which includes the Edenham site at the base of Trellick Tower. The Council will prepare a brief for this site in 2010.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum urges the Council to consider the need for more social housing as well as private housing.</p>		London Plan Policy requires the inclusion of 50% social housing within developments containing 10 or more dwellings. Policy CH2 also requires the provision of affordable housing in new schemes, and the paragraph has been drafted to reflect these. Moreover, the approach complies with policy CH4 on Estate Renewal, which requires, as a minimum, no net loss of affordable housing.	No change proposed
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		6.3.14	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS182	<p><i>6.3.14 Housing renewal is also being undertaken at Wornington Green, which lies to the north west of Golborne Road. The renewal would be part funded by the provision of new private housing alongside the replacement of the existing social rented housing. The Council has prepared supplementary planning guidance to ensure that the redevelopment is attractive, functional and easily managed for future generations to enjoy. The re-provision of affordable housing complying with 'Lifetime Homes' standards is a driving force for the redevelopment.</i></p> <p>Please see the Golborne Forum's detailed comments on the Wornington Green Planning Brief Supplementary Planning Document.</p>		Noted. The Wornington Green SPD was adopted in 2009. The representation is not considered to go to the issue of soundness of the overall plan.	No change proposed
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		6.3.15	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS183	<p><i>6.3.15 There are two parks in the area: Athlone Gardens and Meanwhile Gardens, which are considered to be valued amenities to local residents. Athlone Gardens may be relocated as part of the redevelopment of the Wornington Green Estate, but the replacement will be on the same scale and of better quality than the existing park. The Council will support the maintenance and enhancement of Meanwhile Gardens and the canal side environment.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum advocates that the re-located Athlone Gardens should be bigger than the current park to take account of the proposed increase in housing density on Wornington Green. The Forum welcomes the commitment to maintain and enhance Meanwhile Gardens but again stresses the urgent need to replace the existing building on the site with a purpose-built community building for use by Meanwhile Gardens Community Association.</p>		Necessary infrastructure will be provided alongside redevelopment. This will be secured through a legal agreement which must conform with Circular 05/2005, including the principle that planning obligations may not be used to correct an existing deficiency - for example in the case of an increased size open space. Policy C1 of the Core Strategy is relevant. It is not considered that the representation raises issues of soundness.	No change proposed
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		6.3.16	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS184	<p><i>6.3.16 The bridge over the Paddington main line is visually unattractive and acts as a break in Golborne Road. This will be cosmetically improved.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum wishes to draw attention to the substantial threat posed to the environmental heritage of the Golborne/Trellick area by the proposals from Urban Eye to put glass reinforced polyester cladding on the Victorian iron railway bridge and urges the Council to consider the alternative design from Bownbaby for refurbishing the bridge in a way which respects its integrity. Otherwise, the Forum advocates leaving the bridge alone, rather than covering it in plastic as proposed by Urban Eye.</p>		The issue is one of detail and does not go render the Plan, nor part of the Plan as unsound.	No change proposed
Ms Susie	Golborne Forum		6.3.17	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS185	<p><i>6.3.17 A range of measures will be employed to address the blank façade north of the Portobello Road Market to attract shoppers to</i></p>		Support noted. The Council agrees with this and supports improved way-finding as well as public realm	No change proposed

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Parsons									<p><i>the Golborne Road and better wayfinding will be provided between the two markets.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum continues to promote the concept of 'Golborne Village' and to advocate for improved signage, street lighting and public art to attract visitors to continue up Portobello Road and visit Golborne Road with its vibrant shops, cafes and restaurants as well as the street market.</p>		improvements in Golborne Road as stated in the Golborne/Trellick chapter.	
Ms Claire McAlister	British Waterways		6.3.20	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS475	At 6.3.20 "Better access could be created to the Grand Union Canal and integrate it into the network of local pedestrian routes" cycle routes should be added		Agree to amendment to improve access.	Amend paragraph 6.3.20 to include reference to cycle routes.
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		6.3.25	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS186	<p><i>6.3.25 Development on the Edenham site will need to protect existing biodiversity and attract new biodiversity, especially through opportunities to extend or link existing Green Corridors with the Grand Union Canal. The Council will encourage proposals and design solutions which improve air quality and reduce noise, particularly as a result of the Westway Flyover and the Paddington main line.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum urges the Council to look seriously at the regeneration plans for the Edenham site which have been drawn up with local people by architects Novarc Studio Ltd.</p>		<p>The Council does not consider that this impacts on the test of soundness. The concept scheme prepared by Novarc Studios is not considered to be financially viable development. The Council, through the preparation of a planning brief for the site, will consider the introduction of uses, for example residential dwellings and a new health facility (refer to paragraph 22.2.6), at the site.</p> <p>Any future development at the site will be required to meet relevant environmental standards, including protecting existing biodiversity and attract new biodiversity at the site.</p>	No change proposed
Miss Robina Rose	(The Ladbroke Association)		7.1.1	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS346	<p>chapter 7 PORTOBELLO/NOTTING HILL</p> <p>para 7.1.1.</p> <p>This area DOES NOT consist of Portobello Road - and Westbourne Grove. <i>para 7.1.8 Westbourne Grove has as its hinterland/cluster the retail(and restaurants) of Ledbury Road, Chepstow Place and Road, the Artesian and Needham Roads and extends into the rest of Westbourne Grove reaching toward Queensway. The reason that this has not been assessed correctly, is in no doubt because of Ledbury Road, Westbourne Grove becomes part of Westminster. where many of the so called "most upmarket fashion retail in London, " as well as furniture and art Galleries, are situated).</i> "Therefore what is required is like Earls Court ("A joint SPD for the wider area to be prepared by RBKC AND the Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.)</p> <p>This does not mean that it ceases to be part of a coherent retail identity in its own right, but it does not make it part of Portobello, even Notting Hill, but of Portobello/Notting Hill which need to be linked correctly to its Portobello hinterland, consisting of All Saints Road(to which galleries have begun to migrate, along with the top end of Portobello Road itself (beyond where it crosses Golborne Road) Lancaster, Westbourne, Kensington Park and Talbot Roads, as well as Blenheim and Elgin Crescents....</p> <p>There is also of course the link to Pembridge Road retail, indeed Notting Hill.mean that it ceases to be part of a coherent retail identity in its own right, but it does not make it part of Portobello, even Notting Hill, but of Portobello/Notting Hill which need to be linked correctly to its Portobello hinterland, consisting of All Saints Road(to which galleries have begun to migrate, along with the top end of Portobello Road itself (beyond where it crosses Globorne Road) Lancaster, Westborne, Kensington Park and Talbot Roads, as well as Blenheim and Elgin Crescents....</p> <p>There is also of course the link to Pembridge Road retail, indeed Notting Hill.</p>		<p><i>Preparation of a joint SPD for Westbourne Grove</i></p> <p>The Council takes the view that although functionally different Westbourne Grove and the Portobello Road do have links. The 'place' chapter reflects these links. Indeed the 'place' recognises the links between many of the centres in the area, including All Saints Road, Notting Hill and Golborne Road. These areas are not considered in isolation.</p> <p>The Council has no plans to prepare a wider SPD for the area as it is do for the Earl's Court area. Earl's Court is an area where the Council expects major redevelopment in the medium term. It is being designated as an Opportunity Area within the emerging London Plan. Development of this scale is not expected in the Portobello/Westbourne Grove area. Indeed the Council has not identified (or allocated) any strategic sites in the area.</p> <p>The Council is in regular contact with our neighbours in the City of Westminster with regard retail issues in the area.</p>	No change.
Miss Robina Rose	(The Ladbroke Association		7.1.2	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS345	Para 7.1.2 The Bohemian (<i>and cosmopolitan</i>)Character is one of the main drivers of "the Portobello Brand" . Its authenticity is maintained by the west 11 accolade that it has the highest		Double designation	No change.
											The Council considers that the designation of the	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
)								<p>percentage of people working from home in Europe (!) This is palpable on the street on a daily basis, and in the intellectual fayre above (bookshops etc.) Changing demographics have been limited by the 40% Housing Estates in the catchment area, although, as was demonstrated by the loss of Woolworths.... the poor have been considerably disenfranchised by the changes in retail... HENCE THE NEED FOR THE DOUBLE DESIGNATION of special district AND NEIGHBOURHOOD, without which there is no hope and the Economic Apartheid will destroy the Market. (The recently opened Pound land has a roaring trade.)</p> <p>(Fitzrovia and Bloomsbury are both rekindling the "bohemian flavour that remains an enduring life force today"(ES property) why does RBKC represent it as a thing of the past in Portobello?)</p> <p>para 7.1.7 Young costermongers continue to struggle and need the active support of the Council to maintain this highly traditional way of life, that supplies the authentic and historic 'spine' of the market,</p> <p>The problem of footfall is with the "local"(neighbourhood) market. As local amenity diminishes, so does footfall.</p> <p>7.2 VISION CV 7 does not say HOW "will remain." vibrant retail areas" particularly ill the wake of the recession, with continuing rate rises.</p> <p>Wisdom</p> <p>HOW will the "jewel" be maintained? The repetition of "cutting edge fashion" as the guiding concept for something so much richer and more complex doesn't inspire. Look at what became of Kings Road .</p> <p>para 7.3.12 AGREE on surrounding retail areas....</p> <p>para 7.3.13 the "high end retail" ticket looks particularly vulnerable as the effects of the recession cut in. There is already rapid turnover of these shops in parts of Westbourne Grove.</p> <p>furthermore, at junction with Portobello..."fashion' frontage already submerging antique arcade in Questionable new development of Lipkes</p> <p>para 7.3.15 increase the provision of banks <i>and Post Offices</i></p> <p>FUTURE PLANS & DOCUMENTS</p> <p>Continued need for close stakeholder consultation in developing Portobello Road Town Centre Action Plan as Town Centre Manager feels that "why visitors come to the area -and what they expect is <i>not well understood</i>" :-.</p> <p>Further need to <i>correctly</i> identify "the Portobello Brand". (ASK LOCALS)</p>		<p>Portobello Road as a "Special District Centre" reflects its dual role as a centre which serves local people for much of the week, before accommodating a very large number of tourists and other visitors on Saturdays, and to a lesser extent, Fridays.</p> <p>Although the designation as a 'Special District Centre' is a Council rather than a Mayoral designation, the GLA have confirmed, in their representations, that they do not object to the designation. A 'double designation' as both a neighbourhood and a district centre would merely cause confusion, and add nothing to the proposed designation.</p> <p>The significance of this designation lies on the impact that it will have on the vision for the area, a vision which states that the Council will try to build upon both roles. This will take two main forms; the promotion of the area (by the Markets Promotion Officer and the Council's Town Centre Manager); and by using planning policies to influence the type of new development permitted in the area.</p> <p>Designation, in its self, does not allow, as the consultee appears to suggests, the Council to specify the types of shops which should be allowed in the centre. The nature of the retail occupier is not a planning consideration.</p> <p>Bohemian nature</p> <p>The section accurately reflects the changing nature of the Portobello Road. The character of the Portobello Road has changed since the early 1970s. The Council's vision for the area does, however, remain positive, with the Council wishing to support its dual role.</p> <p>Costermongers</p> <p>The Core Strategy explicitly recognises the contribution that the market plays in the unique character of the Portobello Road. It also refers to the Council's desire to promote the market. This is reflected by the recent appointment of a Market Promotions Officer.</p> <p>Vision</p> <p>The vision sets out the Council's ambitions for the area. This vision is both aspirational and realistic. Both the policies put forward in the Core Strategy and the other Council initiatives referenced in the document provide the framework which will help achieve this aim. The</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>Council does however recognise that it does lack the powers necessary if it, for example, wanted to control the nature of retailers in a given area.</p> <p>Para 7.3.13</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>The loss of individual antique arcade, and the subsequent enforcement investigation, is not the subject of the Core Strategy, however strong public feeling may be.</p> <p>Para 7.3.15, promotes the provision of a new post office.</p> <p>Whilst the Council would support the creation of a new post office in the area, the Council does not feel that the Core Strategy needs to make specific reference to post offices in this section. The Council does note that the Portobello Road area does already have a post office.</p> <p><i>Portobello Road Town Centre Action Plan</i></p> <p>This will be prepared in close consultation with relevant stakeholders.</p>	
Miss Robina Rose	(The Ladbroke Association)		7.1.3	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS347	<p>MAP 07 Portobello/Notting Hill ;</p> <p>This is also incorrect, in that it shows none of the above, other than the Westminster amputation of Westbourne Grove.</p> <p>Needs more detail, even as a diagram....particularly of hinterland shopping streets and how they interconnect. (esp KenlWestPark and Elgin/Blenheim cluster).</p> <p>para 7.1</p> <p>It remains an inadequate description of the "unique retail Experience" in that there is no reference to independent bookshops(one of which in particular being one of the main current attractions , although this has not translated into sales beyond Postcards to Tourists , illustrating part of the nature of the problem). '</p> <p>Also independent music(shops and venues) (Tabemacle, Inn on the Green),including a world famous Independent record company, Rough Green); including a world famous Independent record company, Rough trade) as well as the Electric Cinema (the oldest custom built in Europe) plus Cornet and Gate at Notting Hill.</p> <p>These constitute "destination" shopping and as with the Antiques, critical mass rather than competition is the leitmotif.</p>		<p><i>Need for more detail in map</i></p> <p>The Council considers that the map, as produced, serves its intended function. Its indicates the Council's desire to improve "pedestrian access" (the green dotted arrows) between the area's town centres. The Council does not consider that this issue impacts the upon the soundness of the Core Strategy.</p> <p><i>Nature of Portobello Road</i></p> <p>The Council does not consider that further reference to the detail of the actual occupiers in the Portobello Road questions the soundness of the Core Strategy. The Portobello Place recognises the area's unique character, and the importance that the remaining high proportion of independent retailers in the area has upon it.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									("Edgy" fashion comes in rather after the fact.)			
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	7.3.11	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS505	KHT notes the possible requirement for 'affordable shops' within paragraphs 7.3.11 and 29.2.4. KHT considers that any policy requirement relating to 'affordable shops' should reflect the approach of the adopted London Plan, and should be based on robust and credible evidence.		Comments noted. It is considered that the requirement for provision of affordable shops reflects the evidence based on need arising, and is consistent with government guidance in Circular 05/2005.	No change.
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		8.1.3	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS187	<p>8.1.3 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. The proposed installation of electricity points for the market pitches in the stretch of the Portobello Road north of the Westway could help to overcome this. The underside of the Westway has recently been painted white at Portobello Road, to help to improve the feel of the area. But more could be done here to enhance the quality of the environment and better integrate the area into its surroundings through the introduction of new uses and investment in the public realm , public art and lighting, which would help to turn the Westway from a 'liability' into an 'asset'.</p> <p>The Golborne Forum continues to promote the concept of 'Golborne Village' and to advocate for improved signage, street lighting and public art to attract visitors to continue up Portobello Road and visit Golborne Road with its vibrant shops, cafes and restaurants as well as the street market.</p>		Support noted.	No change.
Westway Development Trust	Westway Development Trust	Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd	8.3.5	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS149	<p>Current para/drawing notation</p> <p>High-level advertisements have been erected by the Westway Trust at the Westway Roundabout. The Council refused advertisement consent, which was granted on appeal. The erection of the advertisements has had a negative impact on the wider area. The Council will continue to oppose advertisements which have a negative impact on the area and take all opportunities to have the existing hoardings removed.</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>Not effective in terms of both its deliverability and maintaining flexibility.</p> <p>The Trust supports the Council's objective to enhance the quality of the environment associated with the Westway.</p> <p>The income generated from advertisements does, however generate significant income for the Trust.</p> <p>The erection of advertisements at the Westway Roundabout was accepted on appeal. The inspector, based on the evidence presented came to the conclusion advertisements in a number of key locations would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>Given the Inspector's conclusions the Trust want to ensure flexibility is retained within the Core Strategy to bring advertisement consent applications forward in appropriate locations and hence create the conditions whereby it will be possible to generate additional income.</p> <p>In view of this situation the paragraph should be deleted and the</p>		The situation expressed in paragraph 8.3.5 remains the Council's intention, within the wider context of improving the environment. The representation does not go to the heart of soundness issues; the paragraph is a statement of matter of fact.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>matter dealt with via the development control process.</p> <p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>Delete para 8.3.5.</p>			
Westway Development Trust	Westway Development Trust	Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd	8.3.9	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS150	<p>Current para/drawing notation</p> <p>..., but the Council will continue to refuse planning permission or advertisement consent for any land usage such as illuminated advertising hoardings, which damage the built environment.</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>Not effective in terms of both its deliverability and maintaining flexibility. Reason: The Trust supports the Council's objective to enhance the quality of the environment associated with the Westway.</p> <p>The income generated from advertisements does, however generate essential income for the Trust.</p> <p>The erection of advertisements at the Westway Roundabout was accepted on appeal. The inspector, based on the evidence presented came to the conclusion advertisements in a number of key locations would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The Trust want to ensure sufficient flexibility is retained within the Core Strategy to enable them to bring advertisement consent applications forward in appropriate locations and hence create the conditions whereby it will be possible to generate additional income.</p> <p>The Trust is of the view that specific reference to illuminated advertising hoardings should be removed.</p> <p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>Delete 'continue'.</p> <p>Delete 'such as illuminated advertising hoardings'.</p>		The Council does not agree that the issue raises soundness concerns. This ensures that any form of signage or advertisements are not precluded, but will be assessed against the relevant policies.	Change paragraph 8.3.9 Delete: "even further".

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									Delete 'even further'. Sentence to read: ...'but the Council will refuse planning permission or advertisement consent applications for any land usage, which damages the built environment.'			
Westway Development Trust	Westway Development Trust	Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd	8.3.10	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS151	<p>Current para/drawing notation</p> <p>'There is scope for a new supermarket where Bramley Road passes under the Westway'.</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>Not effective in terms of both its deliverability and maintaining flexibility.</p> <p>Reason: The Trust acknowledges that the current retail units in this location do not work well and that there is a need to improve access to and security and safety of this location.</p> <p>The Trust is also of the view that, as part of a wider strategy for the area that the opportunity could be taken to reconfigure the space under the Westway between Bramley Road and St Mark's Road and as a result establish more viable building blocks; greater clarity in terms of routes and spaces; improved safety and security and an improved relationship with the park.</p> <p>The above forms a key element in the Trust's future development strategy. However at this stage in the process they would question the viability of locating supermarket in this location.</p> <p>Work undertaken by the Retail Group on behalf of the Westway Trust confirms that whilst there is a capacity for a convenience store in the area that such a location away from the main retail focuses is unlikely to be effective.</p> <p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>Delete 'new supermarket' and replace with 'new active retail/employment uses'.</p>		The existing notations are sufficient for delivering the vision as expressed. The policies within the Core Strategy will be used to determine the developments within each site as shown on the plan. However, it is recognised that additional flexibility could be allowed through the applying the vision and its associated reasoning. The information provided by the Westway Development Trust, more recently than when the wording was originally drafted, demonstrates positive change and action taken by the Trust, which is to be supported through spatial planning policy. For these reasons, some flexibility should rightly be introduced, and a number of changes are therefore suggested.	<p>Amend the Plan to include reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert "or an alternative community use." after "primary health centre". • Delete "Potential for small supermarket" and replace with: "Potential for new mixed use, including retail uses" • Delete "Community centred uses" and replace with "Community/employment uses." <p>These changes, and consequential changes to the reasoned justification at paragraphs 8.3.10 and 8.3.15 will more closely align the Core Strategy with the Westway Development Trust's own plans.</p> <p>In paragraph 8.3.10, delete insert "or other non-retail uses that provide an active street frontage".</p> <p>Delete current paragraph 8.3.15, and replace with "The Trust has gained planning permission for a school where the Maxilla Nursery is, and other community uses would also be appropriate for this site."</p>
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		8.3.12	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS188	<p><i>8.3.12 The eastern end of the Westway should offer small commercial start-up workshop units. Signage and visibility of these units needs to be improved, so that local people know what services are available locally. The skate park adds to the vitality of the area, but does not tend to serve local children. There would therefore be scope for this to become small business workshop space in the future, which could help to foster the development of the existing cultural industries cluster in the north of the Borough.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum wishes to see the popular skate park retained. The Forum believes that it does cater for local children as well as attracting parents who bring children from other areas of London and then spend money in Portobello and Golborne. The Forum urges Westway Development Trust to make more effort to attract more local children to the skate park rather than removing a well-used amenity.</p>		Paragraph 8.3.12 as drafted offers vision and suggestions for development within the Westway Area, in order to expand on the development of existing cultural industries cluster within the north of the borough, which is an objective of the Strategy. The objection does not raise soundness issues, and matters of land use distribution will be addressed through subsequent planning applications.	No change.
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		8.3.13	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS102	<p>8.3.13 <i>The Council will support initiatives to help unify the Portobello Road and Golborne Road markets and which will draw visitors north up the Portobello Road to Golborne Road. The Council is undertaking a feasibility study to assess what actions</i></p>		Support of the Forum is noted. The vision, and spatial expression of uses and policy is intended to further the feeling already established, and to give distinction to future development of the area.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p><i>should be taken to assist in this ambition. These actions may include the provision of electricity points in this part of Portobello Road to make life easier for market traders and their customers. It may also include injecting more life into the area with the use of the blank wall as an ever changing outdoor exhibition space for young artists, although at present it is not clear how this might be delivered.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum continues to promote the concept of 'Golborne Village' and to advocate for improved signage street lighting and public art to attract visitors to continue up Portobello Road and visit Golborne Road with its vibrant shops, cafes and restaurants as well as the street market.</p>			
Westway Development Trust	Westway Development Trust	Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd	8.3.15	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS152	<p>Current para/drawing notation</p> <p>'The Trust has gained planning permission for a school where Maxilla Nursery is, and a health centre would be another desirable use of this site'.</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>Not effective in terms of both its deliverability and maintaining flexibility.</p> <p>Reason: As stated above the Trust's plans identify a need to reconsider the area between Bramley Road and St Mark's Road and come up with a more comprehensive strategy in relation to the future configuration and use of this area.</p> <p>Such regeneration might include the introduction of uses in addition to a school and a health centre and hence the Trust are of the view that this para should be re-worded to allow for a wider range of uses to be considered for the site.</p> <p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>Delete para and replace with: The Trust has gained planning permission for a school where the Maxilla Nursery is, and other community uses would also be appropriate for this site.</p>		<p>The existing notations are sufficient for delivering the vision as expressed. The policies within the Core Strategy will be used to determine the developments within each site as shown on the plan. However, it is recognised that additional flexibility could be allowed through the applying the vision and its associated reasoning. The information provided by the Westway Development Trust, more recently than when the wording was originally drafted, demonstrates positive change and action taken by the Trust, which is to be supported through spatial planning policy. For these reasons, some flexibility should rightly be introduced, and a number of changes are therefore suggested.</p>	<p>Amend the Plan to include reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert "or an alternative community use." after "primary health centre". • Delete "Potential for small supermarket" and replace with: "Potential for new mixed use, including retail uses" • Delete "Community centred uses" and replace with "Community/employment uses." <p>These changes, and consequential changes to the reasoned justification at paragraphs 8.3.10 and 8.3.15 will more closely align the Core Strategy with the Westway Development Trust's own plans.</p> <p>In paragraph 8.3.10, delete "a new supermarket" and insert "new active retail/employment uses".</p> <p>Delete current paragraph 8.3.15, and replace with "The Trust has gained planning permission for a school where the Maxilla Nursery is, and other community uses would also be appropriate for this site."</p>
Westway Development Trust	Westway Development Trust	Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd	8.4.2	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS154	<p>Current para/drawing notation</p> <p>There are no strategic sites allocations within the Westway. A site (Maxilla Nursery School) has been identified as potential redevelopment site for a small school or primary healthcare facility. A new road, to improve access to the Westway Travellers' site, and a site on Bramley Road which has potential for a small supermarket (less than 1000m2 or 10,800ft2) provide additional development opportunity. The land along and under the Westway itself offers a number of opportunities for community use developments, and business opportunities.</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>Not effective in terms of both its deliverability and maintaining flexibility.</p> <p>Reason: Comments in relation to the delivery of a small school or primary health care facility are advanced above.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the delivery of a small supermarket on</p>		<p>The existing notations are sufficient for delivering the vision as expressed. The policies within the Core Strategy will be used to determine the developments within each site as shown on the plan. However, it is recognised that additional flexibility could be allowed through the applying the vision and its associated reasoning. The information provided by the Westway Development Trust, more recently than when the wording was originally drafted, demonstrates positive change and action taken by the Trust, which is to be supported through spatial planning policy. For these reasons, some flexibility should rightly be introduced, and a number of changes are therefore suggested.</p>	<p>Amend the Plan to include reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert "or an alternative community use." after "primary health centre". • Delete "Potential for small supermarket" and replace with: "Potential for new mixed use, including retail uses" • Delete "Community centred uses" and replace with "Community/employment uses." <p>These changes, and consequential changes to the reasoned justification at paragraphs 8.3.10 and 8.3.15 will more closely align the Core Strategy with the Westway Development Trust's own plans.</p> <p>In paragraph 8.3.10, delete "a new supermarket" and insert "new active</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>the site at Bramley Road are advanced above.</p> <p>The Trust has commissioned a number of pieces of research to assess the future potential of the location in terms of attracting both retail and commercial development.</p> <p>As the Council is aware the Trust has, based on the content of these reports commissioned the production of spatial framework for the area. The emerging content of the plan is explained in the document, 'Emerging Westway Spatial Strategy', which is enclosed with these representations.</p> <p>It is the Trust's intention to work with the Council to develop this plan as part of the SPD process.</p> <p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>Delete para 8.4.2 and replace with:</p> <p>'There are no strategic site allocations within the Westway. The land along and under the Westway does, however offer a number of opportunities for community, retail and business uses, as follows;</p> <p>The expansion and improvement of the existing sports facilities at the western end of the site, west of Bramley Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comprehensive redevelopment of the land between Bramley Road and St Mark's Road to provide new community and employment uses. • The enhancement of the existing mixed retail and commercial land uses in the areas associated with Portobello Road. • The provision of mixed employment in the area to the east of Portobello Road, fronting Acklam Road. This provision will necessitate the redevelopment of the existing Skate Park, which it is recognised does not meet the needs of local people. • Maximising the potential of the existing open space/hardstanding areas in the vicinity of Portobello Road to support market related activity, cultural uses and studio/workshop space. 			<p>retail/employment uses".</p> <p>Delete current paragraph 8.3.15, and replace with "The Trust has gained planning permission for a school where the Maxilla Nursery is, and other community uses would also be appropriate for this site."</p>
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		9.3.13	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS189	<p>9.3.13 <i>The area also has one of the Council's two sports centres, as well as the Westway Sports Centre. As part of the proposed redevelopment of the Kensington Sports Centre there is an option to expand the existing Westway Sports Centre by bringing both leisure facilities together. This option would retain the sport and recreation offer in the area. The Council is committed to ensuring that the existing sports facilities in the area are not degraded. This commitment includes the continued provision of a swimming pool, whether this be retained in situ or re-provided elsewhere in the vicinity.</i></p> <p>While the Kensington Sports Centre is not located in Golborne, it provides the only swimming pool in North Kensington and is therefore of great importance to Golborne people. The Golborne Forum requests an assurance that there will be continued public access to swimming facilities. The existing pool should be kept open until any new pool within the proposed leisure centre/academy development is opened. The Forum requests a further assurance that there should be a full-size swimming pool, at least as large as and preferably bigger than the current one, as well as a training pool for children and others learning to swim.</p>		<p>The Council is committed to providing a swimming pool on the wider site. This forms part of the allocation for the sports centre as set out in Policy CA4 of the Core Strategy. This swimming pool will be available for use by the public.</p> <p>However, the Council cannot at this time include a statement within the Core Strategy which sets out any detailed phasing of development of this site, or which commits itself to guaranteeing that the pool not be closed on a temporary basis to enable to redevelopment of the site. Any such assurance could jeopardise the wider regeneration of the area as could limit the Council's options with regard detailed phasing. This is not appropriate.</p> <p>Similarly the nature of the facilities and activities to be provided in the sports centre cannot be provided within the Core Strategy, as firstly are too detailed a matter for inclusion, and secondly are matters which can only be determined in the future, at such time as the need of</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											the residents can be determined.	
Nottingdale Ltd	Nottingdale Ltd	London Planning Practice LLP	9.3.15	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS491	Paragraph 9.3.15 recognises that the Nottingdale Village (NDV) development has changed the nature of the area and that the development provides a greater stimulus for local shopping. The development completed and approved to date therefore represents a positive element that will help to underpin the delivery of the new Latimer Town Centre.		<p>Para 9.3.15</p> <p>The Proposed Submission Core Strategy recognises that the newly built headquarters office buildings in the Freston Road provide a stimulus for local shopping, and as such will help support the provision of a new neighbourhood centre in the vicinity. The suggested addition to para 9.3.15 is, therefore, considered unnecessary.</p>	No change.
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		9.4.2	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS103	<p>9.4.2 <i>The Council has allocated the North Kensington Sports Centre as a Strategic Site (Chapter 23). The allocation is for a new academy (with a floor area no less than 6,000m² or 64,600ft²), the retention of the existing sports centre, or its relocation within the vicinity; external recreation facilities; and element of residential development depending on the layout of the site, and the incorporation of Combined Cooling Heat and Power network. In addition, the Freston Road Garage Site will deliver 63 affordable residential units.</i></p> <p>While the Kensington Sports Centre is not located in Golborne, it provides the only swimming pool in North Kensington and is therefore of great importance to Golborne people. The Golborne Forum requests an assurance that there will be continued public access to swimming facilities. The existing pool should be kept open until any new pool within the proposed leisure centre/academy development is opened. The Forum requests a further assurance that there should be a full-size swimming pool, at least as large as and preferably bigger than the current one, as well as a training pool for children and others learning to swim.</p>		<p>The Council is committed to providing a swimming pool on the wider site. This forms part of the allocation for the sports centre as set out in Policy CA4 of the Core Strategy. This swimming pool will be available for use by the public.</p> <p>However, the Council cannot at this time include a statement within the Core Strategy which sets out any detailed phasing of development of this site, or which commits itself to guaranteeing that the pool not be closed on a temporary basis to enable to redevelopment of the site. Any such assurance could jeopardise the wider regeneration of the area as could limit the Council's options with regard detailed phasing. This is not appropriate.</p> <p>Similarly the nature of the facilities and activities to be provided in the sports centre cannot be provided within the Core Strategy, as firstly are too detailed a matter for inclusion, and secondly are matters which can only be determined in the future, at such time as the need of the residents can be determined.</p>	No change
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		9.4.3	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS105	<p>9.4.3 <i>The following infrastructure that would help deliver the vision for Latimer has been identified:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>a new academy serving the north of the Borough to address the under supply of school places;</i> • <i>the academy will have its own sports facilities, including external sports pitches;</i> • <i>provision of a public sports centre (be this retained in situ or relocated), which offers equivalent sports facilities to the existing centre, including a swimming pool;</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>upgrading of the Hammersmith and City Lines to improve public transport provision in the area;</i> • <i>improvements to pedestrian links over the West Cross Route and West London Line to improve access to the public transport network;</i> • <i>co-ordinating of health premises to better align service provision.</i> <p>While the Kensington Sports Centre is not located in Golborne, it provides the only swimming pool in North Kensington and is therefore of great importance to Golborne people. The Golborne Forum requests an assurance that there will be continued public access to swimming facilities. The existing pool should be kept open until any new pool within the proposed leisure centre/academy development is opened. The Forum requests a further assurance that there should be a full-</p>		<p>The Council is committed to providing a swimming pool on the wider site. This forms part of the allocation for the sports centre as set out in Policy CA4 of the Core Strategy. This swimming pool will be available for use by the public.</p> <p>However, the Council cannot at this time include a statement within the Core Strategy which sets out any detailed phasing of development of this site, or which commits itself to guaranteeing that the pool not be closed on a temporary basis to enable to redevelopment of the site. Any such assurance could jeopardise the wider regeneration of the area as could limit the Council's options with regard detailed phasing. This is not appropriate.</p> <p>Similarly the nature of the facilities and activities to be provided in the sports centre cannot be provided within the Core Strategy, as firstly are too detailed a matter for inclusion, and secondly are matters which can only be determined in the future, at such time as the need of the residents can be determined.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									size swimming pool, at least as large as and preferably bigger than the current one, as well as a training pool for children and others learning to swim.			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.1.1	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS361	<p>p80 Chapter 10 Earls Court</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>10.1.1 and 10.1.3</p> <p>The proposed change clarifies that the text refers to the locality within RBKC to be accurate and avoid possible confusion with the Earls Court exhibition centre site itself or Earls Court as a town centre or the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area within LBHF.</p>		The area of the Earls Court 'place' includes the area of the strategic site, the town centre, some of the surrounding residential areas and parts of Warwick Road. This includes most of the Earl's Court ward with part of the Abingdon Ward. The general area of the 'place' is shown on the map on page 44 and the area of the strategic site is clearly defined by the map in chapter 26. The Regeneration Area is a name given by LBHF, and does not apply to the RBKC portion of the Site. However, when discussing the entire site, the Council will refer to the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, which is consistent with naming in the draft London Plan.	No change proposed to the use of Earl's Court with regards to the Place, but propose consistent use throughout regarding the Strategic Site and wider Opportunity Area.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.1.2	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS363	<p>10.1.2</p> <p>The proposed change reflects the possibility of a changed status for the existing Earls Court town centre. The probability of a reclassification is not known; the RLP continues to designate it as a District Centre.</p> <p>Reference to the one way system impacting upon the centre is a more accurate reflection of the effects of the current arrangement. Whilst the road system segregates the centre and adversely impacts on the environment, there are strong pedestrian links across road system. "Shattered" is in any event, overly emotive language in this context.</p>		The Council recognises that the existing Earl's Court Road shopping centre is of a scale which could be classified either as a (large) neighbourhood or (small) district centre. The Council's Retail Needs Assessment does however note that its key role is for convenience shopping, with a "limited selection of comparison shops reflecting the centre's role as a predominantly local convenience shopping and service destination". The Council has therefore taken the view that the 'neighbourhood' designation is appropriate. This position was supported by the Mayor's office when publishing the Review of the London Plan in April 2009. The designation has however since been upgraded to a 'district centre' in the 'draft replacement London Plan'. The Council notes that the GLA have not raised any objections to Royal Borough's designation of Earl's Court as a neighbourhood centre at any stage of the evolution of the Core Strategy. No objection has been raised at the proposed submission version.	No change to existing designation, but propose change to 10.1.2.
Brookfield Developments	Brookfield Developments (UK) Ltd	DP9	10.1.3	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS62	10.1.3 The Warwick Road is located to the north of Cromwell Road and comprises 5 large sites incorporating retail, residential and commercial uses. The corridor is earmarked for high density residential led mixed use development, with a number of the sites subject to proposals and/or planning permissions for major redevelopment.		Agree changes to introduce the current situation at Warwick Road. However, disagree with making reference to density.	Propose change to 10.1.2.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.1.3	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS362	The proposed change clarifies that the text refers to the locality within RBKC to be accurate and avoid possible confusion with the Earls Court exhibition centre site itself or Earls Court as a town centre or the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area within LBHF.		The area of the Earls Court 'place' includes the area of the strategic site, the town centre, some of the surrounding residential areas and parts of Warwick Road. This includes most of the Earl's Court ward with part of the Abingdon Ward. The general area of the 'place' is shown on the map on page 44 and the area of the strategic site is clearly defined by the map in chapter 26. The Regeneration Area is a name given by LBHF, and does not apply to the RBKC portion of the Site. However, when discussing the entire site, the Council will refer to the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, which is consistent with naming in the draft London Plan.	No change proposed to the use of Earl's Court with regards to the Place, but propose consistent use throughout regarding the Strategic Site and wider Opportunity Area.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.1.6	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS364	<p>10.1.6</p> <p>The proposed change adds recognition that access and servicing arrangements for the Exhibition Centre complex will need continued support until redevelopment occurs, and improvements to alter in the future to serve the day to day operational needs of the existing business.</p>		The text refers to "major changes", however this would be clearer if amended to reflect "major redevelopment" where applications for servicing and access arrangements would be considered in accordance with the development plan and other material considerations.	Propose change to 10.1.6

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.3.2	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS366	10.3.2 The proposed changes reflect more accurately the context for assessing improvements to the one way system and necessary provisos having regard to the information currently available, as explained in the Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.		Noted. Propose change to be consistent with changes to CT1, which includes consideration for investigation and implementation of returning the one-way system to two-way working.	Propose change to 10.3.2.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.3.6	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS367	10.3.6 The proposed change clarifies the importance of the townscape heritage issues in considering new development in the area. Reference to "crucial" implies the success of Earls Court as an area is dependent on these heritage considerations. Impacts on listed buildings and conservation areas will be given relevant weight by other policies in the Core Strategy and under PPG15 guidance. However, this will be one of a range of material considerations, of varying importance, that development proposals would need to address and will depend on the specific circumstances of the site and scheme.		The consideration of the historic environment is crucial to the delivery of an acceptable scheme within Earl's Court. This is consistent with Core Strategy Policy CL4.	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.3.7	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS368	10.3.7 The text clarifies the legacy for the area will be underpinned by development proposals across the wider Regeneration Area and that the existing Earls Court Road centre is a district centre in the hierarchy.		This sentence refers to the potential legacy from the redevelopment of regeneration area. Propose change to be consistent with the Core Strategy, being a neighbourhood centre. The Council recognises that the existing Earl's Court Road shopping centre is of a scale which could be classified either as a (large) neighbourhood or (small) district centre. The Council's Retail Needs Assessment does however note that its key role is for convenience shopping, with a "limited selection of comparison shops reflecting the centre's role as a predominantly local convenience shopping and service destination". The Council has therefore taken the view that the 'neighbourhood' designation is appropriate. This position was supported by the Mayor's office when publishing the Review of the London Plan in April 2009. The designation has however since been upgraded to a 'district centre' in the 'draft replacement London Plan'. The Council notes that the GLA have not raised any objections to Royal Borough's designation of Earl's Court as a neighbourhood centre at any stage of the evolution of the Core Strategy. No objection has been raised at the proposed submission version.	Propose change to 10.3.7.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.3.8	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS369	10.3.8 Reference to a convention centre within the Earls Court or Olympia complexes is deleted as such a facility is no longer being actively pursued at this time. The text confirms that a significant destination use should be provided on the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area instead, reflecting the draw of the site at present		It remains the ambition of the Council to maintain the "Earl's Court" Brand and as such, the retention of an international convention or exhibition centre, or a cultural facility of at least national significance is considered crucial to the redevelopment of the site. The wider Earl's Court Strategic Site includes land within LBHF, which the Council cannot set policy for as part of the Core Strategy. The title Earl's Court and West Kensington Regeneration Area is the name given by LBHF and not used for land within RBKC.	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.3.11	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS370	10.3.11 The proposed change recognises the potential for a new town centre designation within the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area, reflecting the range and scale of land uses proposed across the site and its status as an Opportunity Area in the Replacement London Plan.		The Council does not dispute that an appropriate range of convenience shopping facilities will be required. It is considered that Policy CA7 permits small-scale retail development and associated uses to serve the day to day needs of the new development. However, the place will be revised to reflect the Council's support for this retail provision to be	Propose change to 10.3.10 and consistent reference to the Earl's Court Opportunity Area.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											designated as a centre in the centre.	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.3.12	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS371	<p>10.3.12</p> <p>The proposed change seeks a more diverse housing tenure creating a sustainable balanced community with flexibility required (not unduly constrained by existing tenure mix). The changes clarify the amount of residential development that can be supported across the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area, based on the evidence base presented by Capital & Counties and reflecting London Plan densities and public transport accessibility. It is recognised that these figures will be refined as a result of analysis feeding in to the Planning Framework (OAPF) and a subsequent Masterplan but the potential capacity of the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area is established and should be reflected.</p>		<p>The tenure mix must be in accordance with local and boroughwide housing need, as identified at the time of any planning application. The text will be revised to reflect this. The housing figure is based on the figures in the London Plan and Strategic Site, which are minimum figures. The exact quantum of development and land use distribution across the entire site will be confirmed in the joint planning brief, which will be based on the findings of the transport study and urban design analysis.</p> <p>The wider Earl's Court Strategic Site includes land within LBHF, which the Council cannot set policy for as part of the Core Strategy. The Regeneration Area is a name given by LBHF, and does not apply to the RBKC portion of the Site. However, when discussing the entire site, the Council will refer to the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, which is consistent with naming in the draft London Plan.</p>	Proposed change to 10.3.12 and consistent reference to the Earl's Court Opportunity Area.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.3.15	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS372	<p>10.3.15</p> <p>The proposed changes reflect a deliverable goal for the one way system whilst acknowledging that further feasibility work is required. Reference is introduced seeking Council support for the assessment of initiatives which is important as RBKC is a stakeholder with a role enabling transport and public realm improvements</p>		Noted. Propose change to be consistent with changes to CT1, which includes consideration for investigation and implementation of returning the one-way system to two-way working.	Propose change to 10.3.15.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	10.3.16	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS373	<p>10.3.16</p> <p>A consistent use of "wider Earls Court Regeneration Area" is required for clarity.</p>		The Regeneration Area is a name given by LBHF, and does not apply to the RBKC portion of the Site. However, when discussing the entire site, the Council will refer to the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, which is consistent with naming in the draft London Plan.	Propose changes throughout to ensure consistent naming.
Ms Hanna Shaw	Transport for London (TfL)		10.4.2	Paragraph				PSubCS86	<p>Thank you for your email yesterday. Our letter was not intended as a formal representation but simply to set our views on the future development of The Earls Court Regeneration Area.</p> <p>Please note' that the following comments represent the views of o Property Development (TfL CFPD) In its capacity as a significant lan response. They should not be taken to represent an indication of an emerging policy document.</p> <p>TfL. as a significant landowner of part of the Earls Court Regenerati itself). have been examining the future development opportunities Earls Court Regeneration Area.</p> <p>As stated In</p> <p>10.3.4 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy. we will be closely development in the area in conjunction with other key stakeholder</p>		<p>Comments and support for the comments by Capital and Counties noted.</p> <p>Disagree with the proposed changes to the quantum of development. These figures are consistent the strategic site allocation and calculated to reflect the draft London Plan allocation for this site within RBKC, reflecting a calculation of the development capacity of the site. The London Plan and Core Strategy Policy CA7 states that these figures are minimums, being subject to detailed design and transport capacity.</p> <p>There is a forecast for a 15% growth in demand for office floorspace in Kensington and Chelsea. This equates to nearly 70,000sqm of new floorspace. Whilst Policy CF5 will protect offices, the need to satisfy this demand remains. The Core Strategy allocates 10,000sqm in two of its main strategic sites, namely Kensal and Earl's Court as these (Crossrail permitting) will be in twohighly accessible locations.</p> <p>Policy CA7 has been revised to make provision for</p>	Propose change to 10.4.2.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Alterations are proposed to the output indicators to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the contribution the site makes to meeting housing targets, being one of the Strategic Objectives - potential improvements to the one way system to reflect a deliverable output - clarification of the destination use proposed for the Earls Court strategic site - reference to connections to a district energy source for new development to provide flexibility for future sustainable heat and energy solutions. Reference to "the" district energy source is deleted as there may be a series of smaller sources (eg small scale CHPs) and the provision may also be phased. 		for the one way system will be revised to reflect Policy CT1. Disagree with proposed wording for the cultural facility, as the Council's intention to retain a cultural facility of at least national significance in this location. The output indicator for the district heat and energy network will also better reflect the contents in the place, but not as proposed by the respondent as this is requirement of the strategic site.	
Dr Michael Dixon	Natural History Museum	Drivers Jonas	12.3.3	Paragraph	Yes	No	Justified	PSubCS88	<p>Comments and Response</p> <p>Policy Context The Museum's comments are based on Planning Policy Statement : <i>hrough Local Spatial Planning</i> (PPS12, June 2008) and it is considered does not meet the tests of 'soundness' as set out in this document. PPS12 (para. 4.52) states that "to be 'sound' a Core Strategy should POLICY."</p> <p>Paragraph 4.36 states that for a Core Strategy to be justified, it must be: founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasons. It is therefore essential that core strategies are based on a robust evidence base should contain two elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation : evidence of the views of the local community and stake in the future of the area - Research / fact finding : evidence " <p>Our comments below are based on the above criteria for the assessment:</p> <p>London • Paris • Frankfurt • Madrid • Slough • Birmingham and Drivers Jonas LLP ; a limited liability partnership registered in the United Kingdom . A list of members ' names is open for inspection . London EC4N 7 SL 165 5523411</p> <p>Planning Services -2-9 December 2009 Commentary</p> <p>Our comments relate specifically to Section 1, Part 12 of the Core Strategy 'Opportunities' in relation to South Kensington.</p> <p>The Natural History Museum is an important consideration in the final Quarter and Exhibition Road proposals. On this basis, as a key stakeholder account and incorporated into the final Core Strategy. This approach is set out within PPS12.</p> <p>The Consultation Draft of the Core Strategy, para. 12.3.3 stated in relation to the Museum Grounds " [the Grounds] needs better management so that it 's primary purpose is to provide 'essential' breath in the space ' for visitors . "</p> <p>The Museum made substantial representations to the Consultation and the Museum Grounds are primarily 'public open space.' This is in the context of the Museum and whilst they provide a function as open space, this is not detailed in the Museum's representations.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the Museum's representations, the Proposed Sub-Strategy states that the Grounds' primary purpose should remain as public open space. The submitted comments incorrectly states:</p> <p>" The Council considers that the space outside the Natural History Museum is private space for use of the visitors of the museum. This is not strictly correct in so far as the public have access to this space and entry through the museum is not required to use it. Access to the space can be freely obtained from the forecourt and indeed the Museum use the space to be freely accessible to the public when they have events such as ice skating at Christmas . A more accurate description is considered to be 'publicly accessible open space' and the text is recommended to be altered on this basis.</p> <p>On this basis, it is considered that the Council have not adequately reflected the facts presented by a key stakeholder. The potential risk of this is to reflect the current or actual role of the Museum's Grounds. Therefore this paragraph is not 'justified' as required by PPS12.</p> <p>On this basis, in order to address this issue, we recommend that the following text be added to the Core Strategy, in relation to the Museum Grounds: " The East Lawn of the Natural History Museum , on the corner of Exhibition Road , is to be used as a public open space for the Museum . The forthcoming Grounds Strategy , preparation of a management plan to review the use of this area and the wider area around the Museum . "</p>		We note the view of the Museum that the space outside the frontage of the museum is private space for use of the visitors of the museum. This is not strictly correct in so far as the public have access to this space and entry through the museum is not required to use it. Access to the space can be freely obtained from the forecourt and indeed the Museum use the space to be freely accessible to the public when they have events such as ice skating at Christmas . A more accurate description is considered to be 'publicly accessible open space' and the text is recommended to be altered on this basis.	The reference to 'public open space' at paragraph 12.3.3 is reasoned justification paragraph 12.3.3 is recommended to be replaced with reference to 'publicly accessible open space'.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p><i>This Strategy will review the use of the grounds as open space for visitors as well as assessing suitable areas to accommodate events which are important to the Museum and vital to its commercial viability. Any use of this space must respect the setting of the Grade I Listed Waterhouse Building. "</i></p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Natural History Museum is generally supportive of the policies and vision within the Core Strategy and is pleased that RBKC have made a number of references to the importance of the Museum within the vision for South Kensington. The Natural History Museum does however have significant concerns in relation to the wording of para. 12.3.3 of the proposed Submission Draft and in particular concerns that the Council have not based the above section of the Core Strategy on a credible evidence base as required by PPS12. We trust that the above comments will be taken into account, however, please do not hesitate to contact Adam Donovan (020 7896 8263) or me should you have any queries or require any further information. Planning Services -3-9 December 2009 In addition, we reserve the right to submit further representations and would be grateful if you could keep us up to date on the progress of this document. Yours faithfully</p>			
Mr Graham King	Westminster Council		12.3.5	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS31	<p>We have met with members of your policy team on several occasions during the drafting of our respective Core Strategies and are still in regular contact. We have agreed an approach to support the designated Strategic Cultural Area. We support and will continue to discuss the possible designation of a World Heritage Site in South Kensington to deliver a shared vision for the area.</p>		Support for the soundness of the Core Strategy.	No further action required.
Ms Hanna Shaw	Transport for London (TfL)		12.3.9	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS281	<p>TfL as landowner:</p> <p>1. Paragraph 12.3.9 states that retail units could be introduced along the north side of Pelham Street, paragraph 12.4.3 also refers to Pelham Street having the potential for new retail development on the ground floor. From discussions at officer level we understand that this would weaken existing retail nodes in the borough which is not desirable. Additionally as land owner our agents have advised that the foot fall or even potential foot fall would not sustain retail along Pelham Street and therefore not be a deliverable solution. TfL therefore request that reference to retail along Pelham Street is preferably removed or in the very least stated as 'Retail along Pelham Street is an aspiration of the borough's however will require market analysis on achieving a sustainable occupancy and leading to full regeneration of the station and surrounding area' .</p>		The Council believes that far from weakening the existing retail nodes retail development in Pelham Street would enhance connectivity between South Kensington and Brompton Cross and strengthening both centres. In addition, the Council has recently commissioned footfall counts for South Kensington and Brompton Cross as supporting information for the Core Strategy http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planningandconservation/planningpolicy/evidencebaseddocuments/footfalldatafortowncentres.aspx which indicates that there could be sufficient footfall along Pelham Street to sustain retail.	The requested change is rejected.
Ms Hanna Shaw	Transport for London (TfL)		12.4.4	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS282	<p>As landowner:</p> <p>2. TfL notes that under paragraph 12.4.4 that A) modernisation of South Kensington station to provide step-free access and B) improve the pedestrian foot tunnel have been grouped together in the last bullet point. TfL requests that the reference to the pedestrian foot tunnel be shown as a separate point. What needs to be addressed is whether there is a mechanism by which general s106 contributions could subsidise these improvements otherwise any over station development will have to pay for both the station improvements (including step-free access and congestion relief) and the pedestrian foot tunnel and this is not deliverable.</p>		The Council accepts that it may be appropriate to use general s106 contributions to subsidise improvements to the pedestrian tunnel.	The reference to the pedestrian foot tunnel will be shown as a separate point.
Mr Brian Harvey	Royal Marsden Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	The Barton Willmore Planning Partnership	13.3.10	Paragraph		Yes		PSubCS19		We support the Core Strategy's recognition of the strategic need to support the Royal Marsden Hospital as a facility of local and international importance. We conclude that the specified support is justified and sound.	Support to the soundness of the Core Strategy. No further action required.	Support to the soundness of the Core Strategy. No further action required.
Welcome Trust		Cluttons LLP	14.1.1	Paragraph		Yes		PSubCS156	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We support the proposals to improve pedestrian movement between Knightsbridge and South Kensington 		Support for soundness of the Core Strategy.	No further action required.
Hon. Secretary Carol	Knightsbridge Association		14.3.1	Paragraph		No	Justified	PSubCS225	We believe that there remain aspects of the chapter which are not justified because they do not properly plan for the balance between these activities. In addition there are parts which will not		Knightsbridge is the only International centre in the borough so the chapter's emphasis on shopping needs is not disproportionate. Residential amenity is a borough-	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Seymour-Newton									<p>be effective in practice.</p> <p>In the case of Knightsbridge, the Priorities for Action section (14.3) states that RBKC's number one aim is to "create more retail floorspace, be this by the intensification of retail uses within the centre or by the expansion of the centre itself" (14.3.2). By contrast, the needs of residents figure much lower in the list of priorities (14.3.6) and the Keeping Life Local section is still confined solely to 'shopping needs'. This section is unjustified because it places disproportionate emphasis on Knightsbridge's role as an international shopping centre. As a result the wording of policy CP13, in pledging support for 'proposals likely to favour independent and high end retail and to maintain the area's high quality of life.', is weak. Equally the monitoring indicator no. 2 'Has Knightsbridge retained its identity as an important residential quarter and a service centre?' is inadequate; quality of life must be monitored.</p> <p>The Knightsbridge Association would therefore request that 'quality of life' for Knightsbridge residents be given equal emphasis to the fostering of commercial interests.</p> <p>Recommendation 1: the following 'quality of life' goals should be woven into this section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning and conservation 2. Traffic: through traffic minimisation in residential areas; parking controls 3. Law and order: crime control 4. Air quality and noise control 5. Proper limits on licensing and late night drinking 6. Residents' amenity and rights 		<p>wide issue that is covered by Policy CL5 in the Renewing the Legacy chapter. However, there is no cost effective way of monitoring residential amenity, hence Policy CL5 is monitored through the percentage of permissions where CVL5 was a reason for refusal.</p>	
Hon. Secretary Carol Seymour-Newton	Knightsbridge Association		14.3.11	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS227	<p>14.3.11 Montpelier Street</p> <p>The area round Montpelier Street is densely residential. Over the past three years, residents with the help of the Knightsbridge Association have fought and won battles against disturbances from two restaurants and one pub on Montpelier Street. We have been supported in these cases by Westminster City Council, which covers the vast majority of Montpelier Street. We are concerned that the Strategy should not suggest any increase in such on-street activities in such an inappropriate location.</p> <p>Justified. RBKC's proposals to introduce commercial activities (specifically 'alfresco dining, street markets and events') into an historically residential street are not justified. This is because they are not 'founded on a robust and credible evidence base'. In particular, there is no 'evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area' as required by the 2004 Act. Quite the opposite, in fact: the Knightsbridge Association, which represents local residents, twice informed RBKC that the local community was opposed to such proposals being included in the LDF. The KA's request that the proposals be removed from the LDF was unjustifiably ignored by RBKC.</p>		<p>The Council is committed to work in partnership with Westminster to achieve a shared vision for the area. The Core Strategy states 'The possibility of implementing public realm improvements in Montpelier Street to provide space for alfresco dining, market stalls and events will be investigated' and Westminster supports this statement.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Effective.</p> <p>RBKC's proposals for Montpelier Street are not effective. This is because they do not fulfil the following three criteria of the Statement of Representations Procedure:</p> <p>i. The proposals are not based on 'sound infrastructure and delivery planning'. Montpelier Street is a densely populated residential area where commercial activities are limited to local shops operating during normal shopping hours. Introducing al fresco dining and drinking would disrupt the character of the street and endanger the central Licensing Objectives. Montpelier Street is used by local traffic accessing residential housing and by through traffic between Knightsbridge and Brompton Road. Introducing 'street markets and events' would close this thoroughfare and cause unacceptable disruption.</p> <p>ii. The proposals do not 'have delivery partners who are signed up to it'. The local community opposes the proposals and ward councillors representing the major part of Montpelier Street (which is in Westminster) support the local community's objections.</p> <p>iii. The proposals do not fulfil the criterion of 'coherence with the strategies of neighbouring Authorities'. Only a very small portion of Montpelier Street (the portion of the west side of the street [only] which runs from Brompton Road to Cheval Place [only]) falls within RBKC. The remaining, much larger portion of the street falls within Westminster. RBKC officials have not consulted their Westminster colleagues before producing these proposals. They have not ascertained WCC's attitude to the proposed commercialisation of a residential street largely contained within WCC. They should now accept that the proposals are opposed by local WCC Ward Councillors and by local residents.</p> <p>Recommendation: these concerns should be addressed by amending 14.3.12 and the text on the map opposite to say "The possibility of working with Westminster to implement public realm improvements in Montpelier Street including a shared surface scheme will be investigated". Consequential amendment is needed to the monitoring chapter at 14.4.7.</p>			
Mr Graham King	Westminster Council		14.3.12	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS32	We will work together to secure a better quality public realm in Knightsbridge, and support the need for the possibility of implementing alfresco dining, outdoor market stalls and space for events in Montpelier Street. We are keen to continue to work jointly with you to implement the Exhibition Road public realm project.		Support the soundness of the Core Strategy.	No further action required
London Fire Brigade	London Fire Brigade	Drivers Jonas	15.3.6	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS319	<u>MAP 15</u> THE LFB SUBMITTED REPRESENTATIONS TO THE PREVIOUS ROUNDS OF CONSULTATION. THE LFB HAS IDENTIFIED THE CHELSEA STATION TO BE SUITABLE FOR REDEVELOPMENT AND WISH TO REDEVELOP THE EXISTING SITE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OVERALL VISION FOR THE AREA. LFB SUPPORTS MAP 15 WHICH IDENTIFIES THE ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE KINGS ROAD AND SLOANE SQUARE AREA BUT WOULD WELCOME THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLORE OPTIONS FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE EXISTING FIRE STATION TO MEET THE VISION FOR THE AREA.		This is not a question of soundness. The Council would welcome exploring possible new uses for the Chelsea Fire Station Site as and when appropriate. Any discussions will be influenced by the content of the Core Strategy. Two particular strands of policy will be relevant, policies within Keeping Life Local regarding social and community uses, and secondly the policies with fostering vitality which consider appropriate town centre uses.	No change.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		16.1.4	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS197	Para 16.1.4 refers to the proliferation of poor-quality fast food outlets in Notting Hill Gate and para 16.3.3 states that the Council will discourage applications for new hot-food takeaways. We suggest that the paragraph refers to health benefits of reducing an over concentration of fast food outlets, which could be supported by wider healthy eating initiatives.		The reasons for controlling the proliferation of fast food outlets are not explicit in para 16.1.4 to ensure that the Core Strategy is succinct. The reasons for controlling the number of fast food outlets in para 16.3.3 is based on the existing number within the centre and the fact that these do not cater for the local community. The impact of the fast food outlets on health would not be a reason for resisting applications, but considered in the Council's Health Impact Assessment 2009.	No change proposed.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy		16.3.3	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with	PSubCS198	Para 16.1.4 refers to the proliferation of poor-quality fast food outlets in Notting Hill Gate and para 16.3.3 states that the Council will discourage applications for new hot-food takeaways. We suggest that the paragraph refers to health benefits of reducing an over concentration of fast food outlets, which could be supported by wider healthy eating initiatives.		The reasons for controlling the proliferation of fast food outlets are not explicit in para 16.1.4 to ensure that the Core Strategy is succinct. The reasons for controlling the	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
	Urban Development HUDU						national policy		initiatives.		number of fast food outlets in para 16.3.3 is based on the existing number within the centre and the fact that these do not cater for the local community. The impact of the fast food outlets on health would not be a reason for resisting applications, but considered in the Council's Health Impact Assessment 2009.	
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturgeon on behalf of Metro Shopping Fund LP	16.3.4	Paragraph		No	Justified	PSubCS7	<p>The first sentence which suggests that the centre has a role as a major office location, providing a range of accommodation is unsound in that it is not justified by a robust evidence base and indeed is factually incorrect. Notting Hill Gate is not a major office location and demand for offices in this location has consistently been weak.</p> <p>The Council's own Employment Land Study identifies much of the office space within the Borough being concentrated in and around Kensington High Street and further south, and does not identify Notting Hill Gate as a major office location.</p> <p>There are very few offices within Notting Hill Gate, with most of the space being contained within just one office building; namely Newcombe House, where the space is of poor quality and has persistently been difficult to let and keep occupied. Furthermore, Newcombe House is identified by the Council as an "eye sore", which it would ideally like to redevelop.</p> <p>The Employment Land Studies will be before the Inspector, however, it should be noted that Roger Tym & Partners rightly draw attention to the GLA's London Office Policy Review that concludes that at any one time, outstanding planning permissions should equal at least 3.5 years supply. The updated research by Roger Tym finds that there is already an eight year supply of planning permissions.</p> <p>The revised analysis by Roger Tym published in September 2009 suggests that over the plan period to 2026, a total net addition of 69,000 m² of offices will be required. A net addition of 46,000 m² is already under construction or has planning permission, which is sufficient to meet office demand until 2017. This supply does not include allocations. Previously analysis undertaken by Roger Tym found that seven allocated sites within the Borough offered the potential for a net addition of a further 30,000 m², bringing the total supply to some 76,000 m², which is considerably more than the 69,000 m² required for the whole of the plan period to 2026. In addition, unallocated sites are likely to continue to come forward for office development. A good recent example of this is the Yellow Building off Freston Road, which provided 26,000 m².</p> <p>Furthermore, the Employment Land Study does not take into account the enormous amount of office development that is being promoted at Earls Court. The draft Core Strategy already suggests that 10,000 m² of offices would be acceptable and the plans are for several times this.</p> <p>As such, it would be appropriate for the Core Strategy to allow some flexibility in the future planning of poor quality existing office space in locations where demand is weak, so that such space would be better able to meet the Borough's other competing needs.</p> <p>The first sentence of paragraph 16.3.4 should be deleted, which would make this element of the Core Strategy sound. The corresponding plan on page 170 which includes Notting Hill Gate as having a concentration of offices should also be amended so that it is excluded.</p>		<p>Notting Hill Gate is considered a major office location due to the good public transport accessibility level and the large amount of flexible office accommodation in Newcombe House, which offers large and small floor plates.</p> <p>The Council recognises that the outstanding permissions for office floorspace will meet the predicted office need to 2017. Assuming all this floorspace is built out, a further 23,000 sq m will have to be provided within the plan period. Whilst the Council has allocated 20,000 of this floorspace, and does expect other windfall schemes to provide the remainder, these figures are reliant on the retention of the existing office floorspace. The loss of any existing floorspace will mean that additional floorspace must be found from additional windfalls over the plan period. This is by no means certain as there is a finite number of sites available within the Borough, and each will be subject to competition from a number of competing uses. Given the policy presumption in favour of new residential development, and the 'higher value of housing' there is no guarantee that significant additional windfall office sites will come through.</p> <p>It is, therefore, important that existing office floorspace is protected. This approach is supported by the Employment Land Review Update which does note in para 6.4 that "if forecast demand for offices ...are to be met, the Council needs to control losses of office sites to other uses".</p> <p>Furthermore para 6.9 is explicit in noting that "...demand can only be met if no existing sites are lost (without being replaced).</p> <p>The Employment Land Study does not take into account the office development being postulated at Earls' Court. It cannot be given that this space has yet to have been permitted, or allocated by Hammersmith and Fulham Council (the majority of the site and employment floorspace lying in this borough.) The Core Strategy allocates 10,000 sq m of office space within this Borough, although I note that the owners for this site are seeking in their representations to get this figure reduced. The Council will update the ELPS on a regular basis to take changing predictions/ increases in supply into account.</p> <p>One of the purposes of the Core Strategy is to look across the lifetime of the plan, and to have the policies necessary to ensure that the employment needs of the Borough are met. A long term view is taken. The Council should not plan for the recession, but right up to 2026. If uses are lost as may not be 'needed' in the short term, there is very little chance that the original uses will be regained. Indeed in the case of housing, there will be a policy presumption against the loss of housing to other uses.</p> <p>However, the Council does recognise that viability is a</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>material consideration, and the Council will have to take into account any evidence which shows that a given premises is not viable/suitable in the longer term.</p> <p>The Core Strategy recognises that the Council contains locally import concentrations of offices in the wards around Kensington High Street and South Kensington. There are also concentrations within the other higher order centres. The Council wishes to protect all offices in all areas where they exist, whether there is a particular concentration or not. The only exception being for large and medium offices (outside of Employment Zones) where there are not located in accessible areas. Notting Hill Gate is a district centre and an areas classified within the TfL PTAL map as having "excellent access to public transport". As such it is considered to be a suitable location for offices. Offices are a 'town centre use' which benefit from high accessibility, both in terms of their desirability, and in terms of trip generation.</p> <p>There is no contradiction with the Council's desire to protect small offices across the Borough. Large firms may provide the majority of B1 jobs within the Borough, but this does not mean that the majority of B1 premises cannot be small in scale. The 2007 ELPS estimates that only 11 % of units across the Borough have a floor area greater than 300 sq m. This illustrates the importance of protecting both large and small B1premises across the Borough.</p>	
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturge on behalf of Metro Shopping Fund LP	16.3.6	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS8	<p>The last six words of paragraph 16.3.6, which requires major development to provide "affordable shops" where appropriate, is unsound. This is because the requirement for "affordable shops" is not justified by a sufficiently robust and credible evidence base, would not be effective as it would not be sufficiently flexible to deal with changing circumstances, would not be deliverable in achieving its aims, would be out of step with the strategies of the neighbouring authorities and the requirement would not be consistent with national policy, where there is no basis for the concept of "affordable shops", with Government policy actively supporting a competitive and efficient retail sector, making it clear that it is not the role of the planning system to become involved in competition between retailers.</p> <p>In addition, the case against "affordable retail" can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retailers do not require "social support" in the same way as less fortunate members of our community require help with the provision of affordable housing. • Artificially supporting retailers who are unable to stand on their own two feet (because they do not attract enough shoppers to make them viable concerns) will weaken the vitality and viability of the town centre, not strengthen it. • If a proportion of new retail units in a development have to be supported, then in effect they will be subsidised by the other retailers in the scheme, which is clearly unfair and puts them at a competitive disadvantage. • This would simply be an additional tax on retail development, which would reduce the amount of shopping development within town centres, again harming their vitality and viability. What is important is that new retail development is encouraged as this is 		<p>The creation of affordable shops (to be managed under the Council's neighbourhood shopping policy) is one of the few tools in the Council's possession which allows it to take an active role in helping shape the nature of retailers within our town centres. It is a policy position that was initially put forward by the Council's Retail Commission.</p> <p>It is also a policy position which since has been supported by the Mayor for London, with Policy 4.9 of the Consultation Draft Replacement London Plan (Small shops) stating that "In considering proposals for large retail developments, the Mayor will seek contributions through planning obligations where appropriate, feasible and viable, to support the provision of affordable shop units suitable for small or independent retailers." Although this policy has yet to have been examined it clearly shows intended direction of the London Plan, a document which this Council will have to be in general conformity with, and a document which will form part of this Council's development plan.</p> <p>As with the requirement to provide a mix of unit sizes, the Council recognises that the provision of affordable shops will not always be appropriate, not where this will jeopardise the viability of the wider scheme. Furthermore, the provision of an affordable unit is one of a series of benefits which could be sought under the s106 system for suitable developments.</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>what will enhance centres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsidies are not needed. The market already provides a large spectrum of rents within each centre. The viability of a retail business is much more about getting the product right, effective merchandising, the ability to respond to demand and good marketing, than it is about rents. The Council is not the one best placed to choose what local shoppers want. The customer is. The concept of affordable shops is unworkable. It raises numerous questions such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would one identify which retailers would be eligible for a subsidised unit? What happens when that retailer is shown to be performing well – would they then have to vacate their business premises? If not, then what would be the mechanism for stopping a subsidy to a strong profitable business? Who would be responsible for monitoring and judging the performance of the subsidised retailers? <p>Such interference in the market should not be supported, when it has not been justified with robust and credible evidence, would not be effective and would be inconsistent with national policy.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the soundness of this element of the Core Strategy would be overcome with the deletion of the last six words of paragraph 16.3.6.</p>			
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturge on behalf of Metro Shopping Fund LP	16.4.5	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS10	<p>The third bullet point which requires the provision of affordable shops is unsound. This is because the requirement for “affordable shops” is not justified by a sufficiently robust and credible evidence base, would not be effective as it would not be sufficiently flexible to deal with changing circumstances, would not be deliverable in achieving its aims, would be out of step with the strategies of the neighbouring authorities and the requirement would not be consistent with national policy, where there is no basis for the concept of “affordable shops”, with Government policy actively supporting a competitive and efficient retail sector, making it clear that it is not the role of the planning system to become involved in competition between retailers.</p> <p>In addition, the case against “affordable retail” can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retailers do not require “social support” in the same way as less fortunate members of our community require help with the provision of affordable housing. Artificially supporting retailers who are unable to stand on their own two feet (because they do not attract enough shoppers to make them viable concerns) will weaken the vitality and viability of the town centre, not strengthen it. If a proportion of new retail units in a development have to be supported, then in effect they will be subsidised by the other retailers in the scheme, which is clearly unfair and puts them at a 		<p>The creation of affordable shops (to be managed under the Council's neighbourhood shopping policy) is one of the few tools in the Council's possession which allows it to take an active role in helping shape the nature of retailers within our town centres. It is a policy position that was initially put forward by the Council's Retail Commission.</p> <p>It is also a policy position which since has been supported by the Mayor for London, with Policy 4.9 of the Consultation Draft Replacement London Plan (Small shops) stating that "In considering proposals for large retail developments, the Mayor will seek contributions through planning obligations where appropriate, feasible and viable, to support the provision of affordable shop units suitable for small or independent retailers." Although this policy has yet to have been examined it clearly shows intended direction of the London Plan, a document which this Council will have to be in general conformity with, and a document which will form part of this Council's development plan.</p> <p>As with the requirement to provide a mix of unit sizes, the Council recognises that the provision of affordable shops will not always be appropriate, not where this will jeopardise the viability of the wider scheme.</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>competitive disadvantage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would simply be an additional tax on retail development, which would reduce the amount of shopping development within town centres, again harming their vitality and viability. What is important is that new retail development is encouraged as this is what will enhance centres. • Subsidies are not needed. The market already provides a large spectrum of rents within each centre. • The viability of a retail business is much more about getting the product right, effective merchandising, the ability to respond to demand and good marketing, than it is about rents. • The Council is not the one best placed to choose what local shoppers want. The customer is. • The concept of affordable shops is unworkable. It raises numerous questions such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How would one identify which retailers would be eligible for a subsidised unit? o What happens when that retailer is shown to be performing well – would they then have to vacate their business premises? o If not, then what would be the mechanism for stopping a subsidy to a strong profitable business? o Who would be responsible for monitoring and judging the performance of the subsidised retailers? <p>Such interference in the market should not be supported, when it has not been justified with robust and credible evidence, would not be effective and would be inconsistent with national policy.</p> <p>The deletion of the third bullet point under paragraph 16.4.5 would make this element of the Core Strategy sound.</p>		Furthermore, the provision of an affordable unit is one of a series of benefits which could be sought under the s106 system for suitable developments.	
Port of London Authority Lucy Owen	Port of London Authority		18.1.6	Paragraph	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS329	<p>Lots Road / Worlds End</p> <p>Paragraph 18.1 .6 states that there is the potential for a pedestrian and cycle bridge to be built either within or alongside the existing Cremorne Railway Bridge that would like North Battersea with Imperial Wharf station. Clearly any links such as bridges across the Thames will require early and detailed discussions with the PLA to ensure that any proposal does not have a detrimental impact on navigation, environment and river regime.</p> <p>Consideration should be given at Lots Road to the use of the River for the transport of construction and demolition materials to and from the development site. The use of the River in this way is sustainable and it would accord with Policy 4A.28 of the <i>London Plan</i> which seeks for wastes to be removed from sites and materials to be brought to sites by water wherever that is practicable.</p> <p>Paragraph 18.3.12 makes reference to Chelsea Creek being used as a recreational waterway providing physical access to the Thames . It is unclear what is meant by this so this statement should be clarified.</p>		<p>The Council is statutorily required to notify and seek advice from the PLA where development is proposed near or adjacent to the Thames, especially where the proposal may affect the navigation, environment and river regime. Any future application, which is received by the Council, would be referred to the PLA for advice to ensure compliance with Policy 4A.28 of the London Plan.</p> <p>The S106 Planning Obligation attached to the extant planning permission included Clause 20.9 which requires that the applicant is "to use all reasonable endeavours to procure the use of river transportation for such proportion of materials and construction traffic".</p> <p>This paragraph has been included to reflect the extant planning permission. The regeneration of Chelsea Creek has been considered through the imposition of Condition 12 of the extant planning permission (ref: PP/02/1324) which requires the submission, and approval, of a scheme for the treatment of Chelsea Creek. This scheme includes the provision of mooring posts at the Thames end of the Creek and boat-landing facilities within the Creek.</p> <p>Policy 4C.9 of the London Plan states that "the Mayor</p>	No change proposed

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									Paragraph 18.3.13 states 'the safeguarded Cremorne Wharf will be preserved for waste management purposes, and could be reactivated for river cargo handling purposes. It is also stated that the use of Cremorne Wharf for waste management purposes could generate a high volume of lorry movements.' It is questioned what the evidence base is for the statement that the use of the wharf for waste management purposes could generate a high volume of lorry movements. Additionally, Cremorne Wharf is a safeguarded wharf which policy 4C.9 of the <i>London Plan</i> protects for cargo handling uses. It is therefore considered that the wording should be changed to read "and will be reactivated for river cargo handling purposes."		will and boroughs should protect safeguarded wharves for cargo-handling facilities". This wording does not force the Council to protect these wharves; rather it is a more encouraging policy. Moreover, Policy CE3(a)(iv) provides that the Council will "safeguard the existing waste management sites along with Cremorne Wharf, maximising its use for waste management, water transport and cargo-handling purposes". As this Policy satisfies the requirements of the London Plan, it is not necessary to repeat these provisions within this paragraph.	
Circadian Ltd	Circadian Ltd	DP9	18.4.2	Paragraph		No	Justified	PSubCS278	This paragraph needs to be amended to refer to the correct floorspace areas for the different uses within the consented scheme for Lots Road Power Station. As such, this above section of the Core Strategy is not considered to be Sound as the floorspace figures are not justified. The evidence base for arriving at the figures stated in the document have not been stated.		The Council's Committee report is the only document which identifies the proposed floorspace calculations by Use Class for the Lots Road Power Station development. The reports prepared by the Planning Inspector and the Secretary of State do not provide any specific figures for each proposed Use Class, rather they refer to the general acceptability of the scheme. The Council does not have any evidence that these floorspace areas have been altered through the Appeal process. The difference in the numbers may be due to one set of figures being gross and the other net internal area. As such, the figures quoted within the Core Strategy are consistent with the Committee report. Notwithstanding this, the figure quoted for D1 Use should be amended to 977sqm, in lieu of 877sqm provided.	Change - amend the floorspace for Non-Residential Institutions (D1) to 977sqm to comply with Committee Report
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		19.1.1	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS128	Chapter 19 Strategic Sites Allocations. Please see also attached Sites Schedule. Thames Water's detailed comments on the Strategic Sites Allocations are set out in the attached Sites Schedule. In summary Thames Water has no objection in principle to the allocation of the identified sites for development. However, for some sites depending on the type and scale of development proposed, there may be capacity issues in relation to the existing water supply and sewerage networks. For these sites it may therefore be necessary for Thames Water to undertake investigations to determine the impact of any development proposed. As such it is recommended that the following paragraph should be added to the Core Strategy in respect of the relevant Strategic Sites Allocations. Water: "Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water infrastructure." Waste Water: "Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for		We note that Thames Water has no objection in principle to the allocation of the identified sites for development. Including the requested wording for all strategic sites will be repetitious and over lengthy. The Council's policy for infrastructure provision, including water and sewer infrastructure, is contained with Policy C1 (and its reasoning justification) which considers site specific infrastructure requirements as part of the planning application and planning brief. Policy CA4(i) states that the Council will identify detailed infrastructure requirements as part of the site specific planning brief. This will include consultation with Thames Water. Policy CE1 requires development to meet BREEAM Environmental Standards, which controls water consumption and manages sewer and surface water. Policy CE2(d) requires development to incorporate sustainable urban drainage measures to control the rate at which surface water is discharged into the sewer network. Furthermore, the strategic sites have been sequentially tested. There is a constant dialogue with Thames Water that will continue through the planning application stages. No changes required.	No changes required.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p><i>existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure."</i></p> <p>It is essential to ensure that adequate utilities infrastructure, particularly water and sewerage infrastructure is in place ahead of development, to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property, pollution of land and watercourses plus water shortages with associated low-pressure water supply problems.</p> <p>Water and sewerage undertakers have limited powers under the Water Industry Act to prevent connection to existing networks by developers, ahead of infrastructure upgrades and therefore rely heavily on the planning system to ensure infrastructure is provided ahead of development either through phasing or the use of planning conditions. It is therefore essential that there is a policy requiring the phasing of developments to ensure that they do not take place ahead of the necessary provision of infrastructure.</p> <p>Where the existing infrastructure is of insufficient capacity to cope with the proposed development we may require an 18-month to three-year lead in time for provision of extra capacity to drain new development sites. If any large engineering works are needed to upgrade infrastructure the lead in time could be up to five years..</p> <p>Planning Applications</p> <p>Thames Water would expect to be consulted on most major planning applications. Paragraph B4 of PPS12, states that "<i>the adequacy of infrastructure can be a material consideration in deciding whether permission should be granted.</i>" Paragraph 22 of PPS23, 2004, states at Appendix A that the following should be considered in the preparation of development plans and can be material in the consideration of individual planning applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of sewerage and sewage treatment and the availability of the existing sewerage infrastructure. • The need to make suitable provision for the drainage of surface water. • Compliance with water quality objectives. <p>Thames Water published and circulated in Summer 2007 to all LPAs in our area a " Guide for LPAs on Planning Application & Development Plan Consultation with Thames Water Utilities as Statutory Water and Sewerage Undertaker ". This will be of assistance to you when determining which planning applications to consult TWUL on and in the preparation of LDF documents.</p>			
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		20.2.2	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS104	<p>20.2.2 <i>The Council considers the site to have the have the capacity for upwards of 2,500 new dwellings and the Council considers that the site also has potential for at least 10,000m² of offices. It is also important to cater for the needs of the community and therefore an quantum of in excess of 2,000m² of non-residential floorspace, including social and community facilities is likely to be necessary to provide for local needs. The site would also reprove the existing Sainsbury's supermarket, which may be able to be expanded. This</i></p>		<p>The Council strongly endorses a mix of tenures and an over provision of social housing is no more beneficial to an integrated, socially connected community than an over-provision off market housing.</p> <p>The precise mix of unit sizes and tenures is not included, as this is a high level strategic document and further detailing will be included as part of more detailed</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p><i>should provide a better relationship with Ladbroke Grove and would form the hub of a new town centre which would be needed to meet the local needs of new residents as well as providing a better facility for the existing community. The sites have the potential to deliver a high-density</i></p> <p><i>development which meet a high standard of environmental sustainability¹.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum supports the proposal for a mixed community on the Gasworks site but would wish to see a substantial proportion of social and affordable housing in view of the housing need in the Borough.</p>		masterplanning.	
Ms Claire McAlister	British Waterways		20.2.6	Paragraph				PSubCS476	At 20.2.6, the Grand Union Canal should be seen as a focal point rather than an isolator of the site. We are not aware of being consulted on the Kensal Canalside Pre-feasibility Study, 2009, and would like to ensure that we are fully involved in proposals for this area.		<p>The Pre-feasibility study forms part of the Council's evidence base. The consultation process was internal. The discussions entailed virtually no master-planning as the study was limited to examining the potential for development on site.</p> <p>British Waterways are considered by the Council to be important to the success of the development and will be consulted as part of the preparation for the Kensal SPD</p>	No change
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		20.2.8	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS192	<p><i>20.2.8 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. 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.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum requests more information about this proposal for on-site waste treatment and an environmental assessment. The possibility of generating heat and power from waste could be considered in conjunction with the proposal for a Combined Cooling, Heating and Power plant in section 20.2.11 of the Core Strategy.</p>		At present no further information is provided as it is not considered to be appropriate for inclusion in a high-level strategic document, such as this. The Council notes and is encouraged by the Forum's support of a potential waste recycling to generate heat and power for the site. However, this would be detailed in a lower level SPD.	No change
Mr Matthew Brown	Environment Agency		20.2.9	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS113	<p>Policy no: Strategic Sites 20 Kensal Gasworks (Sites north and south of the railway)</p> <p>Page no: Page 130</p> <p>Paragraph 20.2.29</p> <p>Why it is legally compliant or Sound?</p> <p>We support this paragraph as it states that this site has been sequentially tested to examine flood risk and also makes note that land contamination is an issue on site. These accords with PPS1, PPS23 and PPS25.</p>		Support is noted.	No change
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		20.2.11	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS193	<p><i>20.2.11 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. Central to this will be a 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. To ensure a truly environmentally responsive redevelopment, use of sustainable building materials and techniques are also required. Borough Grade I and II Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and identified green corridors exist on site, notably along the railway and by the canal. Development should therefore be carefully managed. Ways to</i></p>		The comments are noted and agrees that this facility, if not damaging to the amenity of surrounding properties and environment, would be a welcome addition. This will be examined further during the production of the SPD.	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p><i>create biodiversity should also be considered.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum suggests that the Combined Cooling, Heating and Power plant be considered in conjunction with the proposal for on-site waste management in section 20.2.8, including the possibility of generating heat and power from waste.</p>			
Ms Claire McAlister	British Waterways		20.2.11	Paragraph		Yes		PSubCS477	<p>We support the canal's role in providing biodiversity, although this should not be additionally enhanced in ways that may hinder the canal's primary role for navigation.</p> <p>In delivering sustainability, the canal should also be utilised for SUDS and heating and cooling of buildings, and an assessment of the feasibility of these methods should be required as part of any redevelopment.</p>		Noted and agree. The delivery of sustainability will be essential and assessed against policies within the Respecting Environmental Limits chapter of the Core Strategy and not the allocation.	No change
Ms Claire McAlister	British Waterways		20.3.3	Paragraph	Yes			PSubCS478	<p>British Waterways should be highlighted here, particularly in terms of the provision of a bridge over our land and waterspace. We also have significant experience in facilitating the delivery of successful waterside development.</p>		Noted and agree.	Amend text
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		21.2.2	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS194	<p><i>21.2.2 The Estate currently contains 538 social housing units. The number of market housing required to help fund the redevelopment of the Estate is dependent on the grant from the Homes and Communities Agency and therefore currently unknown. Therefore a minimum allocation of 150 market housing units has been proposed. This will result in a density of approximately 130 dwellings per hectare. However, initial urban design studies suggest that the site is able to accommodate higher densities through efficient design and housing provision that meets current need, without the loss of existing community facilities or a negative impact on residential amenity or design quality.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum was concerned to hear recently that, having previously given an assurance that buildings on the Wornington Green Estate would not go above eight stories, Kensington Housing Trust is now proposing at least one 15-storey tower block and urges the Council to reject this proposal because of the visual effect on the Golborne landscape.</p>		This comment relates to a current planning application and not the content of the Core Strategy. The Council's requirements for building heights in Wornington Green is set out in the Wornington Green SPD, which states that development could rise to 8 storeys in some places, subject to street proportions. The SPD also states that some recessed storeys that do not impact on the proportion of the street may be considered and a variety of building heights across the site is essential. The Council's emerging policy for building heights is set out in Policy CL2(h to m).	No change proposed.
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		21.2.5	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS195	<p><i>21.2.5 The site contains community and leisure facilities, which are all Council owned, including Athlone Gardens, a ball court and the Venture Centre with its adventure playground, IT training facilities and several meeting rooms and halls. Many of these facilities are not only used by the residents of the estate, but the wider community.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum urges the Council to seize the opportunity to extend and improve both Athlone Gardens and the Venture Centre. More green space and community facilities will be required with a higher population density on the Wornington Green Estate. The Forum further requests that the design of Athlone Gardens should be such that it continues to be accessible to the whole Golborne community rather than just becoming a park for residents of the Estate. It should therefore continue to have a frontage onto Portobello Road.</p>		Policy CA2(c) requires the replacement of an improved Athlone Gardens, to the same size as the existing park. The Wornington Green SPD requires this new park to meet Green Flag Standard. The SPD also requires that the new park is integrated into the wider area, being publicly accessible to the wider community. However, owing to the lack of land and financial viability, the Council cannot request a larger park than existing. Policy CA(d) requires the refurbishment or replacement of an improved Venture Centre and the scope for its enlargement. The extent to which the new community facility will be enlarged has yet to be decided and will be subject to further consultation.	No change proposed.
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		21.2.6	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS196	<p><i>21.2.6 It is the Council's intention that the retail uses along Portobello Road is extended north to provide convenience shopping and local services to the area and animate this frontage. The Council also intends to reinstate the Victorian street pattern, including the reconnection of Portobello Road to Wornington Road and Ladbroke Grove.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum restates its concerns about providing additional shops and restaurants on Portobello Road. Currently</p>		Policy CA(2) makes provision for A1 to A5 uses, 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. However, the Wornington Green SPD provides flexibility in the short term to take account of the current economic climate by allowing any non-residential use along this part of Portobello Road.	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									there is known to be approximately 18% shop vacancy rates - and this seems to be increasing. Empty shops do not improve an area, they do not encourage footfall, they do not add value to the environment.			
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		21.2.7	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS106	<p>21.2.7 <i>There are approximately 20 market storage lockups in Munro Mews.</i></p> <p>The Golborne Forum requests an assurance that storage, which is vital to the continuing success of the market, will continue to be provided.</p>		Policy CA2(g) sets out the requirement for the replacement of the storage used by the market traders. This is also set out para 7.4.1 of the Wornington Green SPD.	No change proposed.
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	21.2.8	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS500	<p>Wornington Green Site Plan (pages 135 and 341) and paragraphs 21.2.8 and 21.4.4</p> <p>KHT notes that the Wornington Green site plan on pages 135 and 341 within the Core Strategy includes the Open Door Friendship Centre and Kensington and Chelsea College. This is consistent with the site plan within the adopted Wornington Green Planning Brief (Supplementary Planning Document).</p> <p>The Wornington Green SPD clarifies that for the purposes of the Planning Brief, the site is defined as being wider than just the housing estate itself. In addition, the Wornington Green SPD notes that the redevelopment of the properties adjacent to the Wornington Green Estate are not a requirement of the brief, however, have been included to provide greater flexibility and to ensure the area is considered and planned for as a whole; it does not require planning applications to be the same physical extent. KHT considers that this should be explicitly reflected within the Core Strategy to avoid ambiguity.</p>		Comments are noted. It is not considered that the inclusion of certain annotations as contained in the plans will create ambiguity or inflexibility. The SPD referred to sets a more local framework for development at the site and as such all documents will need to be considered during any development, and determining proposals.	No change.
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	21.3.2	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS503	The Wornington Green Planning Brief (Supplementary Planning Document) was adopted on 9 th November 2009. KHT suggests that paragraph 21.3.2 is amended to reflect this.		Noted. Factual updating to be included.	Factual update.
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	21.4.3	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS504	KHT submitted a planning application for the comprehensive redevelopment of Wornington Green in November 2009. The site area that is the subject of the planning application is approximately 5.66 hectares. KHT suggests that paragraph 21.4.3 is amended to reflect this.		Noted. The difference is between the submitted planning application and the site area as measured for the Core Strategy, to deliver development of a strategic site. It is not considered that these differences will affect overall delivery of the site, and in fact relate to the difference between the site as measured and the site as submitted for planning permission.	No change.
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	21.4.4	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS501	<p>Wornington Green Site Plan (pages 135 and 341) and paragraphs 21.2.8 and 21.4.4</p> <p>KHT notes that the Wornington Green site plan on pages 135 and 341 within the Core Strategy includes the Open Door Friendship Centre and Kensington and Chelsea College. This is consistent with the site plan within the adopted Wornington Green Planning Brief (Supplementary Planning Document).</p> <p>The Wornington Green SPD clarifies that for the purposes of the Planning Brief, the site is defined as being wider than just the housing estate itself. In addition, the Wornington Green SPD notes that the redevelopment of the properties adjacent to the Wornington Green Estate are not a requirement of the brief, however, have been included to provide greater flexibility and to ensure the area is considered and planned for as a whole; it does not require planning applications to be the same physical extent. KHT considers that this should be explicitly reflected within the Core Strategy to avoid ambiguity.</p>		Comments noted. It is not considered that the annotation creates ambiguity or inflexibility. The SPD and the Core Strategy will guide development at the site and as such both will be material to the future decisions on development.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		22.2.1	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS108	<p>22.2.1 The Edenham site is adjacent to Trellick Tower and the Cheltenham Estate, both of which are residential areas. A mixed use block that fronts on to the northern end of Golborne Road, at the Golborne Road (North) Neighbourhood shopping centre, also abuts the site.</p>		Comments noted. The Council does not consider that this impacts on the test of soundness.	No change proposed
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		22.2.2	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS109	<p>22.2.2 Residential development with mixed uses is regarded as the most suitable use for the site to achieve the strategic aim of renovating Trellick Tower. At around 80 dwellings per hectare, the site allocation takes account of London Plan 'designs on London' policies, and Table 4B1.</p> <p>The Golborne Forum urges the Council to look seriously at the regeneration plans for the Edenham site which have been drawn up with local people by architects Novarc Studio Ltd.</p>		The Council does not consider that this impacts on the test of soundness. The concept scheme prepared by Novarc Studios is not considered to be financially viable development. The Council, through the preparation of a planning brief for the site, will consider the introduction of uses, for example residential dwellings and a new health facility (refer to paragraph 22.2.6), at the site.	No change proposed
Ms Susie Parsons	Golborne Forum		23.2.2	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS107	<p>23.2.2 The site already contains a very popular sports centre, including adult and junior swimming pools, dance and sports halls, a gym and café, ball courts and play areas which are used by the local community. The Council has yet to decide whether this sports centre should be refurbished in situ or relocated else where on site to facilitate the design of the new academy. If refurbished, extensive internal remodelling would be advantageous. However, the replacement of the facility is more desirable in the long term.</p> <p>While the Kensington Sports Centre is not located in Golborne, it provides the only swimming pool in North Kensington and is therefore of great importance to Golborne people. The Golborne Forum requests an assurance that there will be continued public access to swimming facilities. The existing pool should be kept open until any new pool within the proposed leisure centre/academy development is opened. The Forum requests a further assurance that there should be a full-size swimming pool, at least as large as and preferably bigger than the current one, as well as a training pool for children and others learning to swim.</p>		The Council is yet to decide whether the Leisure Centre will be refurbished or redeveloped. Policy CA4(b) requires the reprovision of equivalent sports facilities, including a swimming pool. Para 9.3.13 also commits to the continued reprovision of a swimming pool. However, the extent and size of the reprovided swimming facilities will depend on design, space and consultation which will form part of demand assessment. This will be identified through the preparation of a planning brief for this site.	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.1.2	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS378	<p>p152 Chapter 26 Strategic Sites, Policy CA7 - Earls Court</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>26.1.2</p> <p>The proposed change seeks to provide no preference to the list of priorities. Due to the nature of the development opportunity on the strategic site and the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area all the Strategic Objectives will be important and relevant. It is preferable to allow some flexibility for development proposals to respond to the Objectives on a more holistic basis, taking in to account opportunities presented by the wider Regeneration Site. This will serve the interests in achieving a sustainable Masterplan. The evidence base for the currently listed priority order is not sound.</p>		This paragraph reflects the priorities for the Strategic Objectives, as set out in the place. The policy requirements set out in the 'places' and 'strategic sites' reflect the policies in the Strategic Objectives, which are informed by sound evidence as listed in Section 43 of the Core Strategy.	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.1.3	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS379	<p>26.1.3</p> <p>Additional text is proposed to reinforce the strategic importance of the Earls Court Regeneration Area, as a location to deliver urban renewal through high density mixed use development, in accordance with the Replacement London Plan</p>		This paragraph highlights the strategic importance of the site in the borough. It does not set out the vision for the site, nor does it introduce the land use allocation and design approach. The Regeneration Area is a name given by LBHF, and does not apply to the RBKC portion of the Site. However, when discussing the entire site, the Council will refer to the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, which is consistent with naming in the draft London Plan.	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.2.1	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS380	<p>26.2.1</p> <p>The proposed changes take in to account the way forward agreed with GLA and the 2 boroughs ie that an OAPF is produced for the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area prepared by the GLA jointly with the local authorities and landowners, in line with the</p>		The Council does not agree that the Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) is the most appropriate route forward. The Regeneration Area is a name given by LBHF, and does not apply to the RBKC portion of the Site. However, when discussing the entire site, the Council will refer to the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, which is consistent with	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									recommended approach set out in the London Plan. The Planning Framework will help inform the disposition of uses across the site and quantum of floorspace, providing additional guidance within which planning applications can be put together to deliver the vision. The Planning Framework and masterplanning process will also determine potential for the hub to provide the focus for a town centre designation. The Core Strategy should acknowledge the full scope of development that could come forward in the Regeneration Area to allow for change and provide a robust policy document within which planning applications can be determined.		naming in the draft London Plan. This paragraph acknowledges the minimum quantum of development for the Opportunity Area as set out in the draft London Plan. It also makes provision for the distribution of land uses and amount of floor space to be confirmed through a joint planning brief for the entire regeneration area. The introduction to the strategic site allocation will be revised to reflect the potential neighbourhood centre designation and provide some flexibility on the location of the non-residential uses.	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.2.2	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS381	26.2.2 The proposed change clarifies that meeting day to day needs will be one function of the retail accommodation provided on redevelopment. It will also, for example, serve those visiting the cultural destination facility and meet demand generated from other uses proposed within a comprehensive scheme.		This paragraph already states that new shops will serve day to day needs of the development, which implies all users. This is consistent with policy CA7(c) in the strategic site. However, para 26.2.2 will be revised to reflect the Council's support for a new neighbourhood centre in the future to improve accessibility to neighbourhood or a higher order centre in this location.	Propose change to para 26.2.2.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.2.3	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS382	26.2.3 The proposed change introduces clarity, - to take account of ongoing operational requirements of the existing Exhibition Centre business. The Core Strategy recognises the importance of the existing exhibition centre and it is relevant for the document to acknowledge that this will be supported until redevelopment occurs. This is consistent with current Local Plan policy; - that redevelopment of the Exhibition Centre is likely to be considered as part of the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area. The proposed range of uses confirms that a scheme would involve residential and non residential uses. Reference to a convention or exhibition centre on redevelopment of the site is deleted as such a facility is no longer being actively pursued at this time. The text confirms that a significant destination use should be provided on redevelopment instead - in relation to the way forward agreed with GLA and the 2 boroughs ie that an OAPF is produced for the Regeneration Area, prepared by the GLA jointly with the local authorities and landowners, in line with the recommended approach set out in the London Plan. The Planning Framework will help inform the disposition of uses across the site and quantum of floorspace, providing additional guidance within which planning applications can be put together to deliver the vision for the site.		The Council will consider any proposals to improve access and servicing arrangements to Earls Court in advance of a planning brief, in accordance with the development plan and on the merits of the proposal having regard to material planning considerations. The potential for sensitive improvements to the servicing and access is mentioned in changes to the place, but does not need to be explicit in the strategic site. It remains the ambition of the Council to maintain the "Earl's Court" Brand and as such, the retention of an international convention centre or national cultural destination is considered to be crucial to the redevelopment of the wider earls court site. This requirement will be clarified in para 26.2.3. The Earl's Court Regeneration Area includes land within LBHF, which the Council cannot set policy for as part of the Core Strategy. The Council will need to protect future provision of this facility on site, or consider any reasonable alternatives through the planning brief. The Regeneration Area is a name given by LBHF, and does not apply to the RBKC portion of the Site. However, when discussing the entire site, the Council will refer to the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, which is consistent with naming in the draft London Plan. The Council does not agree that the Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) is the most appropriate route forward. This paragraph already makes provision for the distribution of land uses and amount of floor space to be confirmed through a joint planning brief for the entire regeneration area.	Propose change to paragraph 26.2.3.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.2.4	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS383	26.2.4 The proposed changes reflect more accurately the context for assessing improvements to the one way system and necessary provisos having regard to the information currently available, as explained in the Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.		Noted. Propose change to be consistent with changes to CT1, which includes consideration for investigation and implementation of returning the one-way system to two-way working.	Propose change to para 26.2.4.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.2.8	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS384	26.2.8 The changes reflect the approach in the London Plan when considering development in Opportunity Areas. It is important to		In accordance with Core Strategy Policy CL4, the Council will carefully control development in the setting of conservation areas, listed buildings and archaeological priority areas. In accordance with CL2 the heights of development will need to have regard to the existing	Propose change to 26.2.8.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									avoid unnecessary prescription so that an appropriate masterplan can evolve. Other policies in the Core Strategy explain how development proposals should address density and townscape context. The current wording is unduly negative.		setting. Development on the RBKC Strategic Site will therefore need to consider approaches to delivering higher density through development that reflects the setting of the surrounding area. However, this paragraph will be revised to reflect the potential for tall buildings in LBHF, as set out in their Core Strategy.	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.2.9	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS385	26.2.9 The proposed changes clarify the requirements for a waste management strategy. The most effective and efficient solution will depend on development and phasing proposed across the Earls Court Regeneration Area.		Core Strategy Policy CE3(b) requires the provision of an on-site waste management facility within Earl's Court, including the facility for recycling and anaerobic digestion, which is intended to contribute to meeting the Council's waste apportionment. RBKC cannot allocate land for this facility outside of the Borough's boundary. The Council will continue ongoing discussions with the applicant, LBHF and the GLA on the location of this facility, which will be taken forward as part of the planning brief. This strategic site will be revised to reflect the potential for this facility to be located elsewhere in the Opportunity Area through the masterplanning as part of the SPD.	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.2.10	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS386	26.2.10 The changes include reference to connections to a district energy source for new development to provide flexibility for future sustainable heat and energy solutions.		Core Strategy Policy CE1 states that Earl's Court will be the location for a district heat and energy source, which will need to contribute heat and energy to the wider community. This would inevitably include a connection, but the deliver does not stop at the connection but includes the provision of heat and power. The Council is currently working with the LDA to prepare a decentralised energy masterplan for the borough, which will be used to inform the energy strategy in the planning brief.	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.2.11	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS387	26.2.11 Opportunities to enhance biodiversity are likely to stem from a strategy for the wider Regeneration Area, informed by the Planning Framework, rather than just the RBKC part of the Regeneration Area. Local biodiversity enhancement is a deliverable policy objective to help to contribute to overall provision.		Part of the Earls Court Strategic Site is designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (Grade 1). The Core Strategy (Policy CE4b) includes proposals to link the SINC's along the West London Line railway to link Green Corridors. The Council cannot designate areas outside of the borough and would need to ensure a local policy to ensure development protects and enhances biodiversity. This section will be revised to clarify this.	Propose change to para 26.2.11.
Mr Matthew Brown	Environment Agency		26.2.12	Paragraph				PSubCS115	Policy no: Earls Court 26 Page no: Page 154 Paragraph: 26.2.12 Why it is legally compliant or Sound? We agree with the supporting text to Policy CA7 which states that the site is located in within Flood Zones 2 and 3. It has also stated that the site has passed the sequential test as required PPS25 and requires that an exception test would be required for this site.		This comment denotes support to the policy and supporting text.	No further action required.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.3.1	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS389	26.3.1 The proposed changes reflect Capital & Counties' representations to the Risks matrix. A scheme not involving as many cultural or destination uses could be implemented if that was the only way of achieving regeneration. However, it is clear that the current Earls Court owners have every intention of building on the Earls Court brand, so this is considered to be a "medium" risk. The deliverability of changes to the Earls Court One-Way system		No change to the risk of delivering a cultural facility, as it is the Council's policy that a cultural facility, of at least national significance, is provided in the Earls Court area. Although this will be clarified in the text. Propose change to the wording and include reference to the risk of not making improvements to the one-way system.	Propose change to 26.3.1.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									should be regarded a medium risk as does not Capital & Counties' proposed change to the policy allows for appropriate flexibility in relation to Earls Court One-Way system "improvements". In reality what can feasibly and viably be done to improve the One-Way system should be done.			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.3.2	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS390	26.3.2 The proposed changes take in to account the way forward agreed with GLA and the 2 boroughs ie that an OAPF is produced for the site, prepared by the GLA jointly with the local authorities in collaboration with the landowners, in line with the recommended approach set out in the London Plan. The Planning Framework will help inform the disposition of uses across the site and quantum of floorspace, providing additional guidance within which planning applications can be put together to deliver the vision for the site.		The Council does not agree that the Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) is the most appropriate route forward.	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.3.4	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS391	26.3.4 The changes clarify the delivery milestones to ensure consistency with changes proposed to the rest of the chapter.		The Council does not agree that the Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) is the most appropriate route forward.	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	26.4.4	Paragraph			Justified Effective	PSubCS392	26.4.4 The proposed change includes TfL as a site owner (freeholder of the Exhibition Centre site).		Agree. Propose changes.	Propose change to 26.4.4.
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		27.3.1	Paragraph				PSubCS141	Strategic Site 8 Lots Road Power Station Water Response: Reinforcement of water supply network mains will be required as recommended by impact assessment, dependant on type and scale of development proposed. Waste Response: Comments as Strategic Site 1. Additional Comment: This site is located very close to Thames Water's Lots Road strategic pumping station, which is an operational sewage pumping station. Surface water discharges should pass straight to River Thames by private agreement. Access to the site is shared and TW obviously require unrestricted 24 hour access. Storm discharge mains pass through the development site.		Thames Water raise this comment for most strategic sites. However, including this wording for these sites will be repetitious and over lengthy. This site has an extant planning permission (ref: 02/1324). However, any future application will be subject to policies contained within the adopted Core Strategy. The Council's policy for infrastructure provision, including water and sewer infrastructure, is contained within Policy C1 which considers site specific infrastructure requirements as part of a planning brief and planning application. This policy will be applicable to any future brief and application.	No change proposed
Circadian Ltd	Circadian Ltd	DP9	27.3.6	Paragraph		No	Justified	PSubCS275	Our clients support the identification of the Lots Road Power Station site of strategic importance to the Borough and will contribute significantly to the housing needs of the Borough. The document refers to the extant planning permission for the redevelopment of the site granted in 2006 and provides the following floor areas for the mix of uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Shops (A1): 1,198sqm (12,900 sq ft); • Financial and Professional Services (A2): 82 sqm (883 sq ft); • Food and Drink (A3): 528 sqm (5,700 sq ft); • Non-Residential Institutions (D1): 877 sqm (9,500 sq ft); • Business (B1): 4,904 sqm (43,000 sq ft); • Housing: 420 dwellings, including 166 affordable units; • Open Space." However, the floor areas for the mix of uses for the consented		The Council's Committee report is the only document which identifies the proposed floorspace calculations by Use Class for the Lots Road Power Station development. The reports prepared by the Planning Inspector and the Secretary of State do not provide any specific figures for each proposed Use Class, rather they refer to the general acceptability of the scheme. The Council does not have any evidence that these floorspace areas have been altered through the Appeal process. The difference in the numbers may be due to one set of figures being gross and the other net internal area. As such, the figures quoted within the Core Strategy are consistent with the Committee report. Notwithstanding this, the figure quoted for D1 Use should be amended to 977sqm, in lieu of 877sqm provided.	Change - amend the floorspace for Non-Residential Institutions (D1) to 977sqm to comply with Committee Report

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>scheme, as stated in the document are incorrect. The approved scheme for the redevelopment of the site includes the following floor areas for the mix of uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shops (A1): 1,097sqm (11,807 sq ft); Financial and Professional Services (A2): 82 sqm (883 sq ft); Food and Drink (A3): 297 sqm (3,197 sq ft); Non-Residential Institutions (D1): 1,109 sqm (11,938 sqft); Business (B1): 3,401 sqm (36,608 sq ft); Housing: 420 dwellings, including 165 affordable units; <p>As such, paragraph 27.3.6 of the Core Strategy should be amended to refer to the correct floor areas for the uses comprising the approved scheme for the Lots Road Power Station site.</p> <p>As such, this above section of the Core Strategy is not considered to be Sound as the floorspace figures are not justified. The evidence base for arriving at the figures stated in the document have not been stated.</p>			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	28.1.3	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS393	<p>p158 - para 28.1.3</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The site boundary for Earls Court Strategic Site needs to be amended to reflect the boundary of the EC Regeneration Area within RBKC. The proper integration of the parcel of land currently outside of the boundary shown is required to ensure a satisfactory setting for the site.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Amend site boundary for Earls Court Strategic Site</p> <p>See map extract attached.</p>		The boundary as allocated within Chapter 26 is correct, however, as the consultee has correctly identified, this is incorrect on the Proposals Map. Therefore, the Proposals Map will therefore be changed to reflect the correct boundary	Alter map
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		29.1.1	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS177	<p>Chapter 29: Policies and Actions</p> <p>We suggest that this chapter refers to the requirement for environmental impact assessment of large developments and to mitigate against their negative impact. Furthermore, we suggest that health impact assessment of large developments as required by Policy 3A.23 of the London Plan.</p>		Whilst the Council acknowledges the health impacts identified by HUDU, the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the Core Strategy clearly identifies the causes and likely impact of various arisings. It is considered that this is the correct location to explicitly refer to health impacts. The health benefits and cost are implicit throughout the document and their direct inclusion within the main body of text adds no strategic value. EIA is required under separate legislation.	No change.
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		29.2.1	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS130	<p>29.2 Infrastructure and Planning Obligations (s106), Paragraphs 29.2.1 - 29.2.4 and Policy C1 Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations.</p> <p>The recognition that "delivery of infrastructure is critical to the delivery of all the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy" is strongly supported. The inclusion of Policy C1: Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations within the Core Strategy is also supported, however Thames Water is concerned that the Policy makes no specific reference to utilities infrastructure.</p> <p>The LDF, in providing a strategy for the future development of the Royal Borough, has a key role in helping to co-ordinate new</p>		Note the support for the policy in general. The policy, and reasoned justification relate to all necessary infrastructure. Therefore, in as much as utility infrastructure is necessary, the policy is considered to cover delivery.	Insert Utility Infrastructure reference into the list within para. 29.2.4

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>development with the requisite infrastructure. This includes the provision of adequate water resources together with the necessary treatment and distribution systems, and waste water treatment capacity and disposal routes. Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12) contains advice on the need for Local Planning Authorities, in preparation of development plan documents, to consider the requirements of utilities for land to enable them to meet demands placed upon them and the environmental effects of such additional uses.</p> <p>The LDF should provide a clear context within which the local planning authority can plan for the future. In doing so, the strategy will need to be sufficiently flexible to enable water supply and wastewater infrastructure to respond to the demand new development creates. For example, we may require a three to five year lead in time for provision of extra capacity to supply and drain new development sites, thus it should not be assumed that utility infrastructure will always be readily available.</p> <p>A utility infrastructure policy within the Core Strategy would be appropriate and should seek the phasing of new development with the appropriate utility infrastructure. This in accordance with consolidated London Plan (2008) Policy 4A.18.</p> <p>This will help to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property, or the pollution of land and watercourses. The policy should include considering land and premises utilities may require. A suggested policy is outlined below:</p> <p>"New development will be co-ordinated and phased inline with the provision of appropriate utility infrastructure.</p> <p>The local planning authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water, foul drainage and sewage treatment capacity to serve all developments. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users."</p>			
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturge on behalf of Metro Shopping Fund LP	29.2.4	Paragraph		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS11	<p>The first sentence under paragraph 29.2.4 correctly explains that planning obligations are intended to make development acceptable, which might otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>Whilst much of this sub-section is intended to provide the start of a basic framework for infrastructure planning, upon which the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) can subsequently be hung, paragraph 29.2.4 is in respect of planning obligations. Therefore, the Inspector has to look carefully at the list, as many items such as "affordable shops" are not justified by policy, or in the case of health facilities, police and fire infrastructure and other services should be funded by other sources and not the development industry. They should therefore not be included in the list of items to be covered by planning obligations. Even in bringing the CIL forward, the Government continues to make it clear that charging authorities are required to consider other available sources of funding when determining what contribution should be sought from development.</p> <p>References to services and facilities that should be funded from other sources should be deleted from the section on planning obligations in order for this section to be sound.</p>		<p>Disagree. Circular 05/2005 deals with the use of planning obligations and sets out the relevant tests and circumstances in which they can legally be used. In the Council's view, this includes those matters listed.</p> <p>Government guidance contained within Circular 05/2005 sets out how planning obligations should be used, and the SPD conforms to these requirements. It sets out the 5 Secretary of State tests, all of which must be adhered to:</p> <p>A planning obligation must be:</p> <p>(i) relevant to planning;</p> <p>(ii) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;</p> <p>(iii) directly related to the proposed development;</p> <p>(iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and</p> <p>(v) reasonable in all other respects.</p>	<p>Insert in paragraph 29.2.4 a reference to Circular 05/2005 which governs the use of planning obligations.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>Planning obligations are private agreements negotiated, usually in the context of planning applications, between local planning authorities and persons with an interest in a piece of land (or "developers"), and intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. Paragraph B6 of the Circular 05/2005 states that "The use of planning obligations must be governed by the fundamental principle that planning permission may not be bought or sold. It is therefore not legitimate for unacceptable development to be permitted because of benefits or inducements offered by a developer which are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms (see B5(ii))." Again, these principles are incorporated into the working of policy C1.</p> <p>A Planning Obligations Supplementary planning Document has also been prepared to assist in formulating the required obligations to secure infrastructure, including the measures contained within the list.</p>	
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		29.2.4	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS131	<p>29.2 Infrastructure and Planning Obligations (s106), Paragraphs 29.2.1 - 29.2.4 and Policy C1 Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations.</p> <p>The recognition that "delivery of infrastructure is critical to the delivery of all the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy" is strongly supported. The inclusion of Policy C1: Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations within the Core Strategy is also supported, however Thames Water is concerned that the Policy makes no specific reference to utilities infrastructure.</p> <p>The LDF, in providing a strategy for the future development of the Royal Borough, has a key role in helping to co-ordinate new development with the requisite infrastructure. This includes the provision of adequate water resources together with the necessary treatment and distribution systems, and waste water treatment capacity and disposal routes. Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12) contains advice on the need for Local Planning Authorities, in preparation of development plan documents, to consider the requirements of utilities for land to enable them to meet demands placed upon them and the environmental effects of such additional uses.</p> <p>The LDF should provide a clear context within which the local planning authority can plan for the future. In doing so, the strategy will need to be sufficiently flexible to enable water supply and wastewater infrastructure to respond to the demand new development creates. For example, we may require a three to five year lead in time for provision of extra capacity to supply and drain new development sites, thus it should not be assumed that utility infrastructure will always be readily available.</p> <p>A utility infrastructure policy within the Core Strategy would be appropriate and should seek the phasing of new development with the appropriate utility infrastructure. This in accordance with consolidated London Plan (2008) Policy 4A.18.</p> <p>This will help to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property, or the pollution of land and watercourses. The policy should include considering land and premises utilities may require. A</p>		<p>Note the support for the policy in general. The policy, and reasoned justification relate to all necessary infrastructure. Therefore, inasmuch as utility infrastructure is necessary, the policy is considered to cover delivery.</p> <p>It is not considered, therefore, useful to insert an entirely new utility-based infrastructure policy. However, in recognition of the points raised, amendments to the reasoned justification of types of infrastructure are recommended to include necessary utility delivery.</p>	Insert reference to Utility Infrastructure within list under para. 29.2.4

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>suggested policy is outlined below:</p> <p>"New development will be co-ordinated and phased inline with the provision of appropriate utility infrastructure.</p> <p>The local planning authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water, foul drainage and sewage treatment capacity to serve all developments. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users."</p>			
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		29.2.4	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS216	<p>London Plan Policy cross ref. 6A.4, 6A.5 - Draft London Plan: 6.5</p> <p>Has this matter been raised previously? No (Revision to SPG)</p> <p>Although the reference to contributions towards Crossrail within the London Plan was revised in October 2009 and now includes guidance on areas of particular relevance, this is particularly relevant for areas of the borough within 960 metres of Paddington but outside the London Plan area. A decision should be taken on a station within this area. The wording should be amended to circumstances, would require this as a result of London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p>		Agree to amendment following publication of the Panel report into the funding of Crossrail.	Amend paragraph to reflect examination findings.
DP9	DP9		29.2.4	Paragraph	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS332	<p>Paragraph 29.2.4</p> <p><i>Planning Obligations are intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. They might be used to prescribe the nature of a development; to secure a contribution from a developer to compensate for loss or damage created by a development; or to mitigate a development's impact. Such measures may (as appropriate and applicable to the relevant proposals) include.....</i></p> <p>[delete 5.] provision of transportation facilities - including public transport and highway improvements to cater for the impact of the development., [delete and towards Crossrail where development within the CAZ (48) would require this as a result of London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), and permit free development]</p>		<p>Disagree. Circular 05/2005 deals with the use of planning obligations and sets out the relevant tests and circumstances in which they can legally be used. In the Council's view, this includes those matters listed.</p> <p>Government guidance contained within Circular 05/2005 sets out how planning obligations should be used, and the SPD conforms to these requirements. It sets out the 5 Secretary of State tests, all of which must be adhered to:</p> <p>A planning obligation must be:</p> <p>(i) relevant to planning;</p> <p>(ii) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;</p> <p>(iii) directly related to the proposed development;</p> <p>(iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and</p> <p>(v) reasonable in all other respects.</p> <p>Planning obligations are private agreements negotiated, usually in the context of planning applications, between local planning authorities and persons with an interest in a piece of land (or "developers"), and intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. Paragraph B6 of the Circular 05/2005 states that "The use of planning obligations must be governed by the fundamental principle that planning permission may not be bought or sold. It is therefore not legitimate for unacceptable development to be permitted because of benefits or inducements offered by a developer which are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms (see B5(ii))." Again, these principles are incorporated into the working of policy C1.</p> <p>A Planning Obligations Supplementary planning</p>	No change in response to this objection.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											Document has also been prepared to assist in formulating the required obligations to secure infrastructure, including the measures contained within the list. The GLA have requested, and the Council have agreed that, following publication of the panel report into the Crossrail amendments to the London Plan, that changes will be made to this part of the list in the paragraph 29.2.4, but to reflect the most up-to-date position.	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	29.2.4	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS395	Changes sought 29.2.4 Planning Obligations are intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. They might be used to prescribe the nature of a development; to secure a contribution from a developer to compensate for loss or damage created by a development; or to mitigate a development's impact. Such measures may (as appropriate and applicable to the relevant proposals)		Disagree with suggested amendments. However, a reference to the relevant circular will assist in interpretation and clarification for use of the policy.	Insert a reference to Circular 05/2005.
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	29.2.4	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS506	KHT notes the possible requirement for 'affordable shops' within paragraphs 7.3.11 and 29.2.4. KHT considers that any policy requirement relating to 'affordable shops' should reflect the approach of the adopted London Plan, and should be based on robust and credible evidence.		Comments noted. It is considered that the requirement for provision of affordable shops reflects the evidence based on need arising, and is consistent with government guidance in Circular 05/2005.	No change.
Miss Robina Rose	(The Ladbroke Association)		30.1.1	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS343	Test of soundness 4 (b) for double designation KEEPING LIFE LOCAL MAP p.] 64 December 10th 2009 designated "Neighbourhood Shopping Centres" nb. 1. Already an evident and considerable dearth of these around Portobello 2. Of those designated, seep.172 <i>Clarendon Cross</i> consists of number of interior design bases, an icon gallery, 2 antique shops, an Art Gallery and a ne expensive bars and restaurant, in spite of its close proximity to several housing estates, which it can hardly claim to serve, (having lost its small Post Office sometime ago). All Saints Road is moving in the same direction. even by the consultants own Local Needs Index, most of the surrounding local /" neighbourhood Centres (All Saints, Clarendon & WestboW11ePark)Only score 3* (out of 12?) as serving "local" need....therefore leaving Portobel1o to fulfil this primary function for the whole of its hinterland (the 40% Housing Estates surrounding it -etc), especially during the week. *(p.150 Nathaniel Lichfield Retail Needs Study2008) LOCAL/ "NEIGHBOURHOOD" failures of interpretation (concerning evidence) Although much excellent ground has been covered, for the LDF to work over the next period, it remains necessary to go the extra mile. Surely, if it was possible to redesignate Earls Court from district to local/ neighbourhood centre, it MUST be possible to protect this dimension of Portobello similarly by the unique double designation of Special District AND "Neighbourhood" Centre. Which is only way to adequately describe and protect Portobello.		Portobello has been designated as a Special District centre which explicitly recognises the dual role that the Portobello Road has - as both an international destination and as a neighbourhood centre. Keeping Life Local recognises the need to support the shops which support the day-to-day shopping needs of the residents in the Borough.	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	30.1.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS397	<p>p164 Keeping Life Local</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The text acknowledges that existing deficiencies in local shopping facilities in the Earls Court area are expected to be addressed through redevelopment of the EC Regeneration Area (30.3.10). The Council's response to earlier representations state that the proposed change is unnecessary and repetitive as the wider area is indicated elsewhere in the document.</p> <p>However, the location of retail facilities on the site will be determined through the Masterplan process and may be on land within LBHF. Denoting the wider EC Regeneration Site (as illustrated on the Key Diagram) will clarify the position for the reader and provide consistency across the document making it effective.</p> <p>Changes sought Add brown shading across land within LBHF to denote the Earls Court Regeneration Area "wider site", as illustrated on the Key Diagram.</p> <p>See map extract attached.</p>		<p>The Council acknowledges that the retail development of Earl's Court may take place in the neighbouring borough, however, as written the Core Strategy still supports this as it would contribute to the existing deficiency. It is considered inappropriate to single out just one of the Borough's Strategic Sites which contributes to retail growth in this part of the document. It should also be noted that the planned retail centres in Kensal and Latimer are also absent from this map as this map is dealing with the present situation. Lots Road is included as planning permission has already been granted for this site.</p> <p>The amendment to the map, whilst potentially suitable would in fact be pre-empting the masterplanning and, in fact, may even be allocating land in a neighbouring borough. For this reason, no change will be made.</p>	No change
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		30.2.1	Paragraph	No	No	Effective	PSubCS315	We consider that para 30.2.1 should also recognise that the role of spatial planning is also to ensure that necessary infrastructure is provided to support the scale, location and timing of development planned for an area.		Noted and agree with the comment.	Amend text
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		30.3.2	Paragraph	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS244	<p>Policy CO 1.1</p> <p>Paragraphs 30.3.2 & 30.3.4</p> <p>It is well known that 52 per cent of K&C children attend private schools but it seems less well-known by the Council that many such schools are short of space (including playgrounds). The loss to housing, in recent years, of such education sites as the College of St Mark & St John, Chelsea College of Art and the Former Jamahiriya School, eliminated valuable social and community land use opportunities. The Core Strategy at present contains no provision to ensure a better future for the needs of children at independent schools.</p> <p>The Strategy is effective in protecting existing uses and in permitting enabling development for the modernisation of social and community facilities.</p> <p>Building an Academy in West Chelsea and another primary school in Warwick Road are also very welcome. However they will not benefit children at EXISTING independent schools in the south of the Borough. In particular they will not provide them with needed sports facilities, outdoor play space or gymnasias. (Hampshire Gems, recently re-established in the old Chelsea Public Library in Manresa Road, for instance, has no playground just a slip of outdoor space.)</p> <p>Independent schools do use the Chelsea baths but because of demand are pushed to the very extremities of the day.</p> <p>The lack of any surveys of the schools and facilities of half the children in the Borough, the absence of any forecast of future demand flowing from the expansion of housing set out in Chapter 35 of the Core Strategy. and the absence of any effort to identify</p>		<p>The Council acknowledges and understands the concerns of the consultee however, it is not practical to write policy to retrofit the lack of playspace etc at existing facilities.</p> <p>The consultee acknowledges the lack of available space for recreation in the borough and the Council would consider that the provision of a larger facility, severing more residents but requiring an inconvenient journey to open space/play space is superior to an educational establishment which serves for fewer children.</p> <p>The increase in the Borough's population will naturally lead to a greater demand for social and community facilities. In areas where this growth is seen as being considerable, appropriate social and community facilities will be expected. This is detailed within Strategic Sites chapters (numbers 20 to 27) of the Core Strategy.</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>additional sites for the recreation and other uses of children at independent schools, points to both unsoundness and ineffectiveness in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Chelsea Society does not underrate the difficulty that this issue raises for the Borough Council. We are not seeking to have Policy CK 1 struck down. We do however want to draw attention to a lack of balance that is present in the Plan due to the provision for expansion of housing (at, for instance Warwick Road and the site of the Earl's Court Exhibition and an overall 20,000 increase in population) even though the existing social and community needs of existing residents are not being met. The question that needs to be addressed is whether too many additional people and too much additional housing is being provided for in a Borough that already has the highest density in Britain. The Society fears that this is the case and that more space needs to be allocated to social and community needs.</p>			
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		30.3.4	Paragraph	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS245	<p>Policy CO 1.1</p> <p>Paragraphs 30.3.2 & 30.3.4</p> <p>It is well known that 52 per cent of K&C children attend private schools but it seems less well-known by the Council that many such schools are short of space (including playgrounds). The loss to housing, in recent years, of such education sites as the College of St Mark & St John, Chelsea College of Art and the Former Jamahiriya School, eliminated valuable social and community land use opportunities. The Core Strategy at present contains no provision to ensure a better future for the needs of children at independent schools.</p> <p>The Strategy is effective in protecting existing uses and in permitting enabling development for the modernisation of social and community facilities.</p> <p>Building an Academy in West Chelsea and another primary school in Warwick Road are also very welcome. However they will not benefit children at EXISTING independent schools in the south of the Borough. In particular they will not provide them with needed sports facilities, outdoor play space or gymnasia. (Hampshire Gems, recently re-established in the old Chelsea Public Library in Manresa Road, for instance, has no playground just a slip of outdoor space.)</p> <p>Independent schools do use the Chelsea baths but because of demand are pushed to the very extremities of the day.</p> <p>The lack of any surveys of the schools and facilities of half the children in the Borough, the absence of any forecast of future demand flowing from the expansion of housing set out in Chapter 35 of the Core Strategy. and the absence of any effort to identify additional sites for the recreation and other uses of children at independent schools, points to both unsoundness and ineffectiveness in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Chelsea Society does not underrate the difficulty that this issue raises for the Borough Council. We are not seeking to have Policy CK 1 struck down. We do however want to draw attention to a lack of balance that is present in the Plan due to the provision for expansion of housing (at, for instance Warwick Road and the site of the Earl's Court Exhibition and an overall 20,000 increase in population) even though the existing social and community needs of existing residents are not being met. The question that needs to be addressed is whether too many additional people and too much additional housing is being provided for in a Borough that already</p>		<p>The Council acknowledges and understands the concerns of the consultee however, it is not practical to write policy to retrofit the lack of playspace etc at existing facilities.</p> <p>The consultee acknowledges the lack of available space for recreation in the borough and the Council would consider that the provision of a larger facility, severing more residents but requiring an inconvenient journey to open space/play space is superior to an educational establishment which serves for fewer children.</p> <p>The increase in the Borough's population will naturally lead to a greater demand for social and community facilities. In areas where this growth is seen as being considerable, appropriate social and community facilities will be expected. This is detailed within Strategic Sites chapters (numbers 20 to 27) of the Core Strategy.</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									has the highest density in Britain/ The Society fears that this is the case and that more space needs to be allocated to social and community needs.			
Barclays Bank Plc	Barclays Bank Plc	Shireconsulting	30.3.6	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS483	Mention is made in the draft of the possible future policy protection to be given to public houses that serve a "social and community" role (Core Strategy, paragraph 30.3.6). This is not something that can be controlled through development plan policy. In planning terms one Class A4 use can only be treated like any other and (as is acknowledged at paragraph 30.3.7 in the case of protecting post offices and pharmacies) there are permitted development rights to change from drinking establishments to any use in Classes A1, A2 or A3.		The Council acknowledge that the retention of Public Houses cannot be subject to specific controls under the Use Class Order, however, it is considered important to note their role as a community asset within the borough.	No change.
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		30.3.7	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS456	<p>Chapter 30 "Keeping Life Local" contains the (only/main) references to post offices:</p> <p>It does not include post offices in the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> list of social and community facilities which have a local catchment (30.2.2); or list of defined social and community uses (30.3.4); but recognises post offices as "valuable community assets .. where change to another use in the same use class, such as a shop, does not require planning consent" (30.3.7) <p>This might suggest that Policy CK1©, for protecting post offices might not apply. If so, this is a mistake. Post offices should be in the list of social and community uses for planning purposes, regardless of whether a particular premises change hands and/or change to a shop. The key issue is the loss of a post office - the loss of a major community facility. The distribution of post offices is a key factor supporting walkable communities.</p> <p>In the last section of Chapter 30 the second item under Corporate or Partnership Actions for Keeping Life Local says:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council's Service Improvement Department will lobby to maintain and improve access to Post Offices in the Borough <p>Please treat this as a late representation for a change to the Core Strategy</p> <p>London Plan</p> <p>The draft Replacement London Plan mentions post offices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> para 4.46: in terms of "accessible local shops and related uses meeting local needs for goods and services (including post offices and public houses) is also important in securing 'lifetime neighbourhoods' (see Policy 7.1)" in Annex 2, para A2.2 under "neighbourhood and more local centres where a sub-post office is seen as one of the basic ingredients. <p>The addressing distribution of post offices and the need to strengthen local centres should be key strategic issue should be key issues for implementing Policy 7.1, these issues need to be dealt with specifically by the final version of the London Plan.</p> <p>I have asked the London Plan team to treat this as a formal representation on the Draft Replacement London Plan.</p>		Noted and Agree. The Council will further investigate the means by which we intend to protect and enhance the Borough's stock of post offices	Amend text to add further protection to post offices.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									It is essential that we get more leverage on this issue - both plans need to tackle this issue head on.			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	30.3.10	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS398	<p>p168 Corporate or partnership actions for keeping life local</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The text refers to existing deficiencies in local shopping facilities in the Earls Court area as being addressed through redevelopment of the Earls Court strategic site (30.3.10). This development opportunity will come forward as part of the Earls Court Regeneration Area, in conjunction with LBHF and the GLA. Whilst this approach is explained elsewhere in the document, it is relevant to include a specific corporate action as the development opportunity will help meet the strategic objective for keeping life local. The proposed change explains the deliverability of this benefit, making the document effective and sound.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Add a new bullet point:</p> <p>15 The Directorate of Planning and Borough Development will work with LBHF and the GLA to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document to bring forward redevelopment of the Earls Court Regeneration Area</p>		As stated by the consultee, the point being raised is covered elsewhere in the document. Therefore an additional Corporate Action is considered to be repetitive and will not be added.	No change
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	31.1.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS399	<p>p169 Fostering Vitality</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p> <p>The supporting text should acknowledge that town centre uses are proposed in the Earls Court Regeneration Area. The strategic site policy (with Capital & Counties proposed changes) confirms the site as a suitable location for cultural, leisure, hotel office and retail uses. There are a number of factors supporting a future town centre on the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the strategy refers to the site being able to meet existing retail deficiencies in the area (para 3.3.10) - the Council in its response to Capital & Counties' earlier representations recognises that new development on the site will generate additional demand for town centre uses - the Vision anticipates a cultural destination on the site - the Opportunity Area status of the site means it is a focus for high density mixed used development. The draft London Plan refers to the site having a strategic role - initial assessment work undertaken by Capital & Counties supports approx 720,000 sqm of town centre uses (office, retail, hotel, destination) on the Regeneration Area although the proposed quantum will be considered in greater detail as part of further assessment including the transport study being carried out for the area and the forthcoming Planning Framework <p>The location of a new centre within the Regeneration Area will be determined through the Masterplan process and it may potentially be concentrated more within the LBHF part of the</p>		<p>The Council concurs with the consultees that it would be appropriate to make reference within the supporting text to the ambitions for the Earl's Court Strategic Site and wider area (the site lying in both this borough and in Hammersmith and Fulham.) These ambitions include housing and a number of town centre uses, uses which include small scale retail, large scale offices and a significant cultural use. This has already been made explicit within Council's Earl's Court Strategic Place (para 10.4.2), and by the allocation for Earl's Court Place (CA7). The development allocated is of the scale and nature suitable for a neighbourhood centre designation.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council is aware that much of the Earl's Court Strategic Site and 'wider area' does lie in an area more than 400 m from another centre. Parts of the Kensal and Latimer areas are in the same position and have been identified as suitable locations for new centres. The Earl's Court Strategic Site (and wider area) had not, which was an anomaly.</p> <p>The Council is, therefore, of the opinion that being explicit in its support for the creation of a neighbourhood centre on part of the Earl's Court Strategic Site (or wider site) to would add consistency to the document. The scale of the neighbourhood centre will have to comply with PPS4, in that it should not 'cannibalise' other centre. Its function will be to serve the day-to-day needs of local residents (both existing and that generated by the proposed development), and not as a centre for comparison retailing to compete with neighbouring centres.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate to designate the site as a centre given the uncertainty over the quantum of development, and the fact that the site may be located in Hammersmith and Fulham. These issues will be resolved by the planning brief currently being prepared on the wider opportunity area site. This brief is listed on</p>	<p>Suggested new para after 31.5.5</p> <p>In addition a significant amount of development is expected within the plan period on the Earl's Court 'wider site'. This site, designated within the Revised London Plan as an Opportunity Area, straddles the boundary with Hammersmith and Fulham. Both the quantum of development, and its detailed nature (including whether the constituent parts lie in this Borough or within Hammersmith and Fulham) will be established within a future planning brief. However, it is likely that the wider area will include a significant amount of housing, as well as business uses, hotel floorspace, and a destination cultural facility. This development is likely to generate some retail 'need'. A neighbourhood centre in the area will, therefore, be appropriate, as long it is of a scale which does not harm the vitality of nearby centres. A new centre is 'supported' rather than 'required' as it is possible that its eventual location may be in Hammersmith and Fulham.</p> <p>CF1</p> <p>Add an additional criteria</p> <p>e) Support the establishment of a new neighbourhood centre in the Earl's Court Opportunity Area, to serve the day-to-day needs of residents of the development.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Regeneration Area.</p> <p>The Council's response to Capital & Counties' earlier representations advises that designating a new centre would be premature and that a new centre could only be designated if the Council is satisfied it would not have a detrimental impact on existing centres. It also is concerned to avoid an indication that the Council is giving carte blanche for retail uses on the site.</p> <p>Reference to an "appropriate" centre together with the additional text in the proposed change makes it clear that the designation needs to be appropriate and is subject to further assessment. The Council in its response suggests that policy CF1 provides scope to permit out of centre retail development. However, the proposed designation is relevant as a Masterplan for the Regeneration Area will also include town centre uses other than retail. The Council recognises that town centres are about more than just shopping providing important places where people live, work and visit for leisure activities (para 31.3.21). This is reflected in the Strategic Site allocation and inherent in promoting new cultural facilities that comprise a destination.</p> <p>The proposed change will comply with the "town centre first" approach advocated in para 31.2.1 and advice in PPS6 that boroughs should adopt a positive and proactive approach to planning for the future of centres. Capital & Counties' representations to the Replacement London Plan will also seek recognition for a town centre designation on the Earls Court Regeneration Area. The change will provide clarity, making the strategy effective and sound.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Add a new paragraph after 31.2.2</p> <p>New town centre uses to include commercial, office, retail, leisure and hotel and a cultural/ destination use or attractions of a destination scale are proposed at the Earls Court Strategic Site as part of a new urban quarter on the Earls Court Regeneration Area which includes land within LBHF. These facilities together with significant levels of residential development will establish an appropriate new town centre within the Regeneration Area, although its location within the Regeneration Area will be determined through a Planning Framework and Masterplan process. Following the adoption of the Planning Framework, an early review of the Core Strategy policy in this respect can be undertaken as required.</p>		the Council's LDS. <p>The Council therefore, will support the provision a new centre, rather than 'designating' it as such. Any policy should make it clear that the centre will serve the day-to-day needs of residents of the area rather than being a centre which serves a wider comparison role. The Retail Needs Assessment does not show a comparison need in this part of the borough in the next five years.</p>	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	31.1.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS400	<p>p170 Fostering Vitality diagram</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document and representations to page 169 - Fostering Vitality.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Add "Appropriate New Centre" notation on the Earls Court Regeneration Area and extend the Concentration of Cultural Uses notation across the wider site.</p> <p>See map extract attached.</p>		<p>The Council would be supportive, if so minded by the Inspector, to illustrate a possible new neighbourhood centre within the Earl's Court Opportunity Area on the 'Fostering Vitality' map. This is consistent with changes already proposed to the Strategic Site allocation.</p> <p>The map shows existing concentrations of cultural uses in a diagrammatic form. It does not include areas outside of the Borough. Therefore it is not considered appropriate to extend the concentration of cultural areas further.</p>	If the Inspector is so minded the Council would support showing a "possible new centre" on the Earl's Court Strategic Site.
Government	Government		31.3.3	Paragraph		No	Justified	PSubCS271	27. PPS6 Planning for Town Centres is clear that the definition of		Following discussions with officers with GOL, GOL are	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
t Office for London	t Office for London						Consistent with national policy		edge-of-centre in relation to retail development is " a location that is well connected to and within easy walking distance (i.e. up to 300 metres) of the primary shopping area.." (PPS6 p31). The Core Strategy states that the PPS6 definition " is not however, considered to be relevant in the Borough because almost the entirety of the Borough would qualify as edge-of-centre within this definition " (para 31.3.3). This reference clearly conflicts with national policy and therefore the Inspector will require detailed evidence regarding the Council's approach e.g. a borough characterisation study.		satisfied that the production of a map which illustrates what parts of the Borough do not lies within 300 m of an existing centre will be sufficient, and that, in their opinion the production of a borough characterisation study is not, in fact, necessary. This will be confirmed in a statement of common ground.	
Miss Robina Rose	(The Ladbroke Association)		31.3.9	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS344	<p>CHARACTER OF TOWN CENTRES p.272</p> <p>para 31.3.9 PORTOBELLO ROAD <i>and Westbourne Grove</i> designated as "Special District Centres"</p> <p>Portobello <i>needs</i> a double designation, that of Special District AND Neighbourhood Centre, reflecting its uniqueness as well as <i>its</i> relationship to Golborne Road.</p> <p>para 31.3.13 The surrounding "Neighbourhood Centre's" (All Saints, Westbourne Park & Clarendon)</p> <p>score very low on the (Nathaniel Lichfield) RBKC 2008 Local Needs Index. (3 out of 11) there by making the Portobello an essential "Neighbourhood Centre" for the 40% Social Housing catchment area around it. This was well demonstrated by the recent Woolworths removal, resulting in considerable loss of footfall as people were forced to go elsewhere for their basic needs. Everyone suffered. The arrival now of Pound land has improved things somewhat, but this aspect . remains vulnerable. Without the appropriate protection (ie dual designation), it may disappear altogether.</p> <p>PORTOBELLO performing a unique dual function of special district <i>and LOCAL</i> ie "neighbourhood" shopping centre.</p> <p>Without this unique, double designation, there will be nothing adequate to protect its local "neighbourhood" function and identity, ironically so central to its International reputation.</p>		<p>The Council considers that the designation of the Portobello Road as a "Special District Centre" reflects its dual role as a centre which serves local people for much of the week, before accommodating a very large number of tourists and other visitors on Saturdays, and to a lesser extent, Fridays.</p> <p>Although the designation of a special district centre is a Council rather than a Mayoral designation, the GLA have supported it. A 'double designation' as both a neighbourhood and a district centre would merely cause confusion, and add nothing above the special centre designation.</p> <p>The significant of this designation lies with the vision for the area, a vision which states that the Council will try to build upon both roles. This will take two main forms, the promotion of the area (by the Markets Promotion Officer, and the Council's Town Centre Manager); and by using planning policies to influence the type of new development permitted in the area.</p> <p>Designation, in its self, does not allow, as the consultee appears to suggests, the Council to specify the types of shops which should be allowed in the centre. The nature of the retail occupier is not a planning consideration.</p>	No change.
John Lewis Partnership	John Lewis Partnership	CB Richard Ellis	31.3.18	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS144	<p>Whilst JL generally supports the Core Strategy, there are certain elements of this which we do not consider to be sound and therefore require further analysis and/ or amendments.</p> <p>We note that the supporting text (paragraph 31.3.18) to policy CF2 of the Core Strategy makes reference to the consideration of the viability in assessing the appropriateness of whether a mix of unit sizes and affordable shops should be provided, which is welcomed.</p>		Support noted.	No change.
Hon. Secretary Carol Seymour-Newton	Knightsbridge Association		31.3.24	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS228	<p>Bars, restaurants, night-clubs and other entertainment uses.</p> <p>The Strategy has a major deficiency in that it fails to provide policy guidance on bars, restaurants and night-clubs to those seeking to locate within the Royal Borough and those who must decide on planning applications for these uses. It will not be effective in delivering its aims without clear policy guidance on all important matters.</p> <p>The main reference to these leisure uses is at para 31.3.24. This statement is inadequate to deal with the practical problems of locating a range of activities which powerfully affect the nature and character of a frontage or centre. On the one hand they can represent the key to a centre's economic success. On the other hand they can be noisy and smelly; they frequently engender demands for pavement tables and chairs and/or smoking areas as</p>		<p>The Council recognises the role that restaurants and drinking establishments have in supporting the diversity of the Borough's town centres. The Core Strategy adequately considers the two main impacts that such uses can have; the impact on the viability of the town centre; and the impact upon residential amenity. CF3 considers in some detail the appropriate balance of shop/non shop uses within particular frontages in town centres. Impact on amenity is considered elsewhere in the plan, particularly in CT1(b) which considers the impact of proposals upon traffic congestion and off-street parking, Policy CL5 on amenity, and CCE6 which specifically considers noise and vibration.</p> <p>Whilst Knightsbridge is the only International centre within the Borough, and therefore is expect to be a concentration of retail and other town centre uses, the</p>	If the Inspector is minded to approve the change, the Council would support re wording of 14.4.4, bullet one to read: "public realm improvements to re-balance pedestrian footfall between the north and south sides of Brompton Road and encourage people to spend longer shopping".

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>well as generating traffic and parking. The strategy is unjustified in not containing a full policy relating to these uses and will be ineffective in guiding planning decisions if it is not included.</p> <p>The result of not considering this policy area can be seen in the material dealing with Knightsbridge. At 14.4.4, the Strategy calls for "public realm improvements to re-balance pedestrian footfall between the north and south sides of Brompton Road" (i.e. to send more shoppers onto the north side of the road). The close relation that Knightsbridge the shopping centre has with Knightsbridge the residential area means that there is no justification for helping the area to become a late night destination. Paragraph 14.4.4 continues to call for measures to "encourage people to stay longer". This should be changed to "spend longer shopping".</p> <p>Recommendation: we believe that the Strategy should include a policy dealing specifically with bars, restaurants and other entertainment activities and that the location specific chapters should be reviewed in the light of the policy chosen.</p>		Council's intention is to encourage people to spend longer shopping in Knightsbridge, rather than simply to spend longer in the centre. The Council would therefore support a change to para 14.4.4 to make this explicit.	
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		31.3.26	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS199	The supporting text to Policy CF4 should recognise the importance of providing access to fresh food and the role of street markets (and farmers markets) in doing this.		Whilst the Council acknowledges the health impacts of markets identified by HUDU, the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the Core Strategy clearly identifies the causes and likely impact of various arisings. It is considered that this is the correct location to explicitly refer to health impacts. The health benefits and cost are implicit throughout the document and their direct inclusion within the main body of text adds no strategic value.	No change.
Nottingdale Ltd	Nottingdale Ltd	London Planning Practice LLP	31.3.31	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS492	<p>Paragraph 31.3.31 -Demand for "large" offices</p> <p>It is clear that there is a demand for larger sized office floorspace as evidenced by the occupation of the two headquarters buildings (the Yellow Building and the White Building) at Nottingdale Village.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review Update incorrectly states at para 3.31 that the Yellow building is the only high quality office building in the area and that Monsoon (the occupier) is a notable exception to demand for this size of unit. This is incorrect. The planning permissions, and development now built, clearly show that the new White Building, providing in excess of 9,000sqm of office floors pace is part of the same development cluster and is fully let to Talk Talk as a headquarters building.</p> <p>Also of relevance is the office building at 125 to 135 Freston Road occupied by Chyialis which has been ignored by the study, alongside its occupation of 130 Freston Road as another significant overspill office in the Employment Zone.</p> <p>Finally, the planning permission for 137-139a Freston Road, provides for a further large office building of approx. 5,000sqm with some smaller flexible business units at ground floor.</p> <p>All of these indicate a strong demand for office floorspace in the area and it is simply not correct for the Study to assume that one part of the Nottingdale Village development (the Yellow Building) represents an "exception" to the majority of demand which is considered to be from smaller companies. Nor is it correct based on the evidence available that for mainstream offices, Freston Road is seen as a "very marginal location and there is little demand" (para 3.29).</p> <p>The Study also incorrectly states at para 3.29 that the Yellow Building letting to Monsoon is a deal that results from the</p>		<p>The Council does not suggest that there is no demand for large scale offices within the Borough. Indeed para 31.3.31 explicitly recognises that this is not the case, stating that "this is not to say that there is no demand for larger units within the Borough. The recent building out of some large scale offices indicates that there is."</p> <p>The introduction of a policy which resists the creation of new large scale offices in the Employment Zone (and other inaccessible areas) illustrates the Council's opinion that there is demand for such uses. Were there be no demand, no such policy would be necessary.</p> <p>Whilst the Council's Employment Land and Premises Study is evidence used to support the policy position taken by the Council, the study does not amount to policy.</p> <p>The Study does not state that there is no demand for large scale offices across the Borough, estimating a need for 69,000 sq m of office space to the end of the plan period. It is the role of the Council to decide where it wants this potential to be located, and it is the Council's view that much of this office space should be accommodated within highly accessible area. It is the accessible areas which the Council considers are most appropriate for large office uses. In addition, it is the Council's view that the Employment Zones should be locations to the smaller office uses in particular demand by Borough residents.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									development of the Westfield Shopping Centre. The whole Nottingdale Village (in excess of 30,000sqm of Class B floorspace) is being developed by Nottingdale Lts a company owned by Monsoon. There clearly is a wider trend, evidenced even more by a further planning application by Nottingdale Ltd at 99-11 Freston Road for a further large office development. These assumptions are therefore unsound.			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	31.3.32	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS404	<p>p176 para 31.3.32</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p> <p>The proposed change reflects the site allocation for the Earls Court Strategic Site, as modified by Capital & Counties' representations. The site designation includes 10,000sqm of non residential floorspace to comprise offices, amongst other uses.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>31.3.32 On the supply side, office floorspace under construction and outstanding permissions provide a net addition of 46,000m² (500,000 ft²) ⁽²⁸³⁾. This level of building will meet office demand until 2017. The Council therefore recognises that a further 23,000 m² of office floorspace needs to be developed within the Borough, within the plan period for the predicted need to be met. The Council has allocated 2 10,000m² (108,000 ft²) of business floor space within the Strategic Site Allocations for the Earl's Court and the Kensal Gasworks sites. A minimum of 10,000 sqm of further commercial floorspace which may include office development is allocated on the Earls Court Strategic Site. Any remaining need would be likely to be met by other smaller windfall sites, particularly by very small and small office developments across the Borough.</p>		The Council's Employment Land and Premise Study states that the Council should provide 23,000 sq m of additional office space (over and above that already granted) in the plan period. As a highly accessible site the Earl's Court Strategic Site is considered to be one of the few locations within the Borough appropriate for this scale of office use.	No change.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	31.3.34	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS403	<p>p176 para 31.3.31</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The current drafting infers that most demand for office floorspace comes from small requirements, whereas requirements for larger units will constitute a greater part of the office supply. The changes provide additional clarity, reflecting demand for large units as well as smaller premises, thus making the policy more effective.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>31.3.31 There is a forecast demand for 15% growth of office jobs over the plan period. This equates to a net addition of 69,200 m² (750,000 ft²) of office floorspace. For industry and warehousing, the forecast is for a small reduction of required stock of just 4,500 m² (50,000 ft²) or just 180 jobs. The types of units sought does vary. For light industrial uses, most take up is in units to about 230 m² (2,500 ft²), whereas for offices, most take up is for units between 45 m² and 75 m² (500 ft² and 800 ft²). This is not to say that t There is no also demand for larger units within the Borough as evidenced by . T the recent building out of some large scale office developments [delet: indicates that there is]. A range of size of sites will be needed, therefore, to meet future demand requirements.</p>		The Core Strategy recognises that the Council is seeking a range of office uses, as there is demand for a range of office types in the Borough. This is set out clearly in Policy CF5 which states that "the Council will ensure that there are a range of business premises within the Borough to allow business to grow and thrive." The proposed change is therefore unnecessary.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Nottingdale Ltd	Nottingdale Ltd	London Planning Practice LLP	31.3.34	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS493	<p>Paragraph 31.3.34 - "Accessibility"</p> <p>This states that:</p> <p><i>"The Council considers an area which has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) score of 4 or greater to be accessible."</i></p> <p>There is nothing contained in the evidence base to suggest a PTAL 4 limit would be necessary to support development of the size and type already recently approved for the Freston/ Latimer Employment Zone. Applying an arbitrary PTAL 4 restriction would act to stifle economic development in an area that the Council has always considered to be a perfectly accessible location suitable for large office development.</p>		The Council's approach as articulated by the Submission draft of the Core Strategy is to locate high trip generating uses within areas which are well served by public transport. This is considered to be a reasonable approach which is supported by the Policies within the London Plan. The Council considers that areas with a PTAL of 2 or 3 should not be regarded as "accessible."	No change.
Nottingdale Ltd	Nottingdale Ltd	London Planning Practice LLP	31.3.36	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS494	<p>Paragraph 31.3.36</p> <p>This paragraph states:</p> <p><i>"In particular it is these smaller units which are of particular demand for the Borough's creative and cultural industries. As a borough with some of the highest land values in the country, there is a danger that lower value land uses, such as light industrial or small offices, will be replaced by higher value uses such as housing (including student accommodation) or large-scale offices. In addition the Council notes that none of the Borough's Employment Zones are located in areas which are well served by public transport and therefore that, as major trip generators, large scale offices in these areas are likely to increase car use and congestion."</i></p> <p>This paragraph explains some of the reasoning behind policy CF5. Namely, that large scale offices (defined as those in excess of 1,000sqm) will be resisted in Employment Zones because:</p> <p>Smaller business units are in particular demand</p> <p>Larger scale offices (and other higher value land uses) will replace or displace smaller business units</p> <p>Large scale offices will increase car use and congestion as the Employment Zones are not well served by Public Transport.</p> <p>We contend that these assumptions are unjustified and therefore the policy going forward in CF5 is unsound. The reasons are:</p> <p>1. Demand</p> <p>It has been shown that although small business units may be in demand in their own right, with reference to our comments under para 31.3.31, there is clear demand for what the Council term "large offices", which reflects the general trend assumptions in the original 2007 Employment Land Review Report, ie that office space requirements will increase whilst industrial requirements will decrease.</p> <p>The evidence is clear at least at the Freston Road Employment Zones that a large number of office developments exist and have permission and it is wrong to simply ignore their presence and to focus on the minority element of this employment zone as being that which defines its character and function.</p> <p>2. Large Offices Displacing small business units</p> <p>It is simply not credible to assume that small flexible business</p>		<p>1) Demand</p> <p>The Proposed Submission Core Strategy seeks to promote smaller business premises as these are those which serve a disproportionate number of Borough residents. However, the Council does not suggest that there is no demand for large scale offices within the Borough. Indeed para 31.3.31 explicitly recognises that this is not the case, stating that "this is not to say that there is no demand for larger units within the Borough. The recent building out of some large scale offices indicates that there is."</p> <p>2) Large offices displacing small business units</p> <p>The Council notes that a planning permission granted on a wide site can contain a range of units, of differing sizes and types. However, it is the creation of any new large office premises in the Employment Zones which is seen as regrettable. The function of Employment Zones is considered to be to provide a mix of the smaller premises in particular demand by the Boroughs residents, and often required by the Creative and Cultural Businesses.</p> <p>The Council does consider that the creation of higher land value uses such as large offices, or residential, is likely to increase house values in an area, and, as para 31.3.36 suggests put greater pressure on lower value uses</p> <p>3) Large scale offices and car use</p> <p>The Council does not concur with the view that the Freston Road Employment Zone is "well served by public transport". The area lies within areas with a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 2 and 3 (Poor and Moderate) of the TfL PTAL map. The Council takes the view that a level of 4 or above (good) is better regarded as being "accessible".</p> <p>This approach complies with Policy 3C.1 of the London Plan. Policy 3C.1 does not specify what it considers to be an appropriate level of public transport accessibility, other than state "high". This is confirmed in para 3.200 of the London Plan which notes that "high density development should be located at points of "good public transport capacity". PTAL 4 is "good".</p> <p>Whilst it does not consider commercial development the London Plan's density matrix is helpful as does give an</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>units and small light industrial units will be lost as a result of larger employment development. The evidence is to the contrary in the Freston EZ. Specifically, the Nottingdale Village development has delivered over 4,300sqm of new dedicated flexible light industrial space designed as very small units. This was delivered in an area which previously contained no dedicated small industrial units.</p> <p>Further, the more recent (2009) planning permission for 137-139a Freston Road has delivered over 1,000sqm of flexible 'very small' business units in place of a large industrial unit which was suited to only a limited market and did not provide small flexible business space as identified as being in demand.</p> <p>The evidence of recent development is therefore that a significant increase in small flexible business units has been delivered alongside larger office developments in excess of what has previously existed in the Employment Zone.</p> <p>The evidence does not support the assumption that larger scale offices have displaced or replaced small business units from the area. To the contrary, the developments have delivered a significant increase in small business units across the employment zone and this can continue to be the case with a policy that seeks positive replacement and provision without stifling other employment generating development.</p> <p>3. Large scale offices will increase car use, congestion and are not well served by Public Transport</p> <p>The Freston Road employment zone is well served by public transport. The sites developed as part of the approved Nottingdale Village already provide for:</p> <p>23,433sqm of 81a offices in two large headquarters buildings for Monsoon and Talk Talk</p> <p>A light industrial building providing 4,378sqm of dedicated 'very small' light industrial units</p> <p>A more recent permission at 137 to 139a Freston Road allows for 1,077 sqm of Class 81 open floorspace providing a mix of "very small" flexible business units and a further 5,008sqm of Class 81a office floorspace, together with some limited retail space and residential development.</p> <p>All of these developments were approved by the Council on the basis that they had good access to public transport under the test set out in Policy E1 of the current UDP.</p> <p>Access to the area has improved, not declined since these planning permissions were granted. The closest underground station is Latimer Road at an average 300m from the main Nottingdale Village development. In particular, the extension of the circle line service on the Hammersmith and City Line will increase services from this station. Furthermore, links to Westfield on the opposite side of the West Cross Route provide access to the Shepherds Bush Overground and Underground services as well as to a new bus service. Local bus services are also close by and provide very good access to these main rail hubs. It is likely that with Latimer Town</p> <p>Centre being developed as part of the Vision, further public transport improvements will occur.</p> <p>Finally, the justification in paragraph 31.3.36 is that "...as major</p>		<p>indication of what the Mayor considers to be differing levels of public transport accessibility. The matrix includes three levels of accessibility, PTAL 0 to 1, PTAL 2 to 3 and PTAL 4 to 6. It is reasonable to equate PTAL 4 to 6 with "good" or "high" Public Transport Accessibility.</p> <p>The Council considers that as "high trip generating" uses, large scale offices do have the potential to increase car use and congestion. This will particularly be the case in areas where public transport accessibility is not good. However, the Council does also recognise that the planning process can limit these problems. Para 31.3.36 is intended to recognise both positions, in that large scale offices in inaccessible area "are likely to increase car use and congestion", this is not to say that they necessarily will. The starting point must however remain as that set out in Policy CT1 (a) - a policy which states that high trip generating development must be located in the more accessible areas. As outlined above, this is a position supported by the London Plan.</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p><i>trip generators, large scale offices in these areas are likely to increase car use and congestion."</i></p> <p>Again there is no evidence of this. Any perceived problems of car congestion and parking can be adequately controlled by the planning process by limiting commuter parking provision and ensuring the adoption of appropriate travel plans for offices.</p> <p>The permissions granted for the Nottingdale Village Development which contained two large office buildings are evidence of this approach. They were limited in terms of parking provision. Only 18 spaces were permitted for over 30,000sqm of employment floorspace across the site, including light industrial uses. It was determined at the time that this would not give rise to any congestion or parking pressure locally. This is reinforced by the fact that the Borough is covered by a residents CPZ limiting opportunities to park on street. Finally, the proximity of public transport to the site, and zone generally, provide a more viable and effective means of accessing the site for office workers and this can clearly be seen each working morning and evening. Further, the presence of workers in the employment zone and in the large offices is acknowledged by the Council's DPD at para 9.3.15 of Chapter 9 as being of benefit by providing a greater stimulus for local shopping, underpinning the vision for a new Town Centre at Latimer.</p> <p>There are other benefits of to the development of larger office developments in parts of the employment zone. Principally, it is these developments that have allowed for the building of the less viable newly built flexible small business units across the site and paid for the significant improvements to the local street pattern and provided for a high quality of architecture -all key parts of the Vision for the Latimer area.</p>			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	31.3.43	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS406	<p>p179 para 31.3.43 Arts and culture uses</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>Reference to the cultural facilities proposed at Earls Court as part of the strategic site allocation is added for clarity. This will make the document effective in delivering the vision for the site and the document sound.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>31.3.43 The Borough's arts and cultural uses include museums, art galleries, exhibition spaces, theatres, cinemas and studios. Several of these facilities are enjoyed by more than just a local audience, but have a national, and, in some cases, an international draw . New cultural facilities or attractions that comprise a destination are proposed at Earls Court as part of the Earls Court Regeneration Area. Further detail regarding the types of uses and their location within the Regeneration Area will be determined through a Planning Framework and masterplanning.</p>		The Council's ambitions for Earl's Court with regard cultural uses are set out with the Earl's Court place, and the Earl's Court Strategic Site. Further reference in this para would therefore add nothing. Other cultural uses are favoured elsewhere in the Borough, and therefore specific reference to Earls Court could give the unintended impression that Earl's Court is valued over all other sites.	No change.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	31.4.4	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS407	<p>p182 Corporate and partner actions for fostering vitality</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p>		Whilst the Council supports the creation of a new neighbourhood centres in the Earl's Court wider site it cannot work with land owners to deliver this given that the centre may be within Hammersmith and Fulham, not this Borough.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>The proposed change reflects the development potential of the Earls Court Regeneration Area as described elsewhere in the document. It provides consistency and clarity to make the strategy effective and sound.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>(3) Planning officers will work with land owners and other stakeholders to deliver two new town centres in the north of the Borough, in the Kensal and Latimer areas and within the Earls Court Regeneration Area.</p>			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	32.2.2	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS408	<p>p183 para 32.2.2 and Policy CT1 Improving alternatives to car use</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>There is no sound and credible evidence base to demonstrate that converting the Earls Court road system to 2-way working is achievable or would deliver the benefits sought. Para 26.2.4 refers to initial feasibility work having been undertaken but this assessment does not form part of the Council's evidence base to the PS Core Strategy. In addition, the Council's response to Capital & Counties' earlier representations states that this work would need to be updated to include development proposals in the area.</p> <p>The GLA's representations to earlier iterations of the document refer to previous studies showing that "removal of the one-way system is highly problematic to achieve" and that TfL has "no plans at present to remove the one-way system and as such no funding has been identified for this". The Council's response to these representations state it is aware of the difficulty in unravelling the one-way system, yet no evidence has been put forward by the Council to justify maintaining this approach as the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. There also seems to have been very little support to unravelling the one way system from the local community during previous consultations.</p> <p>For these reasons, deliverability of 2-way working is uncertain and it is not appropriate, therefore, to "require" development to contribute to this project. As currently worded the policy is not effective. By widening the text so it refers to making improvements to these streets and exploring the potential for one way working would bring the policy in line with PPS12. The proposal would continue to recognise the importance of meeting Core Strategy visions for an engaging public realm, better travel choices and respect for environmental limits.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>32.2.2 In a Borough with such a high concentration of shops, businesses, and arts and cultural facilities, walking and cycling can often be the quickest and easiest way of getting to places. Through constantly improving the street environment, removing and bridging existing barriers, supporting the London Cycle Hire Scheme and by ensuring new development provides the appropriate facilities, the Council will ensure that the number of journeys made on foot and by bicycle increases. Where residents need to use a car, a dense network of on-street car club bays will mean they do not need to own their own vehicle. The communities surrounding the Earl's Court One-Way System are currently blighted by traffic. This would be improved by returning</p>		Paragraph 32.2.2 has been amended and widened to include reference to making pedestrian improvements. Paragraph 26.2.4 has also been amended.	Paragraph 32.2.2 has been amended and widened to include reference to making pedestrian improvements. Paragraph 26.2.4 has also been amended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									the roads to two-way operation. Alternative proposals which can improve the position will be supported, including pedestrian and environmental improvements.			
Ms Bobbie Vincent Emery			32.3.10	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS486	<p>A North-South cycle path</p> <p>1.1 The chain of development down the western edge of the Borough</p> <p>from the towpath on the grand union canal in Kensal, to Lots Road and the Thames Path in the south , provide a magnificent planning opportunity for a north/south safe cycle route.</p> <p>1.2 The three major development areas of Kensal, Warwick Road and Earls Court, with the redesign of the Latimer streets and the proposed pedestrian/cycle route south from Brompton Cemetery to the Thames, make such an idea more than feasible. Between the development sites there is railway land, the quiet roads of the St Quentin estate, and Hansard Mews and an existing contra-flow cycle route up Elsham Road in Holland Ward.</p> <p>1.3 The pupils of the two new Academies located on or near this routein Latimer and the Lots Road area would benefit from a north/south safe route.Boroughs to the centre of London, are likely to be west -east routes,and will not greatly assist cyclists travelling north or south <i>within</i> the Borough.East -west routes would however help through-cyclists. They would also contribute to the reduction of particulates, and improve air quality by encouraging non-resident through-travellers out of their cars and on to bikes.</p> <p>1.4.2 The only west-east continuous cycle path proposed is Westway(Chapter 8). There are no proposals for west-east routes between Westway and the Thames . Improved pedestrian links are addressed in most places and strategic sites, but not cycle links. An example is Notting Hill Gate (Chapter 16), a key location on an important east-west route. The Core Strategy proposes narrowed vehicle lanes and widened pavements for pedestrians, but no cycle path. A few hundred yards to the east of Notting Hill Gate are the dedicated cycle paths of Hyde Park which lead to central London, but there is no recognition of the need to connect to this major cycle route, or make cycling through Notting Hill Gate safer.</p> <p>Linked cycle routes</p> <p>2.1 Where specific cycle routes are shown on maps, they are notlinked to other cycle routes . For example the South Kensington map (Ch 12) shows Imperial College Road is to be improved as a pedestrian and cycle route, but there is no vision to link it via the wide thoroughfare of Queens Gate to the cycling routes within Hyde Park. A safe north-south cycle route on the east of the Borough would greatly assist students at the many educational establishments in this area.</p> <p>2.2 Maps of 'places' and 'strategic sites' do not show the existing dedicated cycle paths, indicating that practical steps to make cycling an attractive option have been overlooked. For example the map of Kensington High Street which now has a central reservation bike park, does not show the north-south Holland Walk cycle path that connects the High Street to Ladbroke Grove.</p> <p>2.3.1 Maps of some areas are not consistent with the text of the Core Strategy in relation to cycling. This makes the overall picture confusing, and suggests that cycle routes were initially seen as a minor planning issue. An example is the pedestrian and cycling</p>		Agree that greater reference could be made of the opportunities presented by development along the west of the borough and the potential for a north-south cycle route.	Additional text has been added to 32.3.10 to secure opportunities to provide cycle and pedestrian links along the western boundary of the borough.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>improvements in the south of the Borough covered in Chapters 17 and 18.</p> <p>2.3.2 The Fulham Road (West) map in Chapter 17 shows an improved <i>pedestrian</i> route through and south of Brompton Cemetery annotated as a 'pedestrian & cycle link from cemetery to Thames '. This is not consistent with the adjacent area map of Lots Road and World's End in Chapter 18 which shows only pedestrian routes to and along the Thames, and no cycle routes.</p> <p>However, 'the number of new pedestrian and cycle links established in and to Brompton Cemetery' is an output indicator for the purposes of monitoring Chapter 17. Further, the Vision statement, CV 17, says that "Pedestrian and Cycle routes to the north and south will be improved." The related map shows a 'North-South cycle link' across Fulham Road although what it links to is unclear</p> <p>2.3.3 The amended policy at CV 18 now includes a specific reference - to cycling and pedestrian routes over the Thames at Cremorne Bridge, But, the proposed bridge over the Chelsea Creek is pedestrian only. At 18.3.11 it says there will be pedestrian and cycling links along and across the Thames, but then a very general commitment to 'support enhanced pedestrian, cyclist and bus links in the area". So there are fragments of good intent but no coherent picture of a pattern of cycle routes .</p>			
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		33.2.2	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS201	Para 33.2.2 refers to open spaces supporting physical activities and we suggest that the paragraph also refers to specific health benefits of physical activity		The health benefits of physical activity are well known and increasing the length of the text at reasoned justification paragraph 33.2.2 is not justified on this basis.	No changes are recommended.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		33.2.3	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS202	Para 33.2.3 refers to lowering traffic speeds and improving pedestrian safety and should also refer to the potential to reduce road and traffic injuries	the reference to pedestrian safety would largely cover road and traffic injuries. It is not considered that making specific reference to traffic injuries will add to the clarity of the reasoned justification and the proposed change is not accepted.	No changes are recommended.	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	33.2.5	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS411	<p>p189 para 33.2.5 and Policy CR1 Street Network</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The proposed changes seek increased flexibility for the policy to be effective. It will not always be feasible to change street network patterns. For example, in the case of the Earls Court one-way system, TfL is not supportive of proposed 2-way working, as explained in C&C's representations to Policy CT1.</p> <p>When considering a regeneration site connectivity with the surrounding area will be important. Whilst the legibility of new routes may be enhanced by drawing from historic patterns, there also needs to be flexibility to allow the introduction of new layouts, reflecting the uses and scale of development being proposed and achieving the wider masterplanning objectives for the strategic sites. The policy should recognise the potential for positive change.</p> <p>Large scale development proposals such as the Earls Court Regeneration Area should embrace a range of urban typologies to reflect different land uses and ranges in density. Whilst a finer grain of development may be appropriate for residential areas, alternative plan forms will be more suited to accommodate larger commercial premises and achieving necessary building efficiencies.</p>		In terms of the change sought to introduce the words 'where feasible' this is not accepted. It will introduce a degree of flexibility which is not desired. The likely scenario will be that a great deal of time and resources will be wasted arguing whether something is feasible or not.	No changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									Change sought 33.2.5 However, there are parts of the Borough where the public realm is of a lesser quality and in need of significant attention. Areas such as the Westway, Cromwell Road, the Earl's Court One-Way System, Kensal, World's End and Latimer. Establishing where feasible a new and improved street network, drawing from the Borough's historic patterns and public spaces, will be at the heart of the successful regeneration of these areas.			
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		33.3.6	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS293	Street Network Para 33.3.6 refers to designing out crime and making design more inclusive. We suggest that this should be cross-referenced to Policy CL2 criterion a vii.		It is agreed that a reference can be made to Policy CL2 criterion a vii in the 'Renewing the Legacy' chapter.	Additional text at the end of paragraph 33.3.6 - (see also Policy CL2 (a) vii)
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		33.3.24	Paragraph		No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS297	Para 33.3.24 suggests public open space deficiency in the south of the borough. Para 10.1.7 refers to Earl's Court lacking public open space and proposals to improve provision (para 10.3.16). This needs to be clarified.		The public open space deficiency map on page 190 illustrates more residential areas outside a 400m walk of the nearest publicly accessible open space in the south of the Borough ie south of Kensington High Street. The Earl's Court ward is shown as part of this deficiency. In the deficiency areas shown on the map it is the intention to provide further open space as part of re-development opportunities as Policy CR5 states. The Borough ward open space profiles (supplied to the GLA)also show that Earl's Court ward fares badly compared with some other wards in the Borough in terms of available public open space.	No changes are recommended.
Mr Matthew Brown	Environment Agency		33.3.28	Paragraph				PSubCS116	Policy no: CR5 Parks Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways (pre-cursor) Page no: 195 Paragraph: 33.3.28 Why it is legally compliant or Sound? We approve of the supporting text to Policy CRE5. It states that river Thames like the Grand Union Canal to the north, the potential of the Thames as a leisure as a leisure recreation, biodiversity and transport resource. This accords with Blue Ribbon Network and London Rivers Action Plan.		This comment provides support to the Core Strategy text.	No changes are recommended..
Port of London Authority Lucy Owen	Port of London Authority		33.4.1	Paragraph	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS328	There is planning policy support for the use of the river for the transport of passengers and goods from the National Level downwards and this includes the use of the River for the transport of construction and waste materials to and from development sites (see for example policies 4C.7 and 4C.8 of the <i>London Plan</i>). Additionally, the Council is fortunate to have a safeguarded wharf within its boundary and policy 4C.9 of the <i>London Plan</i> seeks to protect safeguarded wharves for cargo handling uses. The <i>London Plan</i> states at paragraph 4.1.6.1 that increasing the Blue Ribbon Network for freight transport is a widely supported objective as this is a more sustainable method of transport and can help to reduce congestion and the impact of goods vehicles on London's roads. It is therefore considered that this section of the plan and its policies should be reviewed to place an increasing emphasis on the role that the river could play in meeting the Council's environmental objectives. The PLA would wish for the Council in their waste DPD to set out the steps which will be taken in order to get waste materials delivered to and exported from the site by water. It is noted that the Directorate of Transport, Environment and Leisure Services will work with the GLA to enhance the function of the BRN and particularly the use of the Thames for transport. The PLA should also be involved in these discussions.		Noted. Reference to the use of waterways can be found in chapter 32: "Better Travel Choices", paragraph 32.3.11. Moreover, Policy CT1, <i>Improving alternatives to car use</i> , (located in the same chapter) includes a point (m) which "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". In addition, paragraph 36.3.23 explains that as the Borough is very accessible by river and rail, it can provide opportunities for sustainable transportation of residual waste. Therefore, the role the river and the Blue Ribbon Network could play in meeting the Council's environmental objectives has already been sufficiently explained. The Council will take into account the comments regarding sustainable transport of waste in the future waste DPD. The wording of the Corporate or Partnership Actions for Respecting Environmental Limits (number 15) will be amended to read: " The Directorate of Transport, Environment and Leisure Services will work with the GLA and the PLA to enhance the function of the Blue	The wording of the Corporate or Partnership Actions for Respecting Environmental Limits (number 15) will be amended to read: ' The Directorate of Transport, Environment and Leisure Services will work with the GLA and the PLA to enhance the function of the Blue Ribbon Network, and particularly the use of the Thames for transport '. In addition the wording of Corporate Action 12 in the 'An Engaging Public Realm' chapter will be recommended to be amended to include the Port of London Authority so it will read, ' The Planning and Borough Development Directorate will work in partnership with the Port of London Authority and British Waterways to help deliver improved 'blue infrastructure ';

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<i>Ribbon Network, and particularly the use of the Thames for transport</i> ".	
Brookfield Developments	Brookfield Developments (UK) Ltd	DP9	34.2.1	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS69	<p>order to reflect the wording in policy eL2</p> <p>and to ensure consistency across the</p> <p>document in accordance with PPS12, our client proposes the following revised</p> <p>wording:</p> <p><i>"Careful incremental improvement is needed to ensure our conservation areas</i></p> <p><i>remain of the highest quality. However, there are a number of small areas in the</i></p> <p><i>south and two large areas in the north of the Borough which are not within</i></p> <p><i>conservation areas. It is important that these areas are not regarded as 'second class'</i></p> <p><i>in terms of the future quality and contribution for which we should be striving. We</i></p> <p><i>should aspire for these areas to be our future conservation areas and</i></p> <p><i>high architectural and design quality is needed to create a new design legacy for the</i></p> <p><i>Borough. "</i></p> <p>In</p>		With regard to the proposed re-wording of reasoned justification paragraph 34.2.1 which removes the reference to 'exceptional' design quality outside of conservation areas it is agreed that a ' high' standard of design could be appropriate. Whilst the Council's aim is to ensure that the design reflects the exceptional quality in the Borough as a whole it is agreed that a high standard of design would suffice as to ensure that every aspect of the built environment is 'exceptional' would probably be impossible to attain.	Change the reference from 'exceptional design quality' to 'a high design quality' at paragraph 34.2.1
Sun Life Assurance Plc	Sun Life Assurance Plc	DP9	34.2.1	Paragraph	Yes	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS74	<p>Paragraph 34.2.1</p> <p>In order to reflect the wording in policy CL2 and to ensure consistency across the</p> <p>document in accordance with PPS12, our client proposes the following revised</p> <p>wording:</p> <p><i>"Careful incremental improvement is needed to ensure our conservation areas</i></p> <p><i>remain of the highest quality. However, there are a number of small areas in the</i></p>		The reference to 'high architectural and design quality' in paragraph 34.2.1 instead of ' exceptional design quality' is partially accepted. It is considered that the reference to 'design' in this context would also include 'architecture' as it is being used in very broad terms. Therefore there is no reason to refer to both.	Change 'exceptional' to 'a high design quality' in paragraph 34.2.1
											In terms of 'high design quality,' rather than 'exceptional' the words ' a high design quality' would be acceptable as a wholly 'exceptional' townscape outside of a conservation area may be an unrealistic aspiration. '	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>south and two large areas in the north of the Borough which are not within</p> <p>conservation areas. It is important that these areas are not regarded as 'second class'</p> <p>in terms of the future quality and contribution for which we should be striving. We</p> <p>should aspire for these areas to be our future conservation areas and exceptional</p> <p><u>high architectural and</u> design quality is needed to create a new design legacy for the</p> <p>Borough. "</p>			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	34.2.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS416	<p>p201 para 34.2.1</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The text is inconsistent with Policy CL2 which refers to new development being of the "highest architectural" quality. The proposed change introduces consistency, providing some flexibility for effective interpretation and application of the policy.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>34.2.1 Careful incremental improvement is needed to ensure our conservation areas remain of the highest quality. However, there are a number of small areas in the south and two large areas in the north of the Borough which are not within conservation areas. It is important that these areas are not regarded as 'second class' in terms of the future quality and contribution for which we should be striving. We should aspire for these areas to be our future conservation areas and exceptional high architectural design quality is needed to create a new design legacy for the Borough.</p>		With reference to the wording of reasoned justification paragraph 34.2.1 it is noted that to ensure consistency across the document the reference to 'exceptional design quality' outside of conservation areas should be amended. It is acknowledged that the reference to 'exceptional' may be difficult to attain and there is a danger of of inconsistent approach. On this basis it is recommended that the word 'exceptional' is substituted for 'high'. The specific reference to 'architectural quality' is considered unnecessary in this instance as it would be covered by reference to the design.	Recommended change from 'exceptional' to 'a high' design quality at paragraph 34.2.1
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	34.3.4	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS417	<p>p203 para 34.3.4, 34.3.7 Policy CL1 Context and character</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The existing wording is too prescriptive and will compromise development opportunities and is not effective. In addition, it is inconsistent with advice in PPG15, as explained below.</p> <p>Additional text is proposed to acknowledge that the Borough has a variety of building scales and densities, sometimes (but not always) reflected by increased heights. This has been recognised in earlier versions of the Core Strategy and in the Council's draft Tall Buildings SPD which mentions that certain locations may be appropriate for major development and increased densities which could include taller buildings. The proposed changes also retain a reference from earlier versions of the Core Strategy to increased density making better use of land, which is an important</p>		It is not accepted that the approach to density is inconsistent. Reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.6 states that the Borough does not shy away from high density designs, but is an exemplar in demonstrating that high density and high quality are compatible. However, a minor wording change in the next paragraph (para 34.3.7) should ensure that our approach to density is robust and entirely consistent. The proposed change is to refer to density in terms of being used as 'the sole determinant of design' rather than 'a determinant of design' The representation unfortunately makes the assumption that high densities can only be accommodated by tall buildings. The Borough is an exemplar of demonstrating that high densities can be accommodated without resorting to tall or high buildings.	No changes are recommended except the text at paragraph 34.3.7 which instead of reading: 'densities should not be used as a determinant of design...' should read, 'densities should not be used as the sole determinant of design...'
											Regarding Opportunity Areas, it should be noted that	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>consideration to achieve sustainable development solutions.</p> <p>The current drafting is contradictory on the issue of density. It states that RBKC's context encourages high density schemes (34.3.6) and yet that density should not be a determinant of design (34.3.7). As acknowledged, the existing townscape of RBKC shows that high density is not incompatible with high quality design (34.3.6). It does not follow therefore that high density designs will undermine the Borough's commitment to protect the quality of conservation areas and to support good design. Density will be one of a number of factors to take into account in determining the appropriateness of development proposals. National guidance and the London Plan advocate density levels that are appropriate to a site and the Core Strategy should allow such levels of development to come forward. It is particularly relevant in the case of Opportunity Areas which are regarded as the capital's reservoir of brownfield land with significant capacity to accommodate future growth.</p> <p>PPG15 states that the desirability of preserving or enhancing a conservation area is a material consideration where development would be seen in views into or out of the area. The visibility of a new building could have a neutral or positive impact and still respect the character or appearance of a conservation area in accordance with PPG15, and similarly be acceptable in other sensitive views.</p> <p>The change proposed to para (b) provides clarity to ensure that the context for a site also embraces any existing development on the site.</p> <p>The changes proposed to paras (c) and (f) of the policy introduce flexibility, which is important if the strategic development sites are able to deliver the planning objectives set out in the Core Strategy vision. Para (e) is reworded to reflect PPG15. The Council's response to Capital & Counties' previous representations state that "assess" provides no policy direction. However, a blanket resistance to all development does not acknowledge that in some instances townscape impacts may be acceptable and, indeed positive. The townscape impacts of a development proposal should be considered in the round and weighed against the other impacts the scheme would generate. The policy should not unduly restrict allowing each application to be considered on its merits.</p> <p>The policy/supporting text should apply to the impacts of development in important townscape views and clarify how such "local vistas, views and gaps" will be agreed. In some instances, they may be set out in the Council's Conservation Area Proposal Statement or other adopted guidance but others will need to be agreed in consultation with the applicant.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Insert a new para after 34.3.4</p> <p>In parts of the Borough, different building scales and type give rise to greater densities of development, for example, residential towers (Trellick Tower, Latimer Road Estate and World's End Estate) and commercial buildings along transit routes (Notting Hill Gate, Kensington High Street, Cromwell Road, Brompton Road and parts of Sloane Avenue). Increased densities make better use of land and can be appropriate in some locations. This is particularly the case in Opportunity Areas.</p>		<p>the Council does not have the evidence base to support the case that "tall buildings act as a catalyst for regeneration" and is dependent on policy 4B.9 of the London Plan. The background report to High Buildings by Urban Initiatives comments at section 4.3.3, <i>'It has been argued that regeneration areas should be represented through tall buildings. Nevertheless there is no evidence that high rise buildings act as a catalyst for regeneration. Confidence in regeneration is generally achieved through higher densities and more mixed and intensive uses.'</i></p> <p>That aside, further detailed design analysis is underway in partnership with LB Hammersmith and Fulham, assessing the opportunity for locating tall buildings within the Earl's Court Opportunity Area. The Council's position is that, as part of the Opportunity Area, tall buildings may be appropriate within Hammersmith and Fulham and this notion is in accordance with their draft Core Strategy. The views study will determine the location and appropriate height of the building(s) in relation to existing views, ensuring a positive benefit to the townscape. Tall buildings on the part of the site within the Royal Borough remain unacceptable, because of the close proximity to the existing historic built fabric, impacting upon views out of the adjacent conservation areas and the fact that the townscape of these conservation areas is relatively homogenous with a level roofscape.</p> <p>Regarding the Kensal Opportunity Area, the opportunity for tall building(s) remains constrained by the designation of the adjacent Kensal Cemetery as a conservation area and the potential amenity and environmental impacts for the green space and waterway to be heavily overshadowed. The Council does not rule out the possibility for tall building(s) on the wider site, but it does not wish to confirm that they are appropriate at this stage. Investigations have shown that considerable residential densities can be achieved on the site within a medium-rise development. Such a development model would visually integrate well with the surroundings and complement the Borough's traditional character and form. The Council is concerned that there is a perception that an Opportunity Area is synonymous with tall buildings and that by specifying Kensal as an area for tall buildings little or no regard will be paid to achieving the densities using an approach that is locally distinctive of the Borough..</p> <p>The reference to high buildings not being appropriate in Conservation Areas as it appears at reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.23 has been drafted with the particular townscape characteristics of the Borough in mind. The Urban Initiatives study (page 32) states that a large part of the Borough derives its character and townscape from its heritage of eighteenth, nineteenth and early twentieth century buildings. The Royal Borough comprises some 3,800 listed buildings and has designated 35 conservation areas, covering about 70% of the borough. These conservation areas mainly comprise homogenous Georgian and Victorian quarters characterised by urban street blocks. Average heights range from 2-3 storey terraces in North Kensington to 3-5 storey Georgian and Victorian terraces and town houses, up to 8 storey Edwardian and Victorian Mansion blocks in the Ladbroke Grove Area, Notting Hill, Holland</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											Park Area, South Kensington and Chelsea. The wording of the proposed new paragraph is not accepted as it is framed in such a manner as to give the impression that high densities provide justification for tall buildings. Reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.6 makes it clear that our context encourages us to deliver high density schemes. However, the argument is flawed to assume that these have to be in the form of tall buildings.	
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	34.3.4	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS512	Paragraph 34.3.4 KHT notes the range of residential densities within paragraph 34.3.4. KHT could welcome clarification on the source and evidence to support the residential densities included within paragraph 34.3.4, and suggests that this is referenced within the Core Strategy.		Comments noted. The densities referred to offer a range from Council's monitoring. It is considered that further referencing would be providing too detailed information to include in a Core Strategy which should be broadly strategic.	No change.
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		34.3.7	Paragraph		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS265	22. The Council considers that density should not be used as a determinant of design, as it would undermine their duties to have regard both to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas, and to good design (para 34.3.7) . The Council also considers that the density matrix in the London Plan needs to be read in relation to the context of the development. However, PPS3 states that '... in Conservation Areas and other local areas of special character (where), if proper attention is paid to achieving good design, new development opportunities can be taken without adverse impacts on their character and appearance' .		It is acknowledged that the reference to density being referred to as 'a determinant of design' at paragraph 34.3.7 will be recommended to be referred to 'as solely the determinant of design' We acknowledge that density can be a determinant of design, but it should not override all other considerations and that the context is more important. On this basis reference to 'the sole determinant of design' is more accurate.	Change the wording regarding density at paragraph 34.3.7 from 'a determinant of design' to 'the sole determinant of design'.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	34.3.7	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS418	34.3.7 However, the Council considers that densities should not be the only or foremost determinant of design, [delete as it would undermine o] Our duties are also to have regard both to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas, and to good design `The density matrix in the London Plantherefore needs to be read in relation to the context of the development.		It is recommended that the reference to densities at paragraph 34.3.7 should be amended so that it refers to 'the sole determinant of design' rather than 'a determinant of design' .With this in mind there would appear to be no compelling reason to remove the reference to density not being used as the determinant of design as this would undermine our duties to have regard both to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas, and to good design.	No changes are recommended.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	34.3.10	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS419	34.3.10 The quality and character of an area is not only provided by the individual buildings but it is also gained from views into and out of the area. Therefore development that impacts on important views, vistas and gaps is an important aspect of respecting context. When considering a development proposal, the Council will agree relevant views, vistas and gaps with the applicant.		Whilst it is acknowledged that the agreement of relevant views, vistas and gaps into and out of an area would be useful to agree with the applicant it is not considered appropriate to add to the reasoned justification to Policy CL1. There may also be occasions when other interested parties, such as English Heritage may have a view which needs to be taken on board and the proposed change of wording to the text would make it too inflexible.	No changes are recommended.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		34.3.13	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS298	Para 34.3.13 refers to good design and the aspects of functionality and robustness and in para 34.3.15 the relationship with sustainability. The functionality and robustness of design is closely related to physical and mental health which should be recognised.		Whilst physical and mental health can be affected by design these are secondary considerations to the elements which make up good design. On this basis it would not be appropriate to refer to health benefits in this context.	No changes are recommended.
Miss Robina Rose	(The Ladbroke Association)		34.3.20	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS341	Renewing the the legacy: RENEWING THE LEGACY para 34.3.20 70% increase in SUBTERRANEAN Development over		With reference to a moritorium for subterranean development in the Counter's Creek catchment area this is not justified based on the evidence that is available. The Subterranean Development scoping Study (paragraph 5.1), June 2008 commented that with regard to the impact of subterranean development on ground water flows and levels, groundwater flows will find an	No changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>last 5 years.</p> <p>Full long-term impacts, both in terms of terraces & neighbours in terms of ground and groundwater movements and structure, have yet to be assessed.</p> <p>EVIDENCE</p> <p>OveArup refers to incremental effect, particularly on terraces & London Clay Ladbroke Association report on neighbour impacts.</p> <p>Clearly in the light of what is now known about the inadequacies of the Counters Creek sewer system and the already severe impacts in the catchment area.....</p> <p>There needs to be a moratorium on subterranean development in the Counters Creek catchment, until the Thames Water improvements have taken place there.</p> <p>Furthermore, in the intended large scale developments take place in the north (Kensal etc)the situation will clearly be aggravated.</p> <p>EVIDENCE 4</p> <p>July 2009 Draft Core Strategy LDF document p.223 RISKS column "Counters Creek is unable to take the scale of the development proposed, or the improvements do not take place in alignment with the timing of the development"</p> <p>ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>"Plan C. Delay development until infrastructure was in place."</p> <p>Why should individual householders be exposed to the further increased risk of sewer flooding that incremental subterranean dev's in the vicinity create? (as confirmed by Thames Water technicians at the recent Town Hall meeting)</p> <p>The SPD on Sub-Dev remains weak in many places, and the Party Wall Act not fit for the purpose of dealing with such extreme works. para 34.3.20 "Sub-Dev may have minimal structural impact on existing or adjoining buildings <i>as long as they are designed and constructed with great care</i>"</p> <p>Without considerably greater integration between Council departments (ie Planning, Environmental Health, Building Control, traffic and Highways to say nothing of Health and safety) this would not seem to be deliverable (as has frequently been the case already).</p> <p>EVIDENCE</p> <p>see Ladbroke Association Report.</p> <p>Ove Amp Scoping Study Kensington Society objections.</p> <p>Hidden aspects of Urban Planning 2002(European Council of Town Planners)</p> <p>and LDF PSCS consultation report (Oct 2009)</p> <p>6.42 Flooding, refers to the need for "The Precautionary Approach</p>		<p>alternative route if blocked by a subterranean structure, although there may be very small rises in level. These changes in level are likely to be significantly less than the natural variations in the water table associated with seasonal variations. There is no evidence to show that the flooding of Counter's Creek is caused or exacerbated by subterranean development to a degree which would justify a moratorium.</p> <p>With regard to sewage flooding sewer flooding is a result of the sewer infrastructure being unable to cope with extreme amounts of rainfall over a short period of time. Some measures can be taken to reduce the risk, such as water pumps or non-return valves to the sewers. However, subterranean development may be at risk of sewer flooding, but it does not contribute to it, especially if sustainable urban drainage systems are employed (SUDS) including adequate soil depth.</p> <p>With regard to the effect of large scale development on the capacity of Counter's Creek it is acknowledged that this needs to be carefully handled. To this end Thames Water have recommended that a paragraph be added to the strategic sites which states that developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it should not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to the overloading of existing waste water infrastructure.</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>to flood risk"</p> <p>Test of soundness 4(a) and (b), development with respecting environmental limits.</p> <p>"very little of the borough is located in Flood Zones 2& 3. The majority....is within Flood Zone 1.The threat of fluvial flooding is low, but sewer flooding occurred in theHolland and Norland Wards in 1981 and 2007.(153) (153)RBKC draft Strategic Flood Risk Assessment refer to river and sea flooding only-(ENV AGENCY)</p> <p>-It is therefore not fit for purpose.</p>			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	34.3.22	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS421	<p>p205 para 34.3.22, 34.3.22, 34.3.26, 34.3.28, 34.3.29 High buildings</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The proposed changes add clarity and consistency with strategic policy to make the Strategy effective.</p> <p>The changes clarify that not all the Borough comprises modest development of consistent height. Parts of the borough do have larger and tall buildings, as explained in Capital & Counties' proposed additions after para 34.3.4. The changes proposed at 34.3.24 provide clarity as the current drafting is cumbersome and unclear.</p> <p>The changes reflect strategic policy which identifies Opportunity Areas as potential locations for tall buildings where there is good access by public transport.</p> <p>The proposed changes allow flexibility for development proposals that have a neutral impact on the townscape. A building that is visible from different locations may be acceptable providing it has a positive or neutral impact on local townscape. In addition, a negative impact may be outweighed by other benefits to be generated by the scheme. The proposed change is consistent with Capital & Counties' proposed changes to Policy CL1. Combined, the two policies provide guidance for development having an adverse, neutral or positive impact in key views.</p> <p>The changes proposed in para 34.3.29 explain more clearly recognised good practice in the approach to be used when assessing the impact of buildings in townscape views.</p>		<p>In relation to the proposed re-wording of reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.22 the change from 'within' to 'across a large part' of Kensington and Chelsea is not accepted. This implies there are parts of the Borough, albeit smaller in numbers that do not have a modest and consistent height of building. Whilst there is undoubtedly variety the respondents refer to specific parts of the Borough which have larger and tall buildings although they do not state specifically where.</p> <p>The second deletion relates to high densities being delivered without recourse to tall buildings. This change is also not readily accepted as the Council wishes to make clear that high densities in the Borough are a reality and they have not involved the recourse to tall buildings.</p> <p>With reference to the deletion of the words, 'Tall Buildings' again the revised wording 'waters down' what has been written - tall buildings very much are the exception and this should be clearly stated. In relation to building height being a critical issue and a sensitive feature of the townscape this is part of the justification for the policy and reinforces the locally distinctive approach of the Borough. To remove it would not assist in the clarifying the policy.</p> <p>With reference to Opportunity Areas being suitable for tall buildings the link between tall buildings and regeneration is not readily accepted We must rely on the Mayor of London's evidence base to justify this approach which is yet to be tested at examination. The context needs to be carefully assessed.</p>	No changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Changes sought</p> <p>34.3.22 The relatively modest and consistent height of building across a large part of [delete within] Kensington and Chelsea reflects the primarily residential character of the Borough. High residential densities are delivered within this townscape [delete without recourse to tall buildings] and this pattern of development with its medium-rise, high-density residential areas has produced a very attractive townscape, and is central to the Borough's charm. Given its central location, the Borough has comparatively few tall buildings compared to other central London boroughs, the tallest being Trellick Tower at 98m. [delete Tall buildings] Buildings that are significantly taller than the surrounding townscape are therefore [delete very much] the exception and proposals for new tall buildings must be considered carefully in relation to sensitive features of the townscape. [delete Building height is thus a critical issue and a very sensitive feature of the townscape.]</p>		For a tall building to have a neutral impact, given their impact over a wide area and the guidance contained within PPS1 which resists design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, is simply not enough. They must have a positive impact. Negative impacts also should not be outweighed by other considerations as there is little point in having a tall buildings policy. Other considerations would be treated as material considerations and assigned weight in the normal manner.	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	34.3.23	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS422	<p>34.3.23 [delete One approach to determining the appropriate location of high buildings would be to identify where they are not appropriate - such as in Conservation Areas. However, such an approach risks inferring that they are therefore appropriate anywhere else. That would not be an appropriate approach, because h] Higher buildings considered as local or district landmarks or very tall buildings should [delete must] only be located where - depending on their impact - they give meaning to the local or Borough townscape.</p>		The specific text at paragraph 34.3.24 explains the Council's approach to tall or high buildings. The reference to conservation areas has been drafted with the Royal Borough in mind and helps to explain why we have not designated specific areas as inappropriate for tall buildings. To remove this text would remove some of the reasoned justification as to why we have taken the approach we have and the policy would be less effective as a result.	No changes are recommended.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	34.3.26	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS423	<p>34.3.26 Very tall buildings, more than 4 times their context, characterise central metropolitan areas and are thus inappropriate across much of the [delete to this] Borough. Designated Opportunity Areas fulfil a strategic role and may be suitable for tall buildings, subject to satisfying the criteria in Policy CL2</p>		The evidence base does not support the notion that very tall buildings may be appropriate in some parts of the Borough. The tallest building is Trellick Tower at 98m and this is an isolated example. The Borough does not have central metropolitan areas which can be characterised by very tall buildings. This suggested change is not accepted on this basis.	No changes are recommended.
Ms Sarah Dixey	Wandsworth Borough Council		34.3.28	Paragraph	No		Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS122	<p>Core strategy paragraph 34.3.28 and policy CL2k fail the test of soundness under the " coherence, consistency and effectiveness test" as it does not have adequate regard to those DPDs of its neighbours, namely the Wandsworth Core Strategy Submission version in the follow respect;</p> <p>High Buildings</p> <p>Whilst the principles of paragraph 34.3.28 are supported, it is important that there is some acknowledgement of the existing and pipeline tall buildings in Wandsworth that may be visible from conservation areas in Kensington and Chelsea. Similarly, there should be some acknowledgement of the level of development proposed at the strategic Vauxhall/Nine Elms/East Battersea Opportunity Area. Some of the development sites within the VNEB may be visible from the Embankment and Chelsea bridge.</p> <p>Core strategy paragraph 34.3.28 and policy CL2k fail the test of soundness under the " conformity" test as it is not consistent with other relevant plans, namely the Wandsworth Core Strategy Submission Version in the following respect:.</p> <p>High Buildings</p> <p>Whilst the principles of paragraph 34.3.28 are supported, it is important that there is some acknowledgement of the existing and pipeline tall buildings in Wandsworth that may be visible from conservation areas in Kensington and Chelsea. Similarly, there should be some acknowledgement of the level of development proposed at the strategic Vauxhall/Nine Elms/East Battersea Opportunity Area. Some of the development sites within the</p>		<p>Policy CL2 (k) is effective and consistent with national policy. It is founded upon a robust evidence base and does not preclude the construction of tall or high buildings which exceed the prevailing building height in the London Borough of Wandsworth. It actually requires a proper assessment of the impact of tall buildings to be undertaken in terms of a zone of visual influence.This is not incompatible with Policy IS3 relating to Tall Buildings in the Wandsworth Submission Core Strategy which requires that tall buildings are assessed in terms of their benefits to regeneration, townscape, public realm and their effect on the historic environment. The wording of Policy IS3 does not appear to preclude an assessment of the effect on townscape and the historic environment of adjoining boroughs, but it is recommended that Policy CL2 k is amended to clarify that the reference to 'neighbouring borough's townscape' is as viewed from the Royal Borough. . Furthermore, Wandsworth Policy IS3 requires that detailed criteria for the assessment of tall buildings on individual sites will be contained in a separate Development Management Policy Document and a Site Specific Allocations Document. The London Borough of Wandsworth should ensure that such documents contain criteria which ensures that the impact of Tall Buildings on adjoining boroughs is properly assessed and taken into account.</p> <p>The Royal Borough has not seen the evidence base which recommends that Opportunity Areas may be acceptable for tall buildings, but wishes to ensure a very careful assessment of the context of the area. In a</p>	Recommended change to Policy CL2k to read.....' require an assessment of the zone of visual influence of a proposed district landmark within or visible from the Borough, to demonstrate that the building has a wholly positive visual impact on the quality and character of the Borough's or neighbouring borough's townscape when viewed from the Royal Borough.'

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									VNEB may be visible from the Embankment and Chelsea bridge.		<p>similar vein the regeneration of an area can be achieved without the recourse to tall buildings. The Royal Borough demonstrates the success of a medium height high density townscape. To this end we have made representations to the Mayor regarding the wording of the Tall Buildings policy in the Draft London Plan and have raised concerns regarding the need to properly assess the impact of proposed tall buildings as part of the Vauxhall/ Nine Elms/East Battersea Opportunity Area.</p> <p>The London Borough of Wandsworth has a duty to consider the impact of tall buildings on other Boroughs and this should be reflected in their detailed tall buildings criteria. Furthermore when a planning application is submitted Wandsworth must take into account the views of the Royal Borough as part of the adjoining boroughs consultation.</p>	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	34.3.28	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS424	<p>34.3.28 High buildings can interrupt views that are important in the townscape, both those identified within the London Plan or within the Council's Conservation Area Proposal Statements or other adopted documents. It is not enough, however, to ensure that their location avoids this. They should make a neutral or positive intervention in the existing townscape. Because district landmarks are visible over a wider area, their location must be of significance to the Borough as a whole, and they will therefore be exceptional. Their location and the townscape sensitivity are therefore of the utmost significant importance</p>		The substitution of the word 'significant' instead of 'utmost' in relation to tall or high buildings which are District landmarks is not accepted. The location and townscape sensitivity of tall buildings are the most important factors to be considered - the substitution of the word 'significant' would put these factors on par with other factors such as regeneration potential which is not accepted.	No changes are recommended.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	34.3.29	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS425	<p>34.3.29 Care is also needed to ensure that their visibility of high buildings is assessed in the round to ensure they do not appear in incongruous with their context. A computer generated zone of visual influence should be identified and the likely visible impact of the scheme assessed from points within that zone agreed with the Council. The potential visual impact of proposals is most accurately tested and assessed through the use of computer generated representations of the existing townscape and the proposals., delete that includes an accurate model of the relevant context, is an essential tool in assessing the visual impact of district landmarks.]</p>		It is important that proposals for tall or high buildings are assessed so that they are not incongruous in their context. To remove the reference to context is not accepted as there is nothing to assess tall buildings against except 'in the round.' To produce a zone of visual influence a computer generated zone should be used for consistency and therefore this suggested change is not accepted, especially as computer generated representations are required. The relevant context is especially important to assess the impact of tall buildings and therefore its removal is not accepted.	No changes are recommended.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		34.3.42	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS300	<p>Para 34.3.42 refers to the relationship between amenity and quality of life. Amenity should be defined as it closely related to health and wellbeing.</p>		The Penguin Concise English Dictionary defines amenity as that which is agreeable, or pleasant. Health and wellbeing can form part of something which is agreeable, but it does not define amenity. On this basis health and wellbeing may or may not be closely related to amenity. Their inclusion would confuse the issue.	No changes are recommended.
DP9	DP9		34.4.2	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS330	<p>Paragraph 34.2.1</p> <p><i>Unsound: Not Effective</i></p> <p>In order to reflect the wording in policy CL2 and to ensure consistency across the document in accordance with PPS12, our client proposes the following revised wording:</p> <p><i>"Careful incremental improvement is needed to ensure our conservation areas remain of the highest quality. However, there are a number of small areas in the south and two large areas in the north of the Borough which are not within conservation areas. It is important that these areas are not regarded as 'second class' in terms of the future quality and contribution for which we should be striving. We should aspire for these areas to be our future</i></p>		With reference to the wording of reasoned justification paragraph 34.2.1 it is noted that to ensure consistency across the document the reference to 'exceptional design quality' outside of conservation areas should be amended. It is acknowledged that the reference to 'exceptional' may be difficult to attain and there is a danger of of inconsistent approach. On this basis it is recommended that the word 'exceptional' is substituted for 'high' The specific reference to 'architectural quality' is considered unnecessary in this instance as it would be covered by reference to the design.	Recommended change from 'exceptional' to 'a high' design quality at paragraph 34.2.1

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									conservation areas and high architectural and design quality is needed to create a new design legacy for the Borough.			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	34.4.2	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS427	<p>p212 Corporate or partnership actions</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The selection of architects will be a developer's decision. The proposed change is less prescriptive, so the action can be deliverable and effective.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>(9) The Council will encourage make use of architectural competitions to help select architects for developments on major sites, leading to better quality design;</p>		Corporate Action 09	<p>Recommend a change in the text to Corporate Action 09 for Renewing the Legacy so that:</p> <p>(9) The Council will encourage architectural competitions to help select architects for developments on major sites, leading to better quality design;</p>
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		35.1.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS230	<p>Failure to elaborate key policies in the London Plan, especially those on:</p> <p>1. The density of development (3A.3)</p> <p>The London Plan (3A.3) says that "boroughs should develop residential policies in their DPDs in line with this policy and adopt the residential density ranges set out in Table 3A.2 and which are compatible with sustainable residential quality".</p> <p>Kensington and Chelsea has some of the highest residential densities in the country in terms of both built density and population density. The London Plan has a density matrix (Table 3A.2) based on a sophisticated mix of setting in terms of location, existing built form and massing and the index of public transport accessibility (PTAL), which defines appropriate density ranges for a site or for areas within the Borough.</p> <p>The London Plan (2008) seeks to achieve the maximum intensity of use compatible with the local context and the design principles in Policy 4B.1 and with public transport capacity. This policy was widely misinterpreted to the extent that GLA research revealed that, despite the sophistication of the density matrix as a tool to promote sustainable residential quality, developers were promoting and Boroughs were permitting schemes that greatly exceeded the appropriate residential density for their sites - 67% of schemes exceeded the upper end of the appropriate density range, 10% were below and only 23% were within the range. The pressure to "maximise" the development (without recognising the constraints) had led to inflated densities. The developments along Warwick Road reflect this tendency in the way the planning brief took the "highest" category for each factor resulting in the highest density range and the developers chose the upper end of the range.</p> <p>The Draft Revised London Plan Policy 3.4 proposes to soften the wording of the relevant policy to "optimising housing potential" and advises that "development proposals which compromise this policy should be resisted."</p>		Policy CL1 requires density to be optimised relative to context, whilst taking account of the appropriate density range - and refers to the GLA density matrix to assess the appropriate range. The chapter sets out the constraining factors specific to the Royal Borough, and thus the relevant tests on development proposals, including a recognition of the sensitivity of the Borough to developments which exceed the appropriate density for the site or part of the Borough. Paragraph 34.3.7 explicitly advises that "The density matrix in the London Plan...needs to be read in relation to the context of the development". The council disagrees that the objections have not been addressed, albeit that they are covered elsewhere within the Core Strategy.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Test of soundness:</p> <p>The Society believes that there is therefore a risk that this area of the plan will fail the effectiveness test of soundness, because what is intended may not be achieved. For this reason, we make the following proposal to rectify the soundness issue.</p> <p>Proposal: The Society considers that misinterpretation of the London Plan has been very damaging to the Borough's townscape. It, therefore, considers that it is essential that the LDF should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognise the sensitivity of the Borough to developments which exceed the appropriate density for the site or part of the Borough; • have a clear statement of how the density matrix will/should be applied in the Borough; and • elaborate this within a Supplementary Planning Document on Housing. <p>The Mayor's comments on the Core Strategy support this approach:</p> <p>"There is a clear lack of guidance regarding density within the Core Strategy. Previous iterations made reference to the London Plan density matrix, however, these appear to have been removed. Policy 3A.3 states boroughs should develop residential density policies in their DPDs in line with (3A.3) and adopt the ranges set out in table 3A.2. The current approach is therefore insufficient to satisfy Policy 3A.3. Reference to the London Plan (adoption of table 3A.3) should be considered to satisfy this conformity issue."</p> <p>GLA Comments on Core Strategy September 2009</p>			
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		35.3.1	Paragraph	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS247	<p>Para 2.2.1. Para 35.3.1 Policy C 1 Policy CH 1, CH 2 Policy CH 3 Para vi Policy CT 1 Para b</p> <p>HOUSING, ADDED POPULATION, DENSITY AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES</p> <p>The Core Strategy, taking its lead from the GLA and the London Plan, envisages some 6,000 new dwellings over a decade. (Population is forecast to rise by 20,000.) This housing expansion will occupy much of the developable land in the Borough and significantly increase the overall density of the densest local authority in Britain.</p> <p>But many of the ancillary social, medical and commercial services on which residents rely are already over-subscribed, have little of no room in which to expand and are faced by prohibitive K&C land values if they want to expand.</p> <p>If the Inspector was to talk to residents about this he would find them speaking of surgeries with waiting lists, standing room only on buses, long queues at post offices, lack of on-street visitor parking space, tiny flats and inhuman cramming on the Underground. These are, of course, the views of middle-income residents, not the rich. (But as Figure 8.3 shows, the Borough has a high proportion of residents with incomes of £35,000 and below.)</p>		<p>While the representation does not appear to raise an issue of soundness <i>per se</i> it should be noted that Policy C1, and the assessed infrastructure requirements seek to ensure that new developments will assist in providing necessary infrastructure. In preparing an assessment of infrastructure requirements, best practice as provided by PAS (Planning Advisory Service) has been used, with consultation and involvement of stakeholders. It is an on-going process, and so will evolve over time, while Policy C1 requires necessary infrastructure to be provided alongside development, and complies with Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>A Planning Obligations Supplementary planning Document has also been prepared to assist in formulating the required obligations to secure infrastructure, including necessary community facilities.</p> <p>The specific issue of transport capacity is also raised and queried. In the context of development at Earls Court these would be considered at the planning stage, with infrastructure requirements being assessed along side any planned development.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations	
									<p>The Society does not suggest that delivering additional houses on what are currently non-housing sites would be ineffective in meeting housing demand. The issue is the relationship between that new housing (and additional population) and the capacity of a wide range of social and physical facilities. There is insufficient evidence on the impact of this increase in population on social and community services. The question never seems to be addressed. It is assumed that higher population density is justified without exploring its side-effects.</p> <p>Policy C1 does, of course, require additional social facilities to be financed via S.106 Agreements. But there is no assessment of the scope for expanding the supply of the Borough's already overstretched infrastructure of public transport and roads, surgeries and post offices, playing fields and parks.</p> <p>How, for instance, will the construction of new flats on the site of the Earl's Court Exhibition solve the problems of acute congestion (due both to District/Circle/Piccadilly line interchanging passengers and heavy local demand) at Earl's Court Underground Station?</p> <p>How, furthermore, does the Plan reconcile all the proposed new residents with Policy CT1 (b). 'Ensure that development will not result in any material increase in traffic congestion.....' ? Additional residents will lead to additional servicing vehicles ranging from refuse collection to plumbers, parcels delivery, computer technicians, lift engineers and building contractors. Additional residents will also generate additional business and family visitors. Even if residential development is 'permit free' it will still contribute to traffic.</p> <p>Increasing the Borough's population will put its social and community infrastructure under even greater pressure. This problem is not assessed. No evidence is advanced to justify the addition of 20,000 residents. The Society considers that the Plan is unsound.</p> <p>The plan needs either to scale down provision for increased population or show how the supply of social and community infrastructure should be expanded - or a mix of the two.</p>				
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	35.3.6	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS428	<p>p215 Paragraph 35.3.6</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>This does not identify the key issue in how the SHMA drew its conclusions about the potential role for intermediate accommodation in RBKC.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>35.3.6 Research has been undertaken to ascertain the type of affordable housing that should be provided in the Borough, taking into account the ability of a sample of households to afford different products. On the assumption that intermediate products are priced only at the mid point between social rented housing costs and those of entering the private market this research suggests that 4% of affordable housing should be equity based intermediate housing, 11% should be intermediate rented housing, and 85% should be social rented housing (319).</p>		The SHMA has been used as evidence supporting the drafting of policies within the Diversity of Housing Chapter, and accords with guidance set out in PPS3. It incorporates both a market assessment and a needs assessment. The SHMA looks at the housing market within and around the Royal Borough, while the Londonwide SHMA treats London as a whole, as a housing market. A sub-regional housing market is also being prepared. The studies on which the policy has been based fully comply with government guidance on the conduct of a SHMA (CLG, 2007).	The demand for intermediate housing has been assessed and incorporated into the RBKC SHMA, the preparation of which conforms wholly with recommended practice guidance. The paragraph, as drafted allows for provision of intermediate housing at a usefully affordable point, while the representation seeks to place this affordable point at a mid-point between social rented and market housing, which is not the intention of the policy.	No change.
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturge on behalf of Metro Shopping	35.3.10	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS16	<p>Whilst the Council has commissioned research as its evidence base, the proposed wording is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives and nor are these percentages sufficiently flexible to deal with different</p>		Para. 35.3.11 already introduces flexibility, expressly. The representation is concerned with policy application and as such the objection should be related to the policy. The relevant policy already afford sufficient	No change.	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
		Fund LP							<p>circumstances, and it should therefore be found unsound.</p> <p>Whilst the subsequent paragraph (35.3.11) does recognise that it would be unrealistic to expect all housing schemes to satisfy the exact ratio set out in paragraph 35.3.10, and goes on to say that factors such as location and built context will be taken into account, the Core Strategy needs to expressly recognise that central and accessible sites in the urban area, where the London Plan requires densities to be optimised, are less suitable for larger family sized units and that there will need to be considerable flexibility in trying to achieve the overall Borough-wide mix set out.</p> <p>Such an addition to the supporting text would provide the necessary flexibility and enable the most appropriate strategy to be selected, thereby making this element of the Core Strategy sound.</p>		flexibility, which is monitored over time, in order to allow developments to align with local need as evidenced through the SHMA. However, it recognises that it would not be reasonable nor desirable to ensure every development conforms rigidly to the local need profile.	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	35.3.13	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS430	<p>p217 Paragraph 35.3.13</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>It is beyond the scope of planning policy to specify and restrict the price at which housing is transferred under a planning obligation.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>[delete The Council caps the cost of developing affordable housing, therefore in terms of costs to</p> <p>the developer, there is little financial difference in providing a social rented unit compared to an intermediate affordable unit] .</p> <p>Land values in the Borough, however, make the provision of intermediate housing at the usefully affordable point very difficult</p>		Reference within the objection to the use of planning obligations is misleading and presumptuous. Capping occurs through housing delivery and partnership working between the Council and the RSLs and is a statement of fact as to the operation of affordable housing delivery in the Borough. Delivery of intermediate housing at the usefully affordable point is a requirement, and has been evidenced to be viable through the SHMA and the AHVS.	No change.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	35.3.23	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS431	<p>p218 Paragraph 35.3.23</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>Amendments required to acknowledge that all aspects of Lifetime homes may not be reasonably achievable in all types of residential development .</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Lifetime homes standards will be used to address this issue, although it is acknowledged that full compliance with all aspects can be problematic within certain build forms. [delete because] New homes will incorporate basic design criteria to ensure that the properties are convenient, flexible and adaptable. They are designed to meet a families changing needs over time, but are not intended to be fully wheelchair accessible.The standards exceed those in Part M of the Building Regulations which are only concerned with enabling disabled people to visit a dwelling. The criteria include issues which relate to parking, the approach to a dwelling, entrance treatment and the design of internal spaces (334</p>		Agree to amendment for clarification.	Amend paragraph as set out in the representation, for clarification.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Developme		35.3.28	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS302	Para 35.3.28 refers to relationship between the provision of amenity space and outdoor environments and health benefits.		Whilst the Council acknowledges the health impacts identified by HUDU, the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the Core Strategy clearly identifies the causes and likely impact of various arisings. It is considered that this is the correct location to explicitly	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
	nt HUDU										refer to health impacts. The health benefits and cost are implicit throughout the document and their direct inclusion within the main body of text adds no strategic value. The paragraph explicitly recognises these links, and, as a result, no changes are recommended.	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	36.1.7	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS433	<p>p225 Respecting environmental limits plan</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>To provide flexibility for the site potentially to deliver the facilities in accordance with a Masterplan for the Regeneration Area, consistent with Capital & Counties' proposed changes to para 26.2.9, making the document effective.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>The Map should make it clear that a potential on-site waste management facility may be located within the wider EC Regeneration Area, not necessarily within the RBKC part of the wider site.</p> <p>See map extract attached.</p>		It is the Royal Borough's policy to deliver an on-site waste management facility within the EC Regeneration Area. This Council cannot allocate land for this facility outside of the Borough's boundary, and would not be able to guarantee delivery of this facility if it could. <p>The Council will continue ongoing discussions with the applicant and LBHF on the location of this facility, which will be taken forward as part of the planning brief. In determining planning applications, including joint applications, the LPA(s) will consider the development against the Development Plan and other material considerations. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate the most appropriate location within the site to deliver this facility.</p>	No change proposed.
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		36.3.12	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS129	<p>Paragraph 36.3.12. Subterranean Development.</p> <p>The following should also be noted with reference to subterranean extensions and the associated risk of flooding. Sewage networks are designed to surcharge to just below cover level. The Introduction of subterranean development could mean that point becoming the lowest release point on the network and therefore flooding of a basement could occur in an area not previously affected. Therefore all subterranean development should have a pumped sewage system and protection from backflow to reduce the risk of flooding.</p> <p>Part H of Buildings Regulations 2000 states that manhole covers in the road should be assumed to surcharge to just below cover level. Protection to basements needs to be provided either by the installation of a pumped system where the risk of flooding is high or by the installation of a flap valve where the risk to flooding is low. The best option is for the basement to be protected by pumped systems. Flap valves have a habit of failing when you need them most.</p> <p>Thames Water has provided to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea details of areas at highest risk of sewer flooding and we understand that this information has been incorporated in sequential tests as part of the overall Flood Risk Assessment and in LDF documentation. We understand that subterranean development will not be permitted in areas at high risk of flooding, notwithstanding any protective measures that a developer may put in place. Where we identify or are consulted on third party planning applications for construction/conversion of basements, we seek to ensure that the following informative is included in any planning approval:</p> <p><i>"Thames Water request that the applicant should incorporate within their proposal protection to the property by installing for example a non-return valve or other device to avoid the risk of backflow at a later date, on the assumption that the sewage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions."</i></p>		The Council understands that potential sewer flooding of basements is caused by, among other things, the sewer infrastructure's inability to discharge storm water. The Council is aware of Thames Water's bid for funding to improve the capacity of Counters Creek to mitigate this risk. The Council's policy approach to flooding in Policy CE2 seeks to reduce the amount of water entering the storm water sewers through the introduction of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems. The Council's Subterranean Development SPD contains Informative I165 which highlights the potential risk of sewer flooding to those who wish to construct basements and the suggestions to consult Thames Water and consider water pumps or non-return valves.	No change proposed.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban		36.3.13	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national	PSubCS304	<p>Para 36.3.13 refers to local food production, but should also refer to the health benefits of access to fresh food.</p> <p>We suggest that the supporting text to Policy CE 1 refers to the</p>		Policy CE1(h) seeks to ensure that every opportunity is taken for onsite food production, reducing carbon emissions from transportation, production and packaging of food. The potential health benefits of	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
	Development HUDU						policy		health and wellbeing element of the Code for Sustainable Homes, which links strongly to amenity issues.		delivering onsite food production and ensuring development meets CfSH levels in implicit, as the main reason for inclusion of this policy is to reduce carbon emissions, reduce the Borough's ecological footprint and contributing to reversing the greenhouse effect, which will all have health benefits. The health impacts of the Core Strategy policies are considered in the Council's Health Impact Assessment that accompanies the Core Strategy.	
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		36.3.15	Paragraph	No	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS133	<p>Policy CE2 Flooding and Paragraphs 36.3.15 - 36.3.20</p> <p>The inclusion of Policy CE2 Flooding within the Core Strategy is supported and in particular the recognition within the Policy that surface water and sewer flooding, as well as fluvial flooding, can have serious impacts. However in order to strengthen the Policy accordingly we consider that an additional bullet point should be added to state that developments at risk of sewer flooding, or exacerbating existing sewer flooding, should be avoided unless the appropriate infrastructure can be put in place ahead of the development to avoid adverse environmental and amenity impacts.</p> <p>Thames Tunnel</p> <p>The section of the proposed submission core strategy that relates to the Thames Tunnel addresses the relevant planning issues in a more appropriate way compared with the previous version and the progress that has been made is welcomed. In particular the reference at paragraph 4.3.7 supporting policy CP1 is supported.</p> <p>In our view, in respect of the Thames Tunnel, the Core Strategy is not fully compliant with the legal tests. However, we believe that minor changes to the supporting text using either the focused changes or the minor changes procedure set out in the CLG Plan Making Manual (September 2009) would satisfactorily address this problem. Part of the justification would be to ensure that the document is up to date.</p> <p>Although it is only a short time since the previous consultation there have been a number of relevant policy developments since September 2009.</p> <p>Firstly, the Mayor of London has now published the draft replacement London Plan, and also his draft Water Strategy. Whilst so far the replacement London Plan can only be afforded limited weight as a material planning consideration, it can only gain weight as your Core Strategy progresses towards examination and therefore the Core Strategy will need to reflect the sentiment of the new Plan. Proposed Policy 5.14 relates to Water quality and strategic infrastructure. There is a section headed "LDF Preparation". This states "Within LDF's boroughs should identify sewerage infrastructure requirements and relevant boroughs should support in principle the Thames Tideway Sewer Tunnels". The mayor expressed similar sentiments in a debate at a meeting of the GLA on 9 September 2009 stating that " <i>I do think it important that we get this project done and am sure that all Councils will recognise the long-term benefits to London of the Thames Tideway Tunnel</i> ".</p> <p>This is not however a new policy; rather a clarification of that in the existing London Plan which states "the mayor will, and the boroughs should, support the implementation of the Thames Tideway Sewer Tunnel project". The Core Strategy</p> <p>needs to be in general conformity with this policy and the lack of</p>		<p>General support to Flooding Policy (CE2). To strengthen the policy in regards to sewer flooding Thames Water requires an additional bullet point avoiding developments at risk of sewer flooding or exacerbating existing sewer flooding unless the appropriate infrastructure can be put in place ahead of the development. Whilst the Council acknowledges the importance of sewer flooding and its devastating effects, we are not in the position to predict accurately which development will be at risk of sewer flooding. We will be working in partnership with the Environment Agency and Thames Water to identify areas with critical drainage problems as explained in the corporate and partnership actions. We will also prepare a Surface Water Management Plan and a forthcoming Flooding LDD to strengthen this policy once further evidence base is in place.</p> <p>Moreover, the Council's policy for infrastructure provision, including water and sewer infrastructure, is contained with Policy C1 (and its reasoning justification) which considers site specific infrastructure requirements as part of the planning application and planning brief. They reasoning justification for C1 will be modified to include a new point (12) covering utility infrastructure requirements - including water, foul drainage and sewage treatment.</p> <p>In terms of the Thames Tunnel, we acknowledge Thames Water support of policy CP1. We have acknowledged the importance of this project in the Core Strategy (paragraph 36.3.19) and are fully aware of the Mayor's and DEFRA's support to the Thames Tunnel. We agreed with part of the wording proposed by Thames Water clarifying the importance of the project and how it affects the Borough. However, we will not include reference about the "two CSOs which need to be intercepted within the Royal Borough, one at Lots Road and one located close to the Royal Hospital". We will not include the mentioned reference as the exact location of the CSOs is a matter that will be subject to public consultation later this year and therefore has not been formally approved.</p> <p>Thames Tunnel was included in the infrastructure delivery plan as it is an important infrastructure project.</p> <p>In relation to the comments about Counters Creek, we acknowledge the support to paragraph 36.3.18. The updated information will be included in Corporate or Partnership Action number 7 of the 'Respecting Environmental Limits' Chapter.</p>	<p>Modify the reasoning justification for C1 to include a new point (12) covering utility infrastructure requirements including water, foul drainage and sewage treatment.</p> <p>In terms of the Thames Tunnel, paragraph 36.3.19 will be amended to read:</p> <p>'Thames Water has been instructed by the Government to develop and implement a scheme, the Thames Tideway Tunnel, which will reduce the amount of untreated sewage that currently overflows directly to the river Thames after rainfall. The proposed Thames Tideway Tunnel will capture sewage discharges from existing Combined Sewage Overflows (CSOs) into a new tunnel and transfer the collected sewage for treatment. The importance and London-wide benefits of the Thames Tideway Tunnel are recognised by the Government and the Greater London Authority. On this basis, the Council will ensure that the impacts of the works associated with the tunnel are carefully managed.'</p> <p>In terms of the amendments regarding Corporate and Partnership Action 7 referring to the Counters Creek, the following wording will replace the original text in the Core Strategy:</p> <p>"The Directorate of Planning and Borough Development together with the Directorate of Transport, Environment and Leisure Services will actively support Thames Water in the delivery of short-term mitigation against sewer flooding and will continue to support the planning and development of a long-term solution to reduce the risk of sewer flooding in the west of the Borough"</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>express support for the Thames Tunnel is of concern.</p> <p>Related to this point is the Mayor's Water Strategy which also clearly supports the Thames Tunnel. Proposal 10 indicates that "<i>The Mayor will work with Thames Water and other partners to support the construction of the Thames and Lee Tunnels, in a cost-effective way and minimising disruption, as a means of greatly reducing storm discharges from the combined sewer system and improving the quality of the water in the River Thames .</i>" The Royal Borough is one of these partners.</p> <p>Secondly, the new River Basin Management Plan for the Thames supports the project. This will be published by Defra before Christmas, but is already available on the Environment Agency website. Regulation 17 of the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003 states that each public body must have regard to River Basin Management Plans and supplementary plans. This requirement applies to both local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate. The River Basin Management Plan states that "<i>the London Tideway Tunnels are fundamental to the achievement of good status in the Thames catchment</i>". The London Tideway Tunnels comprise two separate projects, namely the Lee Tunnel (which has been granted planning permission) and the Thames Tunnel. A failure to support the Thames Tunnel would overlook a key project that is fundamental to necessary improvements to the Thames which are required to ensure that the UK complies with the EC Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive.</p> <p>Thirdly, your Council will recently have received a letter from Defra dated 20 November 2009. Although mostly regarding the options for the consideration of our planning submissions the letter also stresses that the project will "play a nationally significant role in securing UK compliance with the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive." It also clearly indicates that consideration of the Thames Tunnel will be included in the Waste Water NPS and as such will be identified in a national policy. As you will know from correspondence from the CLG dated 9 November 2009 NPSs are at the heart of the new planning regime and local planning authorities must therefore have regard to NPSs when preparing plans. This includes draft NPSs. Given that it has been stated to the Council that the waste water NPS will include the Thames Tunnel, it will be prudent for the Core Strategy to support the project. Failure to expressly support the Thames Tunnel means that the Core Strategy would not be in accordance with national policy.</p> <p>Furthermore, not only is it a matter of national policy that the Thames Tunnel be delivered - it is also in the national interest. On 8 October 2009 the European Commission commenced infraction proceedings against the UK Government regarding compliance of the waste water collecting system in London with the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive. Depending on the outcome of the case there is the potential for unlimited fines to be levied against the UK Government. It is therefore in the national interest to deliver the Thames Tunnel as it is part of the solution to the problem of water quality in the Thames .</p> <p>There are a number of factual errors in the wording of paragraph 36.3.19 which contribute towards the existing text not being justified. In particular, there seems to be some confusion in the terminology. When we refer to the London Tideway Tunnels,</p>			

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>these consist of two separate projects; the Lee Tunnel and the Thames Tunnel. The Lee Tunnel is located within the London Borough of Newham and the administrative areas of London Thames Gateway Development Corporation and the Olympic Delivery Authority, and has been granted planning permission. There is therefore no need for the Royal Borough to refer to the London Tideway Tunnels or the River Lee as only the Thames Tunnel is relevant for its area.</p> <p>Having regard to the above, and in order to better link the supporting text to the proposed policy our concerns in respect of the Core Strategy can be overcome by altering paragraph 36.3.19 to read as follows:</p> <p>" Thames Water has been instructed by the Government to develop and implement a scheme to substantially reduce the amount of untreated sewage that currently overflows directly to the River Thames after rainfall. The proposed Thames Tunnel will capture sewage discharges from existing Combined Sewage Overflows (CSOs) into a new tunnel and transfer the collected sewage for treatment. Two CSOs need to be intercepted within the Royal Borough, one at Lots Road and one located close to the Royal Hospital. The London wide benefits of the Thames Tunnel are recognised by the Greater London Authority and in the Thames River Basin Management Plan which recognises that the tunnel is fundamental to improving the water quality in the Thames catchment. Accordingly the Royal Borough supports the principle of the project and suggests detail policy criteria for managing impacts ."</p> <p>We have some reservations regarding the inclusion of the Thames Tunnel in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). In our view the main purpose of the IDP is to identify the infrastructure necessary to deliver the amount of development identified in the Core Strategy. This is set out by paragraph 4.8 of PPS12 and the PAS good practice guide "A steps Approach to Infrastructure Planning and Delivery". However, if the change outlined above is accepted then we would not object to the retention of this text as it does capture the need for the project.</p> <p>Counters Creek</p> <p>The references to proposed capacity improvements to Counters Creek, including at paragraph 36.3.18 are supported. Thames Water has recently secured regulatory funding to progress short-term mitigation from sewer flooding for the period 2010 to 2015, in addition to planning and developing a long-term solution.</p> <p>It is recommended that the following text is added to the Core Strategy:</p> <p>'The Directorate of Planning and Borough Development along with the Directorate of Transport, Environment and Leisure Services will actively support Thames Water in the delivery of short-term mitigation against sewer flooding and the continued planning and development of a long-term solution.</p>			
Ms Bobbie Vincent Emery			36.3.17	Paragraph		No	Justified	PSubCS124	<p>2.8 PPS12 provides that to be 'justified' a DPD needs to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Found on a robust and credible evidence base involving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of participation of local community and others having a stake in the area 		Paragraph 36.3.17 does not imply that only 2 incidents of sewer flooding have occurred in those wards over the years, but states that two of those incidents have happened in 1981 and more recently in 2007. We acknowledge that there is a lack of accurate information	No change required to the wording.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research/fact finding - the choices made in the plan are backed by the facts. ● The most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. <p>Representation</p> <p>My representation on this issue is that I consider the incomplete factual information on the Counters Creek flooding in 36.3.17, is less than robust and credible evidence, because it is wrong, and the choices made are not backed up by correct facts, and therefore not justified under the soundness test.</p> <p>Further a more appropriate strategy for dealing with what is now demonstrated as a more serious the problem, might be to request Thames Water to bring forward the works proposed in their 2009 study of Counters Creek referred to in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Now that you know there have been three floods, one of which was very recent, and not just the two you cited, you might want to correct the facts at some time.</p>		which is also explained in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Further evidence base will be gathered to support the forthcoming Flooding DPD. We have already stated in the Core Strategy that we will work in partnership with Thames Water in order to reduce the risk of flooding (Corporate or Partnership Action for Respecting Environmental Limits number 7). Therefore, there is no change required to the wording of the Core Strategy.	
Port of London Authority Lucy Owen	Port of London Authority		36.3.25	Paragraph	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS327	<p>There is planning policy support for the use of the river for the transport of passengers and goods from the National Level downwards and this includes the use of the River for the transport of construction and waste materials to and from development sites (see for example policies 4C.7 and 4C.8 of the <i>London Plan</i>). Additionally, the Council is fortunate to have a safeguarded wharf within its boundary and policy 4C.9 of the <i>London Plan</i> seeks to protect safeguarded wharves for cargo handling uses. The <i>London Plan</i> states at paragraph 4.1.6.1 that increasing the Blue Ribbon Network for freight transport is a widely supported objective as this is a more sustainable method of transport and can help to reduce congestion and the impact of goods vehicles on London's roads. It is therefore considered that this section of the plan and its policies should be reviewed to place an increasing emphasis on the role that the river could play in meeting the Council's environmental objectives.</p> <p>The PLA would wish for the Council in their waste DPD to set out the steps which will be taken in order to get waste materials delivered to and exported from the site by water.</p> <p>It is noted that the Directorate of Transport, Environment and Leisure Services will work with the GLA to enhance the function of the BRN and particularly the use of the Thames for transport. The PLA should also be <i>involved</i> in these discussions.</p>		<p>Noted. Reference to the use of waterways can be found in chapter 32: "Better Travel Choices", paragraph 32.3.11. Moreover, Policy CT1, <i>Improving alternatives to car use</i>, (located in the same chapter) includes a point (m) which "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". In addition, paragraph 36.3.23 explains that as the Borough is very accessible by river and rail, it can provide opportunities for sustainable transportation of residual waste. Therefore, the role the river could play in meeting the Council's environmental objectives has already been sufficiently explained. No further action required.</p> <p>The Waste DPD will cover waste transportation. Public consultation on this DPD will provide opportunities to comment on it which we welcome.</p> <p>The wording of Corporate or Partnership Actions for Respecting Environmental Limits (number 15) will be amended to cover the proposed changes. It will read: "The Directorate of Transport, Environment and Leisure Services will work with the GLA <u>and the PLA</u> to enhance the function of the Blue Ribbon Network, and particularly the use of the Thames for transport.</p>	Amend wording of Corporate or Partnership Actions for Respecting Environmental Limits (number 15) to read: "The Directorate of Transport, Environment and Leisure Services will work with the GLA and the Port of London Authority (PLA) to enhance the function of the Blue Ribbon Network, and particularly the use of the Thames for transport.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		36.3.35	Paragraph		No	Justified	PSubCS305	<p>Para 36.3.35 refers to the locations along the main vehicle routes which suffer from the worst air quality. We suggest that there is a reference to ill health caused by poor air quality.</p>		<p>The impacts of air pollution on health are not explicit in the Core Strategy, but considered in detail in chapter 1.3 of the Council's Air Quality Action Plan 2009 to 2014. The entire borough is designated as an Air Quality Management Area and therefore the Core Strategy seeks to control air quality, which may result in improved health. The impact of the Core Strategy policies on air quality is considered in the Council's Health Impact Assessment that accompanies the Core Strategy.</p>	No change proposed.
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		37.1.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS260	<p>11. The Core Strategy makes reference to delivery issues and acknowledges infrastructure requirements at a number of points in the document. Chapter 37 of the Strategy sets out further detail of the infrastructure projects that will support and enable development, including <i>delivery lead</i>, <i>delivery period</i> and <i>funding</i></p>		<p>The IDP is a living document . As such the Council have no objection to expanding information where this is available in response to criticism through the process. But note that not each item of infrastructure will relate to a dependent level of development. On balance, the</p>	Amendments to be made to the Infrastructure Plan, and where necessary to the tables in the Core Strategy. These will form part of the Core Strategy, while the IDP sits outside of the Core Strategy, as

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p><i>arrangements</i>. The Infrastructure Table would benefit from additional information in the 'Why' column setting out the number of homes/quantum of commercial development that is dependent on delivery of each infrastructure item.</p> <p>12. In addition, paragraph 29.2.2 states that ' <i>The Council will prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Plan with partners and infrastructure providers, which will be regularly reviewed, forming the basis of site specific requests for infrastructure as part of the development proposals.</i> ' It is unclear what the timescale is for the preparation of this document and how it will differ from the material in Chapter 37. It is assumed that this plan will provide a more detailed version of Chapter 37 and will be a live document to be monitored and updated ?</p>		<p>IDP would be improved with this information, and so amendments will be incorporated in line with the representation comments, and also to the tables, which will themselves be part of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The assumption, that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will provide a more detailed version of Chapter 37 and will be a live document to be monitored and updated is correct.</p> <p>The IDP has been prepared as a living document, taking account of advice available from government and from PAS, and from the POS Infrastructure Groups set up to share best practice and advice as progress is made towards Infrastructure Planning (a PPS12 requirement) and CIL. It provides a 'lower tier' analysis of requirements within the borough or infrastructure required as a result of known developments. As such it is a living document (as advised e.g. by PAS). It can be updated as information becomes available, and changes are reported to the Council's LSP: the Kensington & Chelsea partnership. The KCP, and sub-groups of the KCP have been involved in it's preparation.</p> <p>The document sits within the overall evidence base of the core Strategy. Chapter 37 - the Infrastructure tables are taken directly from the IDP. The IDP itself will update over time, as will the tables, but these will need to be updated within the IDP, and the information within Chapter 37 monitored and reviewed therefore outside of the Core Strategy process, once the Core Strategy is adopted. These are then reported to the KCP, and through the formal AMR process, as with the 2009 AMR.</p>	evidence, and will be continually updated.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	37.1.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS438	<p>p244, 245 Infrastructure</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p> <p>Returning the roads to a two way operation ('unravelling') has not been tested and is yet to be supported by the GLA and TfL. The revised text provides flexibility for a deliverable solution to come forward, without undermining the overall objective. Funding sources and delivery management and organization may involve multiple parties which should be reflected.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Where column - Earl's Court one-way system.</p> <p>What column - "Improvement" to the [delete 'Unravelling'] the Earls Court one-way system.</p> <p>Sources of funding column - TfL, highways authority, developer</p>		<p>Agree to changes. As worded, 'unravelling' can mean many things.</p>	<p>Include changes within the table - delete "unravelling" and insert "improvements to" for clarification.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									contributions and potential further sources of funding			
Brookfield Developments	Brookfield Developments (UK) Ltd	DP9	37.2.1	Paragraph	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS76	<p>Warwick Road</p> <p>Our client submits that the additional wording be inserted under Section 38.5.6 in order to be consistent with Policy CA6:</p> <p><i>"CA6(a v) - Provide a minimum of 350 dwellings on the 100 West Cromwell Road</i></p> <p>Site"</p>		The suggested changes will make the paragraph inconsistent with others. It is not agreed that the amended wording will benefit the policy.	No change.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		37.2.1	Paragraph	No	No	Effective	PSubCS314	<p>Chapter 30: Keeping Life Local Chapter 37: Infrastructure</p> <p>We recognise the requirement for sound infrastructure delivery planning in the core strategy and would like to highlight the gaps at this stage relating to the cost and timing of health infrastructure. In particular, the issue of timescales is of concern as this affects the ability of health infrastructure to respond to the scale and timing of housing growth. Specifically the vision does not refer to the general aspiration that all infrastructure, including health will be delivered to support the scale and timing of housing growth in North Kensington and Earl's Court.</p> <p>It is recognised that not all costs and timescales are known at this stage and we welcome the commitment in paras 37.2.1 and 37.2.5 to keep the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and associated Infrastructure Schedule under review and work with partners, such as the PCT, to update it as costs and timescales become known.</p>		Comments noted, and changes made to Para 30.1.1 to further define the Council's role in delivering infrastructure within a set timescale and phasing of development for the Borough.	Amendments made to Para 30.1.1
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		37.2.1	Paragraph	No	No	Effective	PSubCS317	<p>37.2 Infrastructure Schedule</p> <p>We suggest that the infrastructure table (i) by area is cross-referenced to the area chapters and policies and the accommodation specification, cost and timescales for health infrastructure are clarified with the PCT as follows:</p> <p>Kensal Gasworks-Additional GP premises required (after 2017?, no size specification or cost)</p> <p>Wornington Green-New health premises possibly required (after 2015?, no size specification or cost)</p> <p>Edenham Site-Location of health facility - possible alternative to Wornington Green (no timeframe, size or cost)</p> <p>Latimer Area-Para 9.43 refers to 'co-ordination of health premises to better align service provision' - the opportunities are unclear.</p> <p>Earl's Court area - Community facilities to be secured in redevelopment and possible expansion of Abingdon health Centre (no timeframe, specific requirements or costs)</p> <p>Westway - opportunity for primary care facilities on the Maxilla School Site - no details of co-location opportunities or costs</p> <p>South Kensington-Expansion of services required (by 2012, but not specified or costed)</p> <p>King's Road-Increased medical provision within Hans Town and Stanley wards (2009 onwards, possibility of a hub and urgent care</p>		<p>Whilst the Council acknowledges the health impacts identified by HUDU, the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the Core Strategy clearly identifies the causes and likely impact of various arisings. It is considered that this is the correct location to explicitly refer to health impacts. The health benefits and cost are implicit throughout the document and their direct inclusion within the main body of text adds no strategic value.</p> <p>Each of the components of the Infrastructure Table have been consulted on with NHS Kensington & Chelsea, and will continue to beviewed with them and other partners.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									centre in this location?) Notting Hill Gate - desire to secure premises or facility - Newcombe House?			
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	37.2.1	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS517	Chapter 37: Infrastructure KHT notes the references to Wornington Green within the Infrastructure Table of the Core Strategy. KHT agrees with the principle of the potential requirements, although suggests that the precise nature and scope of provision should be based on a number of considerations including need, demand, financial viability, and should be balanced with the wider objectives of the Wornington Green redevelopment. KHT also considers that the content of the Infrastructure Table should be amended to reflect the content of KHT's representations to the Core Strategy, set out in this letter. KHT notes the possible requirement for new health premises as part of comprehensive redevelopment of Wornington Green. Following discussions with RBKC, KHT understands that such premises would not need to be provided onsite. KHT would welcome recognition of this within the Infrastructure Table of the Core Strategy. In addition, KHT notes the requirement within the Infrastructure Table for the provision of CCHP as part of the comprehensive redevelopment of Wornington Green. KHT considers that this is overly prescriptive, and this is a particular concern given that KHT has been advised that CCHP would not be feasible. KHT would suggest that the Core Strategy should not focus on the specific technical solution; rather, it should provide flexibility to enable technically and commercially feasible solutions to be identified to meet the criteria/objectives. KHT considers that the Infrastructure Table should be amended to reflect this more flexible approach.		The agreement with the potential requirements is noted. The infrastructure table is a requirement as part of infrastructure planning process for the delivery of the Core Strategy. It is an iterative process, with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan being seen as a living document, amended frequently. At the point of publishing the Core Strategy it identifies the most up-to-date requirements, including for Wornington Green, and this is an acceptable approach to infrastructure planning.	No change.
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		38.1.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS262	<u>Able to be monitored</u> 17. All policies included in the plan should be measurable and the plan must have clear arrangements for monitoring and reporting results to stakeholders. Chapter 38 sets out the monitoring framework for the Core Strategy and links to shorter sections on monitoring for each of the Places in Chapters 5-18. The monitoring framework appears to be a reasonable attempt to ensure that the objectives and policies of the plan are tracked. Numerical targets are included for some of the policies and reference is made to National Indicators and Core Output Indicators where appropriate, which is good practice. However, there are other indicators/targets that are less helpful and could be made more robust through the addition of numerical targets for example policies CA4(e), CA4(f), CA5(c) & CA5(d).		Strictly speaking numerical targets are not appropriate for all indicators or policies. This is true for those policies with 'soft' aims such as improving amenity or improving the permeability of a street network as in CA4(e) and CA4(f) or the successful retention of an architectural element or creation of an actively used public space as in CA5(c) and CA5(d). However, it is possible to say whether the action intended to achieve the aim of the policy has been implemented. The monitoring indicators and targets have been changed or reworded in order to achieve this. Introducing quantifiable targets in order to assess the permeability of a network or the usage of public open space would in these cases be secondary to the achievement of the aims of qualitative policies.	These and other monitoring indicators and targets have been changed or reworded in order to achieve robustness.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		38.2.3	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS181	Also, we suggest that the words "through them" in the first sentence of the paragraph 38.2.3 be deleted. Planning and Borough Development Directorate develop a direct relationship with the PCT on s105		While the suggestion that the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the Core Strategy clearly identifies the causes and likely impact of various arisings. It is considered that this is the correct location to explicitly refer to health impacts. The health benefits and cost are implicit throughout the document and their direct inclusion within the main body of text adds no strategic value.	No changes.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Developme		38.4.1	Paragraph	No	No	Effective	PSubCS313	38.6 Monitoring Strategic Objectives Policies It is unclear how the objectives will deliver the components of the vision (regeneration, reputation and residential quality of life		The monitoring section relates to the strategic objectives through the targets and indicators specified for each policy. It is not the purpose of the monitoring section to identify the relationship between objectives and policies other than through the structure already set	Ensure that monitoring indicators and targets are measurable and realistic. Changes have been made to achieve this.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
	nt HUDU								<p>outcomes of the plan) and how the policies meet the objectives. The monitoring section (38.6 Monitoring Strategic Objectives Policies) should include the strategic objectives to identify the relationship between the objectives and the policies and help ensure that the objectives can be achieved and monitored.</p> <p>It is unclear how the objectives will be measured as in many cases there is no baseline information or timescales given and many of the targets are not measurable or realistic and use the words 'to minimise', 'to increase' and 'to reduce'. We would strongly encourage the use of health indicators or targets, which could come from the Local Area Agreement (LAA). The LAA seeks to deliver improvements to public health through measures to reduce child obesity, increase participation in sport, improve food and nutrition and has a strong emphasis on tackling health inequalities, poverty and poor quality environments in the north of the borough.</p>		<p>out in the rest of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The monitoring section does not seek to establish measures for strategic objectives rather it seeks to establish indicators and targets which are appropriate to the policies which in turn support the strategic objectives. Having said this measurable targets are not appropriate for all indicators or policies and timescales may be uncertain.. This is especially true for those policies with 'soft' aims such as establishing an actively used public space. Setting such a target is not unrealistic nor is seeking to increase some characteristic of an area so long as we are able to determine whether or not it has been achieved.</p> <p>While we acknowledge the relevance of health impacts and do so in the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the Core Strategy. We make use of both National and Local Indicators where we consider it appropriate and these are further identified in the appropriate section of regular publications such as the "Kensington and Chelsea: Performance Report 2009" which are linked to the Local Area Agreement.</p>	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	38.4.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS439	<p>p269, 270 38.5.7 Monitoring strategic sites, Earls Court</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p> <p>Consequential changes are required to the policy targets and outputs to reflect the strategic site allocation, including Capital & Counties' proposed changes to chapters 10 and 26 and to reflect the opportunity Area designation on the Replacement London Plan</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>CA7(b) Target column - Provide 10,000 sqm (108,000 sqft) of non residential floorspace to include office, commercial, leisure, cultural/ destination and retail uses [delete floorspace]</p> <p>CA7(d) Monitoring column - The new use [delete of the Exhibition Centre] proposed as part of a planning application for the redevelopment of the [delete site] Earls Court Regeneration Area</p> <p>The new use of the Earls Court Regeneration Area [delete Exhibition Centre] proposed as part of planning application for the redevelopment of the site</p> <p>CA7(l) Target column - Secure highway contributions including measures to facilitate improvements to [delete the unraveling of] the Earl's Court one way system</p> <p>Monitoring column - [delete The unraveling of] Improvements to the one-way system and highway improvements proposed as part of planning application for the redevelopment of the site.</p>		<p>Propose changes to be consistent with changes to the Strategic Site allocation. The Council does not agree with offices being replaced with non-residential floorspace. There is a forecast for a 15% growth in demand for office floorspace in Kensington and Chelsea. This equates to nearly 70,000sqm of new floorspace. Whilst Policy CF5 will protect offices, the need to satisfy this demand remains. The Core Strategy allocates 10,000sqm in two of its main strategic sites, namely Kensal and Earl's Court as these (Crossrail permitting) will be in two highly accessible locations. Furthermore the Draft London Plan proposes to designate Earl's Court as an Opportunity Area with a minimum employment capacity of providing a minimum of 7000 new jobs and it is considered that the most likely means of delivering this would be stimulated by office developments.</p> <p>No change proposed to the reference to the Exhibition Centre as this is used to describe the existing use and will be used to ensure the proposed use reflect Policy CA7, which requires a cultural facility of at least national importance.</p> <p>Propose change to be consistent with changes to CT1, which includes consideration for investigation and implementation of returning the one-way system to two-way working.</p>	Propose changes to 38.5.7, including CA7c, CA7d and CA7l, to be consistent with amendments to the Strategic Site Allocation CA7.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		39.1.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS261	<p>Deliverable</p> <p>13 . PPS12 (para 4.10) asks whether there is a ' <i>reasonable prospect of provision</i>' of infrastructure being delivered within the timescale of the plan. It is unclear whether the CrossRail infrastructure project would pass this test. If there is doubt about whether a major piece of infrastructure is likely to emerge during the plan period, then it is important to consider how this is presented and whether it should be in the plan at all. The need and/or aspiration for a CrossRail station in North Kensington is a significant element of the spatial strategy and, as such, is referred to throughout the document. Some references appear to suggest that the station is deliverable (e.g. on pages 12, 13, 15 and in the Vision CV1 p36). However, in other places it is acknowledged that there are risks to the delivery of the project and it is identified as a high risk project in the table in Chapter 39. Although it is understood that the station is a priority aspiration for the Borough (and that discussions are underway with partners), there should be consistency in the way it is referred to in the plan. Most importantly the implications of not being able to deliver the CrossRail station within an appropriate timescale for development proposed in North Kensington should be made clear. This is also the case for other infrastructure that is required to deliver development in other parts of the Borough (e.g. Earls Court one-way improvements, new underground station on the Kings Road & Chelsea-Hackney line station interchange at Imperial Wharf Station) . In our view, there is some risk of the Plan being found unsound in this area.</p> <p>Flexible</p> <p>16. Some of the information contained in the table is helpful and in some instances a plan b/c is identified which allows some flexibility by identifying alternative options (reduce density, introduce more bus routes instead of delivering a rail station) and timescales. However, further information should be included about the implications of the risks outlined and, in particular, the resulting ability of the plan to deliver numbers of homes and quantum of commercial development (see also para 13 of this letter).</p>		<p>The Council agree that consistency is needed with regard to how the proposed Crossrail station is referred to and we will look carefully to ensure that it is not dealt with in an inconsistent manner in the Core Strategy and will make recommendations for revised wording as necessary.</p> <p>The Council remains firm in its ambition for a Crossrail Station in Kensal. It is acknowledged that this does not form part of the Crossrail Act. However, discussions continue to progress positively with Crossrail and a station is now considered to be more than an aspiration and there is now a reasonable prospect of provision.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge that improvements are required to add weight to the contingencies for Kensal should a station not come forward. These will be consistent throughout and we will make it clear that they are directly related to the Crossrail station not coming forward.</p> <p>It is considered that the phasing and timetabling of development is accurate as stated. Phase One (as stated in the Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site Allocation) is still likely to come forward within the same time frame irrespective of Crossrail, however, it is likely that, the National Grid Gasworks and a large parcel of the North Pole Depot land would not be developed. In light of this, land allocation will be calculated based on the minimum of the Phase One sites only and this will be recommended to be included in the 'Delivery Implications' entry in Section 2D of the Monitoring Risks and Contingencies - Chapter 39. Previous editions of the Core Strategy included a figure and this will now be reinstated.</p>	Amend information on quanta of development.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	39.1.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS441	<p>p304 No7 Contingencies and risks</p> <p>Reasons and changes sought</p> <p>Delete the column dealing with the dependency entitled:"Earls Court One-Way system does not receive sufficient investment to be unraveled, and thus remains in place". This is because the Capital & Counties proposed change to the policy allows for appropriate flexibility in relation to "Earls Court One-Way system "improvements" which makes this issue superfluous as in reality what can feasibly and viably be done to improve the One-Way system should be done and there is no "Plan B" in this context since if it is not feasible or viable, there is not realistically a "Plan B".</p>		Disagree with removing the reference to the one-way from the risks and contingencies, as the delivery of improved pedestrian environment is key to the vision of the place. There are risks that this may not be achieved and these risks need to be identified. It is not sufficient that these risks are identified in the place, as these are merely summaries of the risks and contingencies. However, the wording will be revised to reflect changes to the policy requirement.	Propose changes to No.7 of the risks and contingencies table.
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	39.1.1	Paragraph	Yes	Yes		PSubCS518	KHT notes the inclusion of Wornington Green within the Contingencies and Risk schedule on pages 302 and 303. KHT will continue to liaise with RBKC Officers to seek to mitigate the risks outlined within the schedule.		Noted.	No change.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	39.1.7	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS440	<p>p304 No7 Contingencies and risks</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>To properly reflect the development proposals for the Earls Court</p>		Agree that this schedule should be revised to reflect the policy requirements in CA7. In particular, the reference to exhibition or convention centre will be replaced with cultural facility and propose change to reflect that this facility may be provided on LBHF. However, the	Propose change to the risks and contingencies No. 7 on Earl's Court Strategic Site.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Regeneration Area and to ensure deliverability in accordance with PPS12.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy - Earls Court Exhibition Centre: mixed use redevelopment including an [delete exhibition or convention use] cultural and destination use.</p> <p>Dependency: if this policy is not implemented, what may not happen on the ground as a result? - [delete The Earls Court exhibition 'brand' is lost if no exhibition center or convention centre use is included in the redevelopment.] Redevelopment and regeneration in line with London Plan Opportunity Area designation and policies and Core Strategy Places and Allocations objectives for Earl's Court is not achieved.</p> <p>Central to the delivery of the strategy vision? - Yes</p> <p>Risk(s): what can get in the way of implementing the policy? - The cultural and destination [delete exhibition or convention] uses require too high a cross subsidy from the development [delete forcing up development volumes to unacceptable levels.]</p> <p>Likelihood of risk occurring? (Low, Med, High) - [delete Negligible] TBC depending on viability studies</p> <p>Impact on the strategy if risk occurs? (Low, Med, High) - [delete High] Medium</p> <p>Plan B Required? (Yes/No) - Yes</p> <p>Potential Alternatives - [delete Whilst the possibility of an international convention centre may prove more difficult to achieve.] A scheme not involving as many cultural or destination uses could be implemented if that was the only way of achieving regeneration. However, it is clear that the current Earls Court owners have every intention of building on the Earls Court brand, so no Plan B developed despite the "medium " '[delete high'] impact score.</p>		provision of the cultural facility is a requirement of the policy.	
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		40.1.1	Paragraph		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS264	<p>20. The table in Chapter 40 shows that 5323 homes can be delivered through the strategic site allocations in the plan. However, the Core Strategy should make it clear how the remaining homes (that will not come forward on the strategic sites) are to be delivered. Chapter 40 does not provide adequate material to satisfy an Inspector that the housing target can be met over the plan period. We therefore seek reassurance that the Council has the evidence base to support the full target as, in our view, there is some risk of the Plan being found unsound in this area.</p>		<p>A number of amendments have been made to Chapter 40, including revising figures to take account of known changes following proposed submission. This increases the planned dwelling provision to more than 5,500. It confirms that, if through monitoring housing provision an identified shortfall against the requirement is found, that changes will be brought about to policy or allocations to deliver the necessary housing.</p> <p>Approximately 40% of housing supply in the Royal Borough has, historically, been provided from non-major applications. These sites, totalling less than 10 units, are far harder to identify. These sites, even if we apply cautious estimates, therefore, are extremely likely to supply the shortfall between the known sites, and the overall target, this being, based on known sites, around 50 dwelling per annum. This 50 units p.a. would constitute less than 8.5% of the total requirement.</p>	<p>Introduce, to Paragraph 35.3.1 further paragraphs recognising the role of the SHLAA, and refer to the the use of monitoring and introduction of risk and contingency planning if these targets are not to be met. Further, an explanation of the unique situation in RBKC (as well as other inner-London Boroughs) that require a small proportion of housing delivery to come from windfall sites.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											All of this is contained within monitoring of past trends, which will be continued into the future. If this identifies a projected shortfall then the Council will require interventions in policy or in sites to bring forward further housing developments, and changes have been recommended to this effect.	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	40.1.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS442	<p>p319 Housing Trajectory and Supporting Information and p.321 Appendix 2 Further Evidence Affordable Housing Target</p> <p>Reasons and changes sought</p> <p>The housing trajectory at p.319 should be adjusted to reflect an additional 500 units (minimum) at the Earls Court strategic site from 2013/14 onwards.</p> <p>The table showing the strategic site allocations on p.321 should be adjusted to show a minimum of 1000 units at Earls Court and an estimate of affordable units of 0-400 (indicative, depending on affordable housing delivery across the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area and viability).</p> <p>This change reflects (1) the results of the Council's Housing Viability study which concluded that provision of 50% affordable housing would not be a viable proposition in the current market and a 40% target would be the 'highest' that could be reasonably advanced (para 7.15), (2) C&C's proposed changes to policy CH2, (3) the need for a detailed viability assessment to be undertaken,(4) phasing requirements, and (5) to reflect the fact that the delivery of affordable housing will be assessed across the whole of the Earls Court Regeneration Area, meaning that the number to be delivered in RBKC will be influenced by the whole site provision.</p>		Disagree with proposed changes to the number of residential units, as this is based on a sound calculation of development capacity on the RBKC Strategic Site, calculated in accordance with the minimum figures in the draft London Plan. Disagree with the proposed changes to affordable housing figures, as this is contrary to the Council's policy. Policy CA7 has been revised to accommodate some additional residential units if other non residential uses are proposed on LBHF, however, the extent of this is yet not known and therefore the minimum figures in the Strategic Site allocation will be used for the purposes of the Housing Trajectory.	No change proposed.
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturge on behalf of Metro Shopping Fund LP	42.0.1	Paragraph		No	Justified	PSubCS18	<p>Re: District Centre Plan for Notting Hill Gate – Page 373</p> <p>The plan showing the boundary of Notting Hill Gate District Centre contains an error. As drawn currently, it cuts through Newcombe House Tower on the corner of Kensington Church Street and Notting Hill Gate so that only a third of it lies within the defined centre and all the land that services the retail frontage onto Kensington Church Street (and which is used for the Farmer's Market) has been excluded from the town centre.</p> <p>All of this land actually forms part of the town centre and within the adopted Unitary Development Plan is identified as a "major development site". This location provides one of the few opportunities to potentially accommodate the provision of a new foodstore sought under Core Strategy paragraphs 16.3.16 and 16.4.8. Unless the plan is amended to encompass this land, such development would be defined as edge of centre and as currently worded, the Core Strategy would give priority to edge of centre locations around Knightsbridge, Kensington Church Street and the Kings Road in favour of this location, despite the fact that in reality, it is located in the centre of Notting Hill Gate.</p> <p>To correct this error and ensure that the plan is sound, the Inspector should recommend that the District Centre boundary be redrawn to encompass Newcombe House and the land that services the Kensington Church Street frontage.</p>		This change is considered unnecessary at this stage as the designations show the existing centre boundaries. The map on page 114 shows the potential for considerable redevelopment in this area, including appropriate district centre uses in this 'infill site', which is consistent with the vision of the place to repair any gaps in the retail frontage. The boundaries of the centres will be reviewed in the future to reflect any changes to the land uses as and when appropriate.	No change proposed.
Hon. Secretary	Knightsbridge		42.0.1	Paragraph		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS226	The boundary of the International Shopping Centre.		The retail units in this parade include a number of cafes and restaurants, ATMs and international banks, all of	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Carol Seymour-Newton	Association								<p>In order for land and buildings to be justifiably within the International Shopping Centre they should either contain at present or have the potential for containing in the future the kind of shops which characterise the Centre. The northern frontage of Brompton Road running west from Montpellier Street to the edge of the Centre does not fulfil these criteria for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little existing retail floorspace, certainly none of the size or prestigious nature required by international retailers. • There is no scope for conversion or redevelopment of the buildings to achieve such units because of such factors as the shallowness of the frontage, the presence or proximity of residential property, the requirements of conservation policy etc. <p>It is therefore misleading to those seeking to locate within the Centre to include these properties within the boundary since planning permission for the kind of unit they require could not be given. This boundary coincides with the boundary of the CAZ, which properly expresses the mixed use nature of the frontage. In addition the removal of this section of frontage will reduce the need to provide safe and attractive facilities for crossing Brompton Road and minimise the huge conflict between pedestrians and traffic implicit in the designation of both sides of Brompton Road as part of the Centre.</p> <p>Recommendation 2. Delete the frontage of Brompton Road between Montpelier Street and Brompton Square from the diagram on page 102 and the map of the Knightsbridge International Centre in 42.7. Make consequential changes.</p>		<p>which contribute towards the success of Knightsbridge as an international shopping centre.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge that this parade also serves the local shopping needs of residents. This is not uncommon within the Borough's higher order centre and is indeed encouraged.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that this allocation will not be altered.</p>	
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		42.0.1	Paragraph	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS254	<p>Proposals Map opposite Page 158</p> <p>Policy CL 1</p> <p>CE 2</p> <p>CE2 (c)</p> <p>CE4 (c)</p> <p>THE RIVER THAMES</p> <p>The Embankment and the spaces fronting it (eg the Royal Hospital) are a Chelsea amenity of the greatest importance and the area based on the river itself - the Thames Policy Area - is designated as a 'site of metropolitan importance'. The Society is concerned that little specific is said about it in the Core Strategy. It is important to be able to protect this valued place from intrusive development, to protect views and vistas to and from it along and across the Thames, and to protect it from any consequences of the construction and completion of Thames Water's new sewage tunnel and connectors.</p> <p>Policy CL1 (e) is insufficient. Ideally the Thames Policy Area out to be identified as a 'place'. Views to and from the Royal Hospital and views along and across the Thames, especially from the bridges should be identified and protected. Proposals should be made to work with TfL on creating additional pedestrian crossings and to provide for cyclists in ways that give people on foot safe use of Bazalgette's famous belvedere walkway The Embankment is a</p>		<p>The Thames is a valued asset by the Royal Borough. However, it is considered that the GLA's allocation of the Thames as part of the Blue Ribbon Network affords the area the correct protection and celebration. Kensington and Chelsea continues to support this designation within Policies CR5 and CE4 of the Core Strategy</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>unique and wonderful place. The need to rescue the Embankment from domination by traffic should be stated. Over 20 years much could be achieved.</p> <p>The Core Strategy is ineffective in identifying a Thames Policy area, in addressing its needs, in setting out policies for its protection or in identifying the potential for river-related uses. This makes it unsound.</p> <p>The Plan should show a Thames protection area on the Proposals Map. It should draw together into a single policy or an SPD all the policies that relate to the Thames and its frontages and set out measures for conservation and development.</p> <p>The Society also suggests, that in the absence of a 'place' for the Thames, further policy is added in section 4.4, with text along the following lines</p> <p>In addition to the 14 places identified, the Thames is of particular importance to the borough. Policies ensuring the long term protection of the Thames are contained in chapters 30 - 36, but to ensure the protection of the Thames, a further specific policy is introduced here:</p> <p>CP3 The Council will protect, promote and enhance the environment of the Thames area as defined on the proposals map</p>			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	42.0.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS443	<p>Proposed change</p> <p>The site plan should be revised to reflect the Earls Court Regeneration Area (RBKC Area) boundary for the land within RBKC,</p>		The boundary as allocated within Chapter 26 is correct, however, as the consultee has correctly identified, this is incorrect on the Proposals Map. Therefore, the Proposals Map will therefore changed to reflect the correct boundary	Alter Map
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	42.0.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS444	<p>p355 Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 Brompton Cemetery</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>Clarification should be added to explain the dark shading on the plan</p> <p>A relevant extract from the</p> <p>should also be included</p> <p>Reason for change</p> <p>For the reasons explained in representations above to Policy CE2</p>		Noted. The dark shading on the plan represents the railway line and falls under Flood Risk Zone 3. The SFRA has been part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy. There is therefore, no need to repeat those maps in the proposals map. No further changes are required.	No further changes are required.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	42.0.1	Paragraph		No	Effective	PSubCS445	<p>p357 Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 Philbeach</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>Clarification should be added to explain the dark shading on the plan</p> <p>A relevant extract from the SFRA Residual Risk map should also be</p>		Noted. The dark shading on the plan represents the railway line and falls under Flood Risk Zone 3. The SFRA has been part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy. There is therefore, no need to repeat those maps in the proposals map. No further changes are required.	No further changes are required.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									included Reason for change For the reasons explained in representations above to Policy CE2			
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		44.0.1	Paragraph	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS163	<p>Chapter 44 Relationship to the Community Strategy (pages 429-432)</p> <p>The Proposed Submission Core Strategy does not reflect the concept of spatial planning (PPS1, paragraph 20) and fully integrate Kensington and Chelsea PCT's strategic priorities to promote and improve health and wellbeing and the Strategic Objectives of the Core Strategy of the local population and residential quality of life to regenerate and improve and protect the overall health of the local population and reduce inequalities and to support children and young people to stay safe and be healthy. Chapter 44 aims are not spatial issues.</p> <p>As a result neither the vision or the strategic objectives refer to health or health inequalities and do not recognise that their determinants of life have strong health implications.</p> <p>We suggest that the core strategy should attempt to give spatial interpretation to the health aims of the community strategy.</p> <p>Therefore, we suggest that the following health aims and health issues be included in the core strategy.</p> <p>Aim 1: To improve and protect the overall health of the local population</p> <p>i. reducing the number of premature deaths caused by the main killers</p> <p>ii. addressing our public health priorities: smoking, physical activity and health</p> <p>Aim 5: To support children and young people to stay safe and be healthy</p> <p>i. halting the year on year rise in childhood obesity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improving food, nutrition and oral health in deprived communities encouraging and supporting children to have healthy lifestyles <p>It is recognised that spatial planning cannot address all the health and wellbeing benefits to physical and mental health and wellbeing arising from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to good quality open space and biodiversity Opportunities for sport and recreation Improving housing standards and design Opportunities for active travel - walking and cycling Opportunities to access healthy food Local job, training and education opportunities Encouraging community safety Managing the health impact of development on noise, air quality and climate change <p>We suggest that a cross-cutting approach is taken to ensure that health and wellbeing is included in the vision, objectives, policies and supporting text where appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 44.0.1 states that the Core Strategy will deliver the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy. It is noted that the Strategic Objectives of the Core Strategy of the local population and residential quality of life to regenerate and improve and protect the overall health of the local population and reduce inequalities and to support children and young people to stay safe and be healthy. Chapter 44 aims are not spatial issues.</p> <p>As a result neither the vision or the strategic objectives refer to health or health inequalities and do not recognise that their determinants of life have strong health implications.</p> <p>We suggest that the core strategy should attempt to give spatial interpretation to the health aims of the community strategy.</p> <p>Therefore, we suggest that the following health aims and health issues be included in the core strategy.</p> <p>Aim 1: To improve and protect the overall health of the local population</p> <p>i. reducing the number of premature deaths caused by the main killers</p> <p>ii. addressing our public health priorities: smoking, physical activity and health</p> <p>Aim 5: To support children and young people to stay safe and be healthy</p> <p>i. halting the year on year rise in childhood obesity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improving food, nutrition and oral health in deprived communities encouraging and supporting children to have healthy lifestyles <p>It is recognised that spatial planning cannot address all the health and wellbeing benefits to physical and mental health and wellbeing arising from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to good quality open space and biodiversity Opportunities for sport and recreation Improving housing standards and design Opportunities for active travel - walking and cycling Opportunities to access healthy food Local job, training and education opportunities Encouraging community safety Managing the health impact of development on noise, air quality and climate change <p>We suggest that a cross-cutting approach is taken to ensure that health and wellbeing is included in the vision, objectives, policies and supporting text where appropriate.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the Core Strategy clearly recognises the causes and impacts. It is considered that this is the correct location to explicitly refer to health impacts. The health benefits and cost are implicit throughout the document and their direct inclusion within the main body of text adds no strategic value.</p> <p>No change to the wording is required.</p>	No further action is required.	
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social Council		CO1	Strategic Objective One: Keeping Life Local		No	Justified	PSubCS39	<p>Strategic Objective CO 1.1</p> <p>To be sound the following changes are required in accordance with the London Plan 2008:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The word "affordable" must be added alongside accessible and widely available To highlight the role of the voluntary and community sector as integral to the provision of social infrastructure within the borough <p>London Plan Policy 3A.19 refers to boroughs working with the voluntary and community sector when preparing development plan documents so as to address their need for accessible and affordable accommodation. Usually this takes the form of a</p>		<p>The community and voluntary sector is extremely valuable to the Royal Borough as noted by the designation of both dedicated community and meeting halls and bespoke spaces for the voluntary sector as social and community uses within Keeping Life Local.</p> <p>Throughout the document, the impact on the likely increasing number of residents is included. This in part, refers to estate renewal but also the creation of new communities in Earls Court and Kensal. Both strategic site allocations the need for social and community floorspace and in the case of Kensal this may well result in the provision of new, improved facilities currently</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>community premises audit, mapping current provision and identifying future need, the findings from which are then given a policy hook within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>PPS12 refers to the importance of assessing the need for and delivering social infrastructure with the voluntary and community sector an important stakeholder. The neglect of this also renders unsound chapter 37 Infrastructure and we wish this to be examined at the public hearings.</p> <p>There are other weaknesses in the evidence base which render this policy unsound. The ethos of keeping life local should be applied to employment and housing. By integrating employment with housing people can live and work locally and options for achieving this should be evaluated</p> <p>There should be an evaluation of employment zones to see to what extent they are geared towards local employment, with cross-references under Keeping Life Local.</p> <p>There should have been an evaluation of the impact of estate renewal on keeping life local, as there is a view that estate renewal leads to the disintegration of existing communities.</p>		<p>offered by Canalside House.</p> <p>The Employment Zones have been assessed using the Employment Land and Premises Study which highlights that a disproportionate number of employees are employed in the Employment Zones. This is widely accepted and acknowledged briefly in Keeping Life Local and in greater detail in Fostering Vitality. It is considered that the Core Strategy should, unlike the UDP, be read as a whole and not by chapter, therefore, direct cross-referencing is not considered necessary.</p>	
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social Council		CO1	Strategic Objective One: Keeping Life Local		No	Justified	PSubCS44	<p>DIVERSITY OF HOUSING</p> <p>Strategic Objective CO 1.6</p> <p>The core strategy is unsound because it fails to cater for a variety of housing needs. No evidence or policy is provided on the housing needs of young people. There is concern that many young people have to move out of the borough because there are not enough options for them to stay when moving out of parental homes</p> <p>No evidence is provided on the number of empty homes in the borough, by tenure and by location. Plans to redevelop the north are based on the notion that it is not as densely populated as the south of the borough. This assumption is unsound as it is based on the number of units but does not take into account occupancy rates, some wards in the south have up to 1 in 5 empty properties.</p> <p>The stated aim of reducing polarisation between north and south in fact is unbalanced as this only means adding intermediate and market housing in wards where there is a higher proportion of social rented housing.</p> <p>The Council's strategic focus on "diversity of housing in mixed communities" (35.1.1), is unsound when the need to increase the stock of social rented housing should come first</p> <p>The strategic focus on adaptability and Lifetime Homes is incoherent without a guiding statement on Access needs to show a firmer commitment to Homes for All.</p> <p>There should be a policy target on bringing empty homes into use. Reference should be made to the housing trajectory study which in 40.1.1 reports that over one-third of the annual housing target is being met by vacant dwellings.</p>		<p>The policies relating to Diversity of Housing are underpinned by evidence from the SHMA, SHLAA and monitoring of housing need. The objective and policies cater for a wide range of housing needs. In preparing the housing trajectory evidence the full scale of available housing is used, including vacant premises.</p> <p>Issues such as Homes for all - to address access issues are dealt with, for example through the Council's Access for All SPD, and the Lifetime Homes requirement, and wheelchair standards, within CH2.</p> <p>A focus on social rented housing is provided: the evidence demonstrates, and the policy requires 85% of new affordable housing to be of this tenure.</p>	No change
Mr Malcolm	NHS London		CO1	Strategic Objective	No	No	Effective Consistent	PSubCS167	<p>3.3 Strategic Objectives</p> <p>The 'residential quality of life' element of the vision relates to objectives CO2-CO7, but use of the</p>		<p>In relation to CO2, the 'quality of life' referred to in the vision is not specifically making</p>	delete the last sentence of paragraph 3.3.11 and replace with:

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Souch	Healthy Urban Development HUDU			One: Keeping Life Local			nt with national policy		or 'wellbeing' is not defined and we would suggest that reference to health is incorporated. CO 2 Strategic Objective for Fostering Vitality Our strategic objective to foster vitality is that the quality of life in a predominantly residential Borough is enhanced by a wide variety of cultural, creative and commercial uses which can significantly contribute to the health and well being of residents and to the capital's role as a world city. CO 3: Strategic Objective for Better Travel Choices Our strategic objective for better travel choices is that walking, cycling and public transport are safe, healthy, easy and attractive, and preferred by our residents to private car ownership and use.	reference to health - it is referring to the benefits of living in a mixed use environments which can lead to health (fitness) benefits, and to build health into the objective would therefore make the objective unnecessarily complex. However, it could be inserted into the preceding paragraph 3.3.11	By making it easier to live without a car, we can improve residents' quality of life and opportunities for physical fitness through walking and cycling, as well as improving the local built environment and reducing our environmental impact.	
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		CO1	Strategic Objective One: Keeping Life Local	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS243	<p>Policy CO 1.1</p> <p>Paragraphs 30.3.2 & 30.3.4</p> <p>It is well known that 52 per cent of K&C children attend private schools but it seems less well-known by the Council that many such schools are short of space (including playgrounds). The loss to housing, in recent years, of such education sites as the College of St Mark & St John, Chelsea College of Art and the Former Jamahiriya School, eliminated valuable social and community land use opportunities. The Core Strategy at present contains no provision to ensure a better future for the needs of children at independent schools.</p> <p>The Strategy is effective in protecting existing uses and in permitting enabling development for the modernisation of social and community facilities.</p> <p>Building an Academy in West Chelsea and another primary school in Warwick Road are also very welcome. However they will not benefit children at EXISTING independent schools in the south of the Borough. In particular they will not provide them with needed sports facilities, outdoor play space or gymnasia. (Hampshire Gems, recently re-established in the old Chelsea Public Library in Manresa Road, for instance, has no playground just a slip of outdoor space.)</p> <p>Independent schools do use the Chelsea baths but because of demand are pushed to the very extremities of the day.</p> <p>The lack of any surveys of the schools and facilities of half the children in the Borough, the absence of any forecast of future demand flowing from the expansion of housing set out in Chapter 35 of the Core Strategy. and the absence of any effort to identify additional sites for the recreation and other uses of children at independent schools, points to both unsoundness and ineffectiveness in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Chelsea Society does not underrate the difficulty that this issue raises for the Borough Council. We are not seeking to have Policy CK 1 struck down. We do however want to draw attention to a lack of balance that is present in the Plan due to the provision for expansion of housing (at, for instance Warwick Road and the site of the Earl's Court Exhibition and an overall 20,000 increase in population) even though the existing social and community needs of existing residents are not being met. The question that needs to be addressed is whether too many additional people and too much additional housing is being provided for in a Borough that already has the highest density in Britain/ The Society fears that this is the case and that more space needs to be allocated to social and community needs.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges and understands the concerns of the consultee however, it is not practical to write policy to retrofit the lack of playspace etc at existing facilities.</p> <p>The consultee acknowledges the lack of available space for recreation in the borough and the Council would consider that the provision of a larger facility, severing more residents but requiring an inconvenient journey to open space/play space is superior to an educational establishment which serves for fewer children.</p> <p>The increase in the Borough's population will naturally lead to a greater demand for social and community facilities. In areas where this growth is seen as being considerable, appropriate social and community facilities will be expected. This is detailed within Strategic Sites chapters (numbers 20 to 27) of the Core Strategy.</p>	No change	
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		CO 1.3	Strategic Objective for Better Travel Choices		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS208	<p>Transport</p> <p>44. Transport for London has provided a table of detailed comments. The comments do not raise matters which would strengthen the clarity and robustness of the plan as a whole. The lack of acknowledgement of Crossrail sites has previously been raised. In particular there is no reference to safeguarding land for Crossrail.</p>	<p>The comments do not raise matters which would strengthen the clarity and robustness of the plan as a whole. The lack of acknowledgement of Crossrail sites has previously been raised. In particular there is no reference to safeguarding land for Crossrail.</p>	<p>A reference to CT2 has been made to include reference to safeguarding land for Crossrail.</p> <p>The Planning Obligations SPD will include a reference to the Mayor's SPG on Crossrail funding. Given that the</p>	<p>A reference to CT2 has been made to include reference to safeguarding land for Crossrail.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									. that may impact on the delivery of strategic sites including Kensal. The status of proposals affecting the system should be strengthened to make it clear that the proposals have not yet been fully tested and secured for any changes. As previously requested more clarity is needed on the status of new and proposed rail infrastructure of Knightsbridge in this publication in October 2009 of a planning obligations in the funding of Crossrail.		SP6 with the Core Strategy will have a limited impact on the borough (that applying would need to be based on the use of the Core Strategy is not necessary.	
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		CO3	Strategic Objective for Better Travel Choices	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS168	3.3 Strategic Objectives The 'residential quality of life' element of the vision relates to objectives CO2-CO7, but use of the term 'wellbeing' is not defined and we would suggest that reference to health is incorporated. CO 2 Strategic Objective for Fostering Vitality Our strategic objective to foster vitality is that the quality of life in the predominantly residential Borough is enhanced by a wide variety of cultural, creative and commercial activities that significantly contribute to the health and well being of residents and to the capital's role as a world city. CO 3: Strategic Objective for Better Travel Choices Our strategic objective for better travel choices is that walking, cycling and public transport are safe, healthy, easy and attractive, and preferred by our residents to private use.		Both the Vision and the Strategic Objectives of the Core Strategy take into account regeneration and residential quality of life. As the respondent has stated, "It is important that spatial planning cannot address all the health conditions and their determinants". A cross-cutting approach to try to address health and wellbeing is that walking, cycling and public transport are safe, healthy, easy and attractive, and preferred by our residents to private use. A degree of repetition in the wording not adding any clarity to them. Furthermore, the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the Core Strategy clearly recognises the causes and impacts. It is considered that this is the correct location to explicitly refer to health impacts. The health benefits and cost are implicit throughout the document and their direct inclusion within the main body of text adds no strategic value. No change to the wording is required.	No change.
Port of London Authority Lucy Owen	Port of London Authority		CO3	Strategic Objective for Better Travel Choices	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS321	<i>Transport / Better Travel Choices</i> Strategic Objective CO3 is concerned with better travel choices and Policy CT1 seeks to improve alternatives to car use. Reference is made to public transport, walking and cycling and parking. The PLA is pleased to see reference at CT1(m) to a requirement that new development adjacent to the River Thames takes full advantage of, and improves the opportunities for, public transport and freight on the water and walking and cycling alongside it. The use of the River for the transport of passengers and freight is a sustainable method of transport that has policy support from the National Level downwards. Policy CT1 would therefore appear to be in broad conformity with <i>London Plan</i> policy. However, the Council should review the wording of Strategic Objective CO3 as it appears to be related solely to the transport of people however, policy CT1 is a broader policy and is concerned with the movement of people and freight. In order to accord with planning policy from the National Level downwards and with the Council's own policy CT1, Strategic Objective CO3 should therefore be widened to include reference to the transport of freight.		Noted. CT1 provides a strong policy for use and improvement of opportunities for transport on the Thames. Although the vision does not explicitly refer to this policy, this does not undermine the policy intention of CT1.	No changes proposed.
Mr Clive Wilson	Norland Conservation Society		CO 3	Strategic Objective for Better Travel Choices		No	Effective	PSubCS222	Nowhere does the Core Strategy indicate how the objectives of improving north-south transport links, and at the same time, protecting and enhancing Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings can be achieved in the case of Royal Crescent and St Ann's Villas. Relating this problem to relevant sections of the Core Strategy: Strategic Objective Three: Better travel choices is to be achieved by, amongst other things, improving bus services linking the north and south of the Borough (para 3.4.11) At the same time, Strategic Objective Five: Renewing the Legacy (para 3.3.13 and CO 1.5) is assumed to have been achieved in para 3.4.14: "we will have renewed the legacy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the quality of our built heritage will continue to be central to the image of the Borough property owners will be accustomed to undertaking 		Renewing the Legacy is principally based on ensuring the Borough's built heritage in is maintained and protected and that conservation areas remain of the highest quality. Whilst it is understood that a potential conflict has arisen, the increased traffic itself would not overtly damage the character and appearance of the conservation area. North-south bus routes, connecting otherwise isolated communities in the north with easy access to the retail, cultural and employment opportunities found in the centre and south of the Royal Borough is considered to be of a great strategic importance. The borough is keen to seek a resolution to the problems faced in Royal Crescent and St Ann's Villas, however, this is not a matter to be detailed within a high level strategic document and will be further detailed should opportunities arise to improve linkages.	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>restoratin and enhancement works as part of development proposals"</p> <p>and in para 3.4.18:</p> <p>"we will have renewed the legacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - our historic townscapes will have been cherished and will appear much as they do today - our listed buildings will have been preserved" <p>It does not say how.</p> <p>We maintain that in relation to Royal Crescent and St Ann's Villas, the Legacy will not be renewed if the Buses/HGV problem is not addressed and resolved. How the conflict is to be resolved, and both objectives achieved, is not addressed in the Core Strategy document. We therefore maintain it does not pass the "Effectiveness" test.</p>		It should however be noted, that St Ann's Villas is only one of a number of arterial routes which could be used in improving these links.	
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		CO 5	Strategic Objective for Renewing the Legacy	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS172	CO 5: Strategic Objective for Renewing the Legacy Our strategic objective to renew the legacy is not a diminution in the excellence we have inherited, but to pass to the next generation a Borough that is of the highest design quality which promotes healthy, sustainable and inclusive communities for all, by taking great care to maintain and conserve and enhance the glorious built heritage we have inherited and to ensure that where new development takes place it enhances the Borough.	The additional sentence is unnecessary. It is better than today, of the kind great care to maintain and to ensure that where new development takes place it improves and promotes healthiness and inclusiveness and that these are of a strategic importance to the Core Strategy. However, adding a catch-all sentence to the Objectives does not give this matter any more strategic weight, it merely jumbles an otherwise clear message.	No change	
Mr Clive Wilson	Norland Conservation Society		CO 5	Strategic Objective for Renewing the Legacy		No	Effective	PSubCS223	<p>Nowhere does the Core Strategy indicate how the objectives of improving north-south transport links, and at the same time, protecting and enhancing Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings can be achieved in the case of Royal Crescent and St Ann's Villas.</p> <p>Relating this problem to relevant sections of the Core Strategy:</p> <p>Strategic Objective Three: Better travel choices is to be achieved by, amongst other things, improving bus services linking the north and south of the Borough (para 3.4.11)</p> <p>At the same time, Strategic Objective Five: Renewing the Legacy (para 3.3.13 and CO 1.5) is assumed to have been achieved in para 3.4.14:</p> <p>"we will have renewed the legacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the quality of our built heritage will continue to be central to the image of the Borough • property owners will be accustomed to undertaking restoratin and enhancement works as part of development proposals" <p>and in para 3.4.18:</p> <p>"we will have renewed the legacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - our historic townscapes will have been cherished and will appear much as they do today - our listed buildings will have been preserved" <p>It does not say how.</p> <p>We maintain that in relation to Royal Crescent and St Ann's Villas, the Legacy will not be renewed if the Buses/HGV problem</p>	<p>Renewing the Legacy is principally based on ensuring the Borough's built heritage in is maintained and protected and that conservation areas remain of the highest quality. Whilst it is understood that a potential conflict has arisen, the increased traffic itself would not overtly damage the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>North-south bus routes, connecting otherwise isolated communities in the north with easy access to the retail, cultural and employment opportunities found in the centre and south of the Royal Borough is considered to be of a great strategic importance.</p> <p>The borough is keen to seek a resolution to the problems faced in Royal Crescent and St Ann's Villas, however, this is not a matter to be detailed within a high level strategic document and will be further detailed should opportunities arise to improve linkages.</p> <p>It should however be noted, that St Ann's Villas is only one of a number of arterial routes which could be used in improving these links.</p>	No change	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									is not addressed and resolved. How the conflict is to be resolved, and both objectives achieved, is not addressed in the Core Strategy document. We therefore maintain it does not pass the "Effectiveness" test.			
Mr Matthew Brown	Environment Agency		CO 7	Strategic Objective for Respecting Environmental Limits				PSubCS111	<p>Policy no: C07 Strategic Objectives for Respecting Environmental Limits</p> <p>Page no: 41</p> <p>Paragraph</p> <p>Why it is legally compliant or Sound?</p> <p>We support this policy as it complies with the general themes of Planning Policy 1(Delivering Sustainable Development) 2005, Planning Policy Statement 9 (Biodiversity) Planning Policy Statements 23 (Planning and Pollution Control) 2004, Planning Policy Statement 25 (Development and Flood Risk), policies within the London Plan 2008.</p>		This comment denotes support to the 'Respecting Environmental Limits' chapter.	No further action required.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		CO 7	Strategic Objective for Respecting Environmental Limits	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS175	CO 7: Strategic Objective for Respecting Environmental Limits Our strategic objective to respect environmental limits and contribute to the mitigation of, and adaption to, climate change and to the health and wellbeing of residents by 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.	Additional wording is unnecessary. It is considered that the Strategic Objectives clearly improve and promote health and well being and that these are of a strategic importance to the Core Strategy. However, adding a catch-all sentence to the Objectives does not give this matter any more strategic weight, it merely jumbles an otherwise clear message	No change	
Mr Martyn Baker			CV1	Vision for the Royal Borough: Building on Success		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS4	<p>The Core Strategy needs further refinement if it is to be a sound strategy because: -a) its Vision, and its rather too narrow range of key policies (cv1-3) do not fully reflect the particular characteristics and challenges of the RBK&C in terms of economic as well as social and environmental sustainability.b) A too limited range of numerical targets are laid out in the summary of the Council's policies on pages 11-16. Without more quantification and more specific target dates it will prove difficult to drive forward the Core Strategy effectively. The effectiveness of its policies in securing the sustainable development of the Borough will be difficult to measure in an accountable way. c) Its low key approach to economic development in terms of Work and Business (the last of eight themes in the third community strategy for the Borough and only dealt with on pages 74-80) is not fully consistent with the Mayor's recently published draft replacement London Plan with its major emphasis on supporting London's development and employment growth, as further set out in the Mayor's new draft Economic Development Strategy also published for public consultation in mid-October. This recognises that alongside building more housing there is a need to create more workspace together with additional social infrastructure.</p> <p>Because RBK&C is already the most densely populated Borough in England & Wales with so much pressure on it by residential developers to maximise the return from scarce sites by achieving a change of use, there is an over-riding need to adopt a Core Strategy which signals a clear determination to resist further loss of sites designated for office, retail,small business, leisure and educational use, because all of such uses provide employment space for a growing population. Rigorous policies spelt out more clearly within the Core Strategy are needed to avoid further residential developments which will overload the social and physical infrastructure of the Borough. Ideally there should be a cap on further residential developments, at least in those wards</p>		<p>In response to point a) above: It is assumed reference should be to CP1-3 (not CV1-3). These policies are not intended to cover the full breadth of the plan. The characteristics and challenges are reflected in the Strategic Objectives (CO1-7).</p> <p>In response to point b) above: Pages 11-16 are summarising the plan. They are not the plan itself. They are intended to help the lay person understand the 'story' of the plan. Where numbers are relevant they are included. There is a clear policy on the quantum of development (CP1) and a full chapter on monitoring (Chapter 38).</p> <p>In response to point c) above: it is not clear if pages 74-80 are referencing the community strategy or the core strategy. If the latter, they refer to the chapter on Latimer. One of the seven strategic objectives of the plan is to 'foster vitality'. This sets out how important the business and retail sector is to the borough. It is not possible therefore to say that the plan takes a 'low key' approach to economic development. In addition, the development management policies in Chapter 31 protect 'employment' uses and allow for new employment uses to be established. The RBK&C Core Strategy responds to the locally distinct circumstances of the borough in promoting small businesses in particular. It is fully in accordance with both the existing and revised London Plans.</p> <p>In response to the second paragraph: The core strategy does just this. Policies within the development management section, chapter 31 in particular, protect</p>	<p>In response to point a) above: Recommendation: no change</p> <p>In response to point b) above: Recommendation: no change</p> <p>In response to point c) above: Recommendation: no change</p> <p>In response to the second paragraph: Recommendation: no change</p> <p>In response to the third paragraph: Recommendation: no change</p> <p>In response the upper part of the fourth paragraph: Recommendation: no change</p> <p>In response to point 1) above: Recommendation: no change</p> <p>In response to point 2) above: Recommendation: no change</p> <p>In response to point 3) above: Recommendation: no change</p> <p>In response to point 4) above: Recommendation: no change</p> <p>In response to point 5) above:</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>with residential densities four times the London-wide average density, until such time as the social, recreational, educational and employment needs of the Borough's existing population have been adequately catered for, its population having increased substantially from the last census to reach a total of 178000 according to ONS estimates.</p> <p>In terms of specific measurable targets there is a need to match the house building targets specified in the Core Strategy in response to the last London Plan requirements by setting out an equivalent target to generate the additional work space needed to accommodate the additional working age population to be accommodated in this new housing.</p> <p>If the Core Strategy and its policy priorities and specific targets are to be deemed sound the exceptional challenges facing the RBK&C need to be spelt out more clearly so that the risks and opportunities for this community can be better addressed in conformity with the Mayor's latest draft policies. Naturally, the RBK&C cannot control many underlying trends (in particular growth in population, in employment/unemployment, in traffic levels, in congestion and pollution, in demand for primary and secondary school places, in the need for more recreational space and leisure services, in the requirements for greater health care for the sick and elderly and in the provision of social benefits for the disadvantaged and those unable to work) and cannot accurately predict their speed of development, yet (working in partnership with many other public bodies with wider responsibilities for particular services and infrastructure investment decisions) the Council should have an overall perspective as to the feasibility of meeting these challenges in a more or less sustainable way within the constrained spatial limits of Kensington and Chelsea. To be authentic this unique perspective needs to be well grounded in a recognition of what makes the RBK&C distinctly different from other boroughs particularly in Inner London. The perspective provided by the Core Strategy is not entirely sound because it does not sufficiently take into account the following key characteristics as the basis for advancing effective policies: - 1) Not only is the RBK&C the most densely populated borough in England and Wales (with twice the number of people per hectare as in Wandsworth across the Thames) several wards have a density five times the overall London average, and overall 83% of properties in the Borough are flats.2) Despite having some of the lowest levels of car ownership in the Country the Borough suffers from high traffic volumes generated in particular by through traffic and by three secondary schools (Faith schools) importing most of their pupils from other boroughs. This means that 59% of students at the RBK&C's four secondary schools live in other boroughs. This also means that in turn 23% of RBK&C's children have to commute to maintained secondary schools in other boroughs, which also adds to the considerable volume of traffic during term times.3) Topographically RBK&C is most clearly defined by its beautiful river frontage and the historic and architecturally distinguished buildings and public gardens which look onto the Thames. Yet this major amenity area is fast being blighted by the increasing traffic and pollution on the A3212 (Cheyne Walk/Chelsea Embankment) generated by the Western Extension of the Congestion Charging Zone which has increasingly been turning this road into a slow moving "urban motorway".4) Although described as a high-density area the Borough accommodates many non-residential buildings which provide essential employment space, not just in three specific zones but in major high streets, in local shops, restaurants and pubs, in substantial hotels, at major cultural attractions, in the limited number of public parks and sports facilities and amongst the wide range of often small, specialist enterprises providing high value business, consultancy and design</p>		<p>non-residential uses from change of use to residential, reversing the situation with the existing UDP. There cannot, however, be a cap on further residential development because of the need to comply with the housing targets set in the London Plan. However, the vast majority of new housing will be accommodated on strategic sites where new infrastructure will also be provided.</p> <p>In response to the third paragraph: The plan protects existing, and permits the provision of new employment uses. It takes a strong approach with regard to the employment zones, resisting their slow evolution into residential areas, to facilitate premises suitable for small businesses in particular, which the evidence shows employ a disproportionately large number of borough residents.</p> <p>In response to the upper part of the fourth paragraph: the plan pays close attention to the locally distinct characteristics of the borough. The vision is based upon those distinct characteristics, and the strategic objectives underpin the delivery of the vision.</p> <p>In response to point 1) above: the plan makes specific reference to the density of the borough, particularly in relation the appropriate form of future developments.</p> <p>In response to point 2) above: The plan specifically addresses the issue of the schooling of the borough's children by making an allocation for a new secondary school in the north of the borough.</p> <p>In response to point 3) above: It is agreed that the Thames is an important element of the quality of the borough. The Thames policy area is already on the UDP proposals map.</p> <p>In response to 4) above: it is agreed that the borough is much more than a residential suburb. This is why the strategic objective of fostering vitality is included within the plan, and a suite of policies to protect the non-residential uses of the borough.</p> <p>In response to 5) above, the plan puts in place a suite of policies to protect the non-residential uses of the borough.</p> <p>In response to the fifth and sixth paragraphs: whilst only 70% of the borough's working age population is economically active, this is not the same as 30% of the borough looking for work. As is set out in chapter 2, the borough has higher than average incomes, more managerial and professional staff, and high numbers of the population with degrees. The spatial distribution shows that issues of access to jobs is concentrated in (but not exclusive to) the north of the borough, and this is where the plan is focusing attention in terms of regeneration.</p>	<p>Recommendation: no change</p> <p>In response to the fifth and sixth paragraphs : Recommendation: include in Chapter 2 information on the economic activity and unemployment of the borough, to clarify this matter.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>services. 5) The borough has already "lost" a good deal of educational, cultural and other employment generating sites to "upmarket" residential use as a result of planning decisions which have turned the St Mark and St John College, Chelsea Art School and Glebe Place into exclusive housing developments.</p> <p>Taking these key characteristics into account a crucial consideration must surely be how to preserve and, in effect, ration the finite amount of land left for "development" in this most densely populated borough. The reasons for giving employment space as much priority as residential space are spelt out in the Mayor's latest drafts but there is an over-riding economic argument in the case of RBK&C. This is that only 70% of the Borough's working age population was economically active according to Facts and Figures about RBK&C 2008. This compares badly with the overall average for London of 75%. Indeed HMG is known to want this London wide percentage increased to match the percentage for England as a whole (78.6% in 2007) and for the national rate to move upwards to 80% in order to harness more of the economic potential of the Country. Among reasons militating against fuller employment (prior to the current recession) included the limited amount of space devoted to employment in most London boroughs; the continuing loss to residential use of sites previously devoted to employment (as a result of planning authorities not resisting change of use applications) ; and the time and expense involved in commuting often long distances to areas of employment. This must be environmentally undesirable since it adds to pollution and excessive energy use. Consequently it must be in the interests of this Borough's sustainability both economically and socially for a specific policy to be adopted as part of the Core Strategy which would seek to achieve a higher percentage of economically active residents (at least reaching the overall London average) through the provision of additional work space in the Borough, or at the very least the safeguarding of all existing non-residential space in RBK&C, non-residential space being defined as all existing space for office, retail, educational, health, social and other public services, as well as artistic and leisure purposes because activities under these headings all involve employment of one sort or another. As a measure of the success of such a policy, targets should be set for the number of job spaces preserved and newly created through the Borough's planning and regenerative efforts.</p> <p>Given the wealth of RBK&C it is an unattractive fact that the Borough's unemployment amongst those economically active (5.5%) was in 2007 higher than the average for England as a whole (5.4%) although lower than the overall London rate of 6.8%. The Core Strategy should contain stronger policies to find young people in particular pathways into work and these policies should be matched by more measures to encourage local employment initiatives to make available suitable premises for enterprising, new and growing businesses. In summary further targets should be set to reduce the unemployment rate progressively, and to reduce the percentage of the Borough's working age population which is economically inactive (29.4%) since this amounted to 36,368 residents in 2007, meaning that of the Borough's total population slightly less than 50% were in employment or seeking employment. This is hardly conducive to the economic leave alone social sustainability of the RBK&C over the longer term unless this trend is reversed</p>			
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		CV1	Vision for the Royal Borough: Building on Success	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS165	<p>CV1 Vision for the Royal Borough: Building on Success</p> <p>North Kensington contains some of the most deprived wards in London and as such is designated in the London Plan as an Area for Regeneration. London Plan Policy 2A.7 requires an integrated approach to deprivation in these areas, which includes proposals for health improvement. The regeneration in north Kensington element of the vision should acknowledge the need for an integrated approach whereby policy interventions to secure better transport, better housing and better social infrastructure will together have a positive influence on deprivation and health.</p> <p>The 'improving our residential quality of life' element of the vision doesn't mention the impact of new development, or health</p>		Agreed. However, rather than altering the Vision, it would be preferable to alter paragraph 3.1.6	at the end of paragraph 3.1.6, delete the semi colon and insert "to secure better transport, better housing and better social infrastructure which will together have a positive influence on deprivation and both physical and mental health;"

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									explicitly, but mentions design quality, environmental performance, flood risk , biodiversity, air quality and noise. These issues will have health impacts and it is suggested that the text refers to mitigating the impact of development, particularly on health, the environment and residents' amenity.			
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		CV1	Vision for the Royal Borough: Building on Success		No	Effective	PSubCS229	<p>We strongly support the Core Strategy but we are, however, concerned that the plan still does not deal effectively with a number of key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● it fails to elaborate key policies in the London Plan, especially those on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the density of development (3A.3); ○ identifying views and vistas; ○ the premises needs of voluntary organisations (3A.19); and ○ matching development to transport capacity and accessibility (3C.1 and 3C.2). ● it fails to reflect the needs of Borough residents in the mix of housing required, in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the proportion of new housing that should be affordable; ○ the proportion of market housing that should be in large units, most of which seem to be sold to an international market as "second homes"; and ○ promoting housing choice for the elderly which would release underoccupied housing. ● it fails to identify the areas at risk from surface water and sewer flooding <p>Statement of Support</p> <p>The Society strongly supports the Core Strategy, particularly those policies designed to solve problems experienced since the UDP was adopted, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the provision of affordable housing; ● a sequential approach to the retention of social and community uses; ● the retention of offices throughout the Borough; ● the infrastructure contributions proposed for S106 agreements; ● the promotion of walkable communities - keeping things local; and ● the control of the extent that open spaces are used for commercial events. 		<p>We note the support for the Core Strategy. Taking each of the concerns above in turn:</p> <p>weaknesses in relation to the London Plan:</p> <p>the density of development (3A.3); This is addressed at Policy CL1</p> <p>identifying views and vistas. Specific views and vistas have not been included in this document in a comprehensive manner over the whole borough. The LDS adopted March 2010 includes for two SPDs on views. One timetabled during 2010 setting out a methodology for the assessment of views, and a subsequent one to identify key views within the borough.</p> <p>the premises needs of voluntary organisations (3A.19); the need to provide for affordable office accommodation is fair, and changes are recommended to the relevant policies.</p> <p>matching development to transport capacity and accessibility (3C.1 and 3C.2). This is addressed in policy CT1</p> <p>weaknesses regarding Borough resident's housing needs:</p> <p>the proportion of new housing that should be affordable. The plan maintains that the maximum amount of affordable housing should be provided, but makes it clear the expectation is at least 50%. In current economic circumstances it is possible this may not be achieved, but the Council wishes to make its intentions regarding the importance of the provision of affordable housing very clear and unambiguous, and has thus retained the presumption of at least 50 % in policy CH2</p> <p>the proportion of market housing that should be in large units, most of which seem to be sold to an international market as "second homes". The planning system cannot control the sale of private market units. The housing needs of the borough indicate that many larger houses are needed. However, we have not included hard and fast targets in policy, because we believe that this needs further investigation and potential for swift updates. For that reason the LDS adopted in March 2010 identifies the preparation of a housing SPD once the Core Strategy is adopted. This will allow more careful examination of the preferred housing mix for new developments.</p> <p>promoting housing choice for the elderly which would release underoccupied housing. The plan encourages the provision of extra care housing at CH2.</p> <p>it fails to identify the areas at risk from surface water and sewer flooding. This work is of too detailed a nature to form part of the Core Strategy. In addition, it is believed expedient for the Council to get to grips with</p>	<p>Insert "affordable" in Para. 29.2.4, item 4 so that the last line reads, "affordable premises for voluntary and community organisations and churches and other religious facilities;"</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											the new Surface Water Management Plans and related regulations before carrying out further detailed work in this area.	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	CV1	Vision for the Royal Borough: Building on Success		No	Effective	PSubCS354	<p>p11 Policy CV1 Vision for the Royal Borough: Building on Success</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>To reflect the vision for the Earls Court Regeneration Area, as explained in chapters 10 and 26.</p> <p>The Earls Court Regeneration Area is one of only 3 Opportunity Areas in the Borough and the second largest (albeit including land within LBHF). These are the areas where greatest change through urban regeneration is envisaged over the plan period. It is appropriate, therefore, to include a specific reference in policy CV1 as it is the overarching policy setting out the Council's vision. It is important that the Executive Summary gives the reader a clear message about the direction of the Strategy. The proposed change ensures the text is consistent with references in chapters 10 and 26. It will enable the policy to be more effective and sound.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CV1</p> <p>Our vision for Kensington and Chelsea over the next 20 years is to build on success. To further develop the strong and varied sense of place of the Borough, we will, in partnership with other organisations and importantly with our residents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> stimulate regeneration in North Kensington through the provision of better transport, better housing and better facilities; enhance the reputation of our national and international destinations - Knightsbridge, Portobello Road, South Kensington, the King's Road, Kensington High Street, and Earl's Court - by supporting and encouraging retail and cultural activities and a new urban quarter as part of the Earls Court Regeneration Area in particular; uphold our residential quality of life so that we remain the best place in which to live in London, through cherishing quality in the built environment, acting on environmental issues and facilitating local living, including through strengthening local centres. 		The additional wording is not considered to be necessary as it merely repeats content which is found within the Earls Court Strategic Site chapter. As such, no change proposed as it may dilute the overarching Vision for the borough as a whole.	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	CV1	Vision for the Royal Borough: Building on Success		No	Effective	PSubCS356	<p>p36 Policy CV1 Vision for the Royal Borough: Building on Success</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>To reflect the vision for the Earls Court Regeneration Area, as explained in chapters 10 and 26.</p> <p>The Earls Court Regeneration Area is one of only 3 Opportunity Areas in the Borough and the second largest (including land within LBHF). These are the areas where greatest change through urban regeneration is envisaged over the plan period. It is appropriate, therefore, to include a specific reference in policy CV1 as it is the overarching policy setting out the Council's vision. It is important that Executive Summary gives the reader a clear message about the direction of the Strategy. The proposed change ensures the text is consistent with references in chapters 10 and 26. It will</p>		The additional wording is not considered to be necessary as it merely repeats content which is found within the Earls Court Strategic Site chapter. As such, no changes proposed as they may dilute the overarching Vision for the borough as a whole.	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>enable the policy to be more effective and sound.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CV1</p> <p>Our vision for Kensington and Chelsea over the next 20 years is to build on success. To further develop the strong and varied sense of place of the Borough, we will, in partnership with other organisations and importantly with our residents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> stimulate regeneration in North Kensington through the provision of better transport, better housing and better facilities; enhance the reputation of our national and international destinations - Knightsbridge, Portobello Road, South Kensington, the King's Road, Kensington High Street, and Earl's Court - by supporting and encouraging retail and cultural activities and a new urban quarter as part of the Earls Court Regeneration Area in particular; uphold our residential quality of life so that we remain the best place in which to live in London, through cherishing quality in the built environment, acting on environmental issues and facilitating local living, including through strengthening local centres. <p>By 2028 regeneration in North Kensington will have resulted in significantly improved transport, with a new Crossrail station at Kensal, better links to Hammersmith and Fulham across the West London line and improved north-south bus links overcoming the generally lower levels of accessibility in the north. 2-3000 new homes will have been built, both private market and affordable, addressing the serious shortfall in housing need, and helping to diversify supply. It will be of a high quality design, well integrated into its context, overcoming some of the barriers to movement by which the North of the Borough is characterised. Better facilities will have been provided by the building of a new academy to serve the communities of North Kensington to address the serious shortage of secondary school places in the borough, helping to make life more local for residents. The deficiency in local shopping will have been addressed with two new town centres at Kensal and Latimer and the Earls Court Regeneration Area. The unique character of Portobello Road will have flourished, including the antiques and street market, adding to the vitality of the area. Jobs will be readily available as the Employment Zones will have been protected from encroaching residential and be thriving centres for small businesses and the cultural industries sector. The north of the Borough will be at the heart of environmental sustainability with the combined heat and power network extending from the hubs at the major new developments at Kensal, Latimer and Wornington Green.</p> <p>In the Borough as a whole our reputation as a national and international destination will have been further enhanced. The Borough will have avoided becoming little more than a residential suburb, with a flourishing and rich variety of retail and cultural activities adding so much to the quality of life of the residents. Our top retail destinations of Knightsbridge, King's Road, Kensington High Street and Portobello will have been maintained and enhanced. Opportunities to expand retail floorspace in Knightsbridge, King's Road, Fulham Road and South Kensington will have been taken up. Earl's Court will remain an important cultural destination, as well as providing offices, hotel, commercial, leisure and retail floorspace and around 2 2700 new dwellings at Earls Court and on surrounding sites. Exhibition Road</p>			

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>be a priority. Specific initiatives that encourage employment and training for local people in Dalgarno and Kensal East Side should also be encouraged.</p> <p>Health facilities must be included as part of any development if it is to be judged sound. They are essential rather than desirable (5.3.8).</p> <p>As an Opportunity Area, Kensal should have an Area Action Plan as the planning framework (rather than an SPG). This would give more weight to community involvement.</p>		<p>smaller Employment Zone, however, Kensal Employment Zone is unique in that the designation is split Kensal Gasworks to the west of Ladbroke Grove and a more conventional employment zone for small business uses. There area being removed from the designation is the gasworks, which has never been used for light industry, nor has the land been used for the small business which the consultee correctly identifies as making a significant contribution to local employment.</p> <p>The area de-designated falls within the Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site and should this redevelopment will provide a minimum of 1000 new jobs by 2031 which will in fact improve local employment further.</p> <p>One of the key drivers for regeneration in Kensal is centred around creating a development which is well connected to the local area, are referred to in detail in 5.3.10 and later in the vision where it clearly states that development should be "knitted into the surrounding urban fabric".</p> <p>In doing so, it is believed that estates such as Delgarno will be benefitted. It is for this reason that the Council considers that bridging the railway between Kensal Gasworks and Delgarno</p> <p>Health facilities have been regarded as desirable following consultation with NHS Kensington and Chelsea into their infrastructure needs in light of development of the size of Kensal Gasworks.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has considered using the AAP instead of an SPD, the timescales involved in the Kensal redevelopment would be unsuitable for an SPD as government guidance suggests they should have no more than a five year lifespan.</p>	
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		CV 5	Vision for Kensal in 2028		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS210	<p>London Plan Policy cross ref. 3C11 3C12 Draft London Plan: 6.3 6.4</p> <p>Has this matter been raised previously? yes, Draft Core Strategy</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.7 specifies that a new Crossrail station at Kensal is the council's ambition for the Kensal Gasworks sites although it acknowledges that no Crossrail station is included at Kensal in the Crossrail Act. Crossrail is currently in discussion with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea over a potential station at Kensal. However there is no provision for this station in the current Crossrail scheme, no commitment has been made and Crossrail is still investigating the viability of a station in this location.</p>		<p>The GLA's comment is duly noted, However, the Council believes that a Crossrail Station in Kensal is the best possible means of stimulating wide-scale regeneration in North Kensington and indeed, in neighbouring boroughs. As the GLA is aware, the Mayor has been quite clear in his position that if various hurdles can be overcome (namely that the Crossrail is delivered on time, on budget and without degrading the proposed service), that a station could become a reality. The Council believes that all of these can be overcome and it is for this reason that the Council considers the plan to be more than just a mere aspiration.</p> <p>The delivery of a turnback in Paddington New Yard is already in Crossrail timetable of work and has accordingly will have a funding stream. The Council has been informed that this work is not due to take place in the immediate future which would compromise the viability of relocating the turnback in Kensal.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that additional costs will arise</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>relating to track layout but believes this can be funded through contributions.</p> <p>The use of a turnback would mean that the service would not interfere with the current proposed timetable of the Maidenhead to Shenfield Crossrail trains, as the station at Kensal would extend the central London "shuttle" service west beyond Paddington to where the trains could still adequately be readied to return east whilst still allowing an ingress of passengers. This model is familiar to TfL and is utilised at the end of many Underground and DLR routes.</p> <p>The Council is of the opinion that Crossrail drives forward the Core Vision of the Core Strategy, however contingencies have been prepared in Chapter 39 which the prospect of Crossrail not coming forward have been included to demonstrate that the aims of the Core Vision and indeed the Core Strategy as a whole can still be delivered without Crossrail. As these options are very much "Plan Bs" we have not directly referred to them in the main body of the text for Kensal and Kensal Gasworks Strategic Site as the Council has endeavoured to provide the Inspector with an understandable and transparent set of objectives and positioning its contingencies in a separate chapter where they do not detract from Core Strategy's over-arching vision.</p>	
Ms Pat Cox	London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham		CV 5	Vision for Kensal in 2028				PSubCS457	"Hammersmith and Fulham Council note the Core Strategy vision (CV 5) and priorities for actions (paras. 5.3.3/4) for a Crossrail station at Kensal and for vehicular access to the west onto Mitre Way near Scrubs Lane in LB H&F in order to improve the public transport accessibility of the site. Whilst H&F considers that Kensington and Chelsea's Proposed Submission Core Strategy is sound, it may have to be reviewed in the light of future DfT decisions on HS2 and links to Crossrail."		<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Council wishes to reiterate that stations at Old Oak Common and Kensal will be entirely separate and provide different services. Therefore a station at Old Oak Common will not affect the viability or likelihood of a station at Kensal and the Royal Borough's position on this is clear.</p>	No changes are recommended.
Ms Claire McAlister	British Waterways		CV 5	Vision for Kensal in 2028	Yes	Yes		PSubCS473	The vision should be slightly amended to include an active waterspace.		<p>Noted, Whilst the use of the canal is welcomed, the Council will not at this stage commit to an active waterspace. This would need to be assessed against the existing biodiversity of the canal.</p>	No change
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social Council		CV 6	Vision for Golborne / Trellick in 2028		No	Justified	PSubCS52	<p>6 GOLBORNE and 21 WORNINGTON GREEN</p> <p>Policy CV Vision for Golborne and Trellick in 2028</p> <p>We support the emphasis on Golborne Road market. Golborne should be a special centre in its own right along with Portobello Road and its unique architectural history and diversity should be preserved. The area should be defined by the Golborne triangle, Westway Railway and Ladbroke Grove.</p> <p>However, for the policy to be sound the core strategy must contain specific actions to ensure the sustainability of the Golborne market. The Core Strategy should refer to a vitality plan for the Golborne Area, with help for retailers and independent business through different initiatives including affordable business rates and improved signage and street lighting. There should be an L shaped market from Portobello continuing into Golborne. There is a need to brand Golborne market into 'Golborne Village' and restore and maintain the beautiful architecture of the</p>		<p>The support for CV vision is noted. The Council does not consider that the representations affect the overall soundness of the Plan, and are related to a variety of specific matters.</p> <p>The chapter already contains a list of specific thematic policies which will deliver the vision. These will be used to assess applications for development in the Golborne and Trellick area.</p> <p>Wornington Green is the subject of a separate, adopted, SPD and planning application. Additionally, other policies in the Plan - for example CH4 - deal with the matter of estate renewal, and specify that there should be no net loss of affordable units. Matters such as density are dealt with through other policies, and should not require repetition here.</p> <p>Similarly, necessary infrastructure will be provided alongside redevelopment. This will be secured through a</p>	No change proposed

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>buildings that date from the 1880s.</p> <p>Policy on Wornington Green is unsound. The return of social housing from the proposed large scale redevelopment is negligible. There is no social justification for the upheaval that will be caused by the demolition of Wornington Green estate.</p> <p>The density proposed is extremely high in an already highly populated area of K&C. We have concerns over the health impacts the proposed high density will have on the residents. A recent K&C PCT study showed there is great correlation between high density and physical/mental health.</p> <p>The proposed Wornington Green development will have a negative impact on the area's infrastructure, public transport and amenities as the capacity to cope with current demand is limited. The failure to consider voluntary sector premises as an output from the section 106 is unsound.</p> <p>To be sound there should be an increase in the amount of social housing and provision of additional voluntary sector premises and community facilities to meet the established local need. The re-located Athlone Gardens should be bigger than the current park to take account of the proposed increase in housing density on Wornington Green. Athlone Gardens should continue to be accessible to the whole Golborne community rather than just becoming a park for residents of the Estate.</p>		legal agreement which must conform with Circular 05/2005, including the principle that planning obligations may not be used to correct an existing deficiency - for example in the case of an increased size open space, or voluntary premises.	
Westway Development Trust	Westway Development Trust	Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd	CV 8	Vision for Westway in 2028	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS148	<p>Current para/drawing notation</p> <p>Notation on drawing: Redevelop Maxilla Nursery School as small school or primary health centre.</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>Not effective in terms of both its deliverability and maintaining flexibility.</p> <p>Reason: The Trust acknowledges that there is a need to redevelop/reconfigure the Maxilla Nursery School. However they are not yet in a position to confirm the nature of this redevelopment or to define more precisely the nature of the replacement use.</p> <p>For these reasons the Trust would like to see greater flexibility in relation to the definition of replacement uses.</p> <p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>Replace existing notation with the following:</p> <p>Redevelop Maxilla Nursery school for an alternative community use.</p> <p>----- ----- -----</p> <p>Current para/drawing notation</p>		<p>The existing notations are sufficient for delivering the vision as expressed. The policies within the Core Strategy will be used to determine the developments within each site as shown on the plan. However, it is recognised that additional flexibility could be allowed through the applying the vision and its associated reasoning. The information provided by the Westway Development Trust, more recently than when the wording was originally drafted, demonstrates positive change and action taken by the Trust, which is to be supported through spatial planning policy. For these reasons, some flexibility should rightly be introduced, and a number of changes are therefore suggested.</p>	<p>Amend the Plan to include reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert "or an alternative community use." after "primary health centre". • Delete "Potential for small supermarket" and replace with: "Potential for new mixed use, including retail uses" • Delete "Community centred uses" and replace with "Community/employment uses." <p>These changes, and consequential changes to the reasoned justification at paragraphs 8.3.10 and 8.3.15 will more closely align the Core Strategy with the Westway Development Trust's own plans.</p> <p>In paragraph 8.3.10, delete "a new supermarket" and insert "new active retail/employment uses".</p> <p>Delete current paragraph 8.3.15, and replace with "The Trust has gained planning permission for a school where the Maxilla Nursery is, and other community uses would also be appropriate for this site."</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Notation on drawing: Potential for supermarket</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>Not effective in terms of both its deliverability and maintaining flexibility.</p> <p>Reason: The Trust acknowledges that the current retail units in this location do not work well and that there is a need to improve access to and the security and safety of this location.</p> <p>The Trust is also of the view that, as part of a wider strategy for the land between Bramley Road and St Mark's Road that the opportunity could be taken to reconfigure the space under the Westway and as a result establish more viable building plots; greater clarity and connectivity in terms of routes and spaces; improved safety and security and an improved relationship with Maxilla Gardens.</p> <p>It is intended that the above will form a key element in the Trust's future development Strategy which will be explored as part of the process of preparing an SPD for the area. At this stage in the process, however the Trust would question the viability or indeed appropriateness of locating a supermarket in this location.</p> <p>Work undertaken by the Retail Group on behalf of the Westway Trust confirms that whilst there is capacity for a convenience store in the area that such a location away from the established retail area is likely to struggle.</p> <p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>Delete the existing notation and replace with the following:</p> <p>'Potential for new mixed use, including retail uses'.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>-----</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Current para/drawing notation</p> <p>Notation on drawing: Community centred uses notation.,</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>Not effective in terms of both its deliverability and maintaining flexibility. Reason: As stated above the Trust's plans identify a need to reconsider this area and come up with a more comprehensive strategy in relation to the future configuration and use of this area.</p> <p>Such regeneration might include the opportunity to introduce other uses in addition to 'community centred uses' and hence the Trust are of the view that the definition should be expanded to include an element of employment use.</p> <p>Such a designation would also be compatible with the existing planning consent on the site.</p> <p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>Delete existing notation and replace with</p>			

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									Community/employment uses. ----- ----- -----			
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social Council		CV 9	Vision for Latimer in 2028		No	Justified	PSubCS55	<p>9 LATIMER and 23 NORTH KENSINGTON SPORTS CENTRE</p> <p>CV 9 Vision for Latimer in 2028</p> <p>The vision is unsound because when it says "Latimer will be rebuilt" the vision ignores affordable housing provision and associated social infrastructure requirements, despite the evidence base and the policy imperative for making these the key priority.</p> <p>The vision and text refer to the large scale redevelopment of housing estates, with re-working of the traditional urban structure. There is concern over large scale redevelopment and what will happen to residents during the re-development of their homes . Regeneration must increase the amount of Social Housing for which there is huge need. The absence of a commitment to social housing makes it impossible to support this policy.</p> <p>In 9.3.12 and 9.3.13 there is support for redeveloping the Kensington Sports Centre site, so long as existing community facilities are re-provided and strengthened. The brief must give emphasis to the retention of the public swimming pool, the only one in North Kensington. The existing pool should be kept open until any new pool within the proposed leisure centre/academy development is opened. There should be a full-size swimming pool, at least as large as and preferably bigger than the current one.</p> <p>The new school is supported but should be a co-educational state secondary school. The school should provide adult education, with pre-employment training for local residents a priority. It should be considered as an option for the Kensington Sports Centre site, possibly amalgamated with the sports centre.</p> <p>The vision proposes a new shopping centre at Latimer Road station. This is unsound as it will not meet the day to day needs of the residents of the area.</p> <p>Assessments of each of the local centres, several of which are struggling, should be included to provide a sound evidence base. In these local centres there is a lack of local shopping, specifically food shops, shops providing multi-cultural food and shops where you can purchase fresh fruit.</p> <p>The policy we want to support is the provision of local shops throughout the area, which is more important than one large new retail centre at Latimer Road station. There should be priority given to affordable rents and low rate units for shops meeting</p>		<p><i>Need to provide affordable housing and associated social infrastructure:</i> The vision refers to the rebuilding of parts of the Latimer area, it does not consider the nature of the tenure. This is the nature of a vision, it sets out the Council's (and wider stakeholders) ambition for an area, but does not include fine detail. The 'Diversity of Housing' section of the Core Strategy' sets out the Councils requirement with regard estate renewal with Policy CH4 stating that a maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing be provided, with a prerequisite being that being that there must be no net loss of existing social rented housing.</p> <p>Similarly the social infrastructure requirements for new developments are set out elsewhere in the section and elsewhere within the Core Strategy. In particular Chapter 29 considers in some detail the infrastructure requirements of new development.</p> <p><i>Residents during redevelopment:</i> The detail plans for the re-housing of residents (should this be necessary) does not form part of a Core Strategy. It would be premature to include at this stage given the there is still considerable work to be carried out before the Council decides whether estate renewal will occur and the scale and nature of this renewal.</p> <p><i>Kensington Sports Centre site.</i> The Council is committed to providing a swimming pool on the wider site. This forms part of the allocation for the sports centre as set out in Policy CA4 of the Core Strategy. This swimming pool will be available for use by the public.</p> <p><i>New school:</i> The Council is satisfied that a new Academy will best suite the education needs of the Borough's residents.</p> <p><i>New shopping centre:</i> The Council is unsure why the consultee is concerned why a new neighbourhood centre at the Latimer Road Station will not meet the day to day needs of resident of the area. No further information has been provided. Serving of residents is the raison d'etre of the proposed neighbourhood centre. This is explicitly set out in para 9.3.11 of the chapter.</p> <p>The Council's Retail Needs Assessment does indicate that there is a need for an additional 3,600 sq of</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>local needs.</p> <p>To be sound, the vision should refer to improved transport and community safety which are significant issues in Latimer. The evidence and options for this are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport must improve with better bus links between east and west, and to the hospital, and pedestrian and cycle access to Westfield shopping centre • The development of an over-ground station on North Pole Road should be evaluated as an option. There should be underground parking facilities available • Community safety must be evaluated e.g. there is a lack of lighting around Latimer Road tube station and across the Westway. <p>In 9.3.5 a planning framework and master-plan for the Latimer area are proposed. We support these, so long as residents are extensively involved in shaping them.</p> <p>To make the vision sustainable and sound any section 106 funds from estate renewal must be ring-fenced for investment in social housing and local amenities in Latimer.</p>		<p>comparison floorspace between 2008 and 2015 across the Borough. The Council has also noted that the Latimer area is currently in an "area of deficiency" in that it does not lie within a five minute walk of designated centre. Whilst isolated shops and small parades do play a role in serving the day-to-day needs of local residents these needs are often better served by concentrations of shops within a neighbourhood centre than single isolated shops. Collections of shops 'feed of' the footfall created.</p> <p><i>Transport and community</i></p> <p>The vision concentrates on the 'big ambition' for the area. This does not mean that other issues, such as transport and community safety are not significant. The importance of improving transport links in the area is set out within the Better Travel Choices section of the chapter, and on a borough wide basis within better travel choices. The Council recognises the need to improve better bus links as well as pedestrian links with Hammersmith and Fulham over the West London Line.</p> <p>Community safety is an integral part of 'good design', and a key criteria in the Engaging Public Realm chapter of the Core Strategy (Policy CR1(f))</p>	
Westway Development Trust	Westway Development Trust	Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd	CV 9	Vision for Latimer in 2028	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS162	<p>Current para/drawing notation</p> <p>Employment designation on land associated with Stable Way.</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>Not effective in terms of both its deliverability and maintaining flexibility.</p> <p>Reason: The industrial uses that comprise the Stable Way employment site are currently isolated from the remainder of the employment zone situated to the south (Freston Road/Latimer) and suffers from problems of poor access and security.</p> <p>The Trust propose to provide new employment floorspace in more prominent and accessible locations to the west of St Mark's Road and to the east of Portobello Road (see 'Emerging Spatial Strategy' enclosed with these representations).</p> <p>In view of this situation the Trust would request for the notation on the plan to be removed in order to provide the flexibility to enable relocation of the existing uses and their replacement with sports related uses.</p> <p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>Remove the employment notation from the plan.</p>		<p>The Stable Way area lies within the Freston Road Employment Zone. Whilst small in area the Borough's Employment Zones retain locally important concentrations of business uses. The Freston Road Employment Zone is unusual in that it still contains a concentration of light industrial uses. The London Plan supports LPAs protecting locally important concentrations of employment uses (Policy 3b.4 Industrial Locations) and therefore the Council is not looking to de-designate, and therefore weaken, this Employment Zone. Similarly part (h) of Policy EC2 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth) of PPS4 notes at "at the local level", LPA should "where necessary" safeguard land from other uses."</p> <p>The Council's Employment Land and Premises Study states that the need for additional floorspace in the future is such that the all existing business uses should remain (subject to some caveats). There is, therefore, no evidence to suggest that the employment uses within the Freston Road Employment Zone will not be needed in the longer term.</p> <p>The Core Strategy offers flexibility with regard the provision of new employment floorspace, and therefore will assess the provision of such uses 'to the west of St Mark's Road and to the east of Portobello Road' as and when any proposals are submitted. These uses would however expected to be in addition to retaining existing uses.</p>	No change.
Mr Peter Martindale			CV 9	Vision for Latimer in 2028				PSubCS454	<p>We, the undersigned, express our concern at the proposals put forward by the Latimer Area Feasibility Study of the Housing Stock Options Review.</p> <p>The stock is relatively new having been built in the 1960s and 70s,</p>		<p>The Council greatly values the views and opinions of its residents, and has undertaken extensive consultation to draw up a Core Strategy which we believe develops a positive vision of the Borough for the next twenty years. Part of this consultation has been specifically targeted at</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>and yet now, just as a cohesive community feel is developing, the Council's consultations are proposing to destroy the very community that residents have built. We strongly disagree with proposals for re-development: we like our homes and resent that opinions on how the estates might be improved have been twisted to justify "estate regeneration" - the euphemism for demolition.</p> <p>We do not agree with the proposals to disrupt the relative tranquillity of the estates and our green spaces by creating more "activity" with shopping centres, concreted public spaces, and linking thoroughfares, nor to increasing levels of crime that would result from re-creating links to troublesome estates around White City. If the council is to meet its targets to provide more housing, then the notated photograph, showing new schools and extended leisure centre and a new park, is dis-honest and unachievable, included purely to dupe residents into agreeing something otherwise unpalatable. Furthermore, such mass demolition is environmental nonsense.</p> <p>We request that RBKC take a more sober approach to its review and do not propose to disrupt these communities with destruction, upheaval, and demolition.</p>		<p>residents in the Latimer area and a number of meetings were held at the London Lighthouse where the views of local people were canvassed.</p> <p>A wide range of opinions were received through our consultation events and throughout the development of the various iterations of the Core Strategy. Two things have, however, become increasingly clear. First, the Latimer area contains a vibrant community who care passionately about the future of the area. Second, despite its strengths, there is the potential to make the Latimer area a better place to live for its existing and future residents. We were told that the area lacks connections to the wider area, feels isolated and, to many residents, therefore unsafe; the street form is confusing and truncated; and the state of repair of some of the housing estates is poor. The Council has also identified the Latimer area as one of the few parts of the Borough which is 'deficient' in local shopping facilities, much of it being more than a 5 minute walk from an existing neighbourhood or higher order centre.</p> <p>The Council's emerging Core Strategy recognises that there is now an opportunity to deliver improvements to the Latimer area, which in some cases, have been long overdue. The Council's long term vision for the area is set out in the Latimer 'Place' of the Core Strategy. This includes the reintroduction the traditional urban street pattern to build a better quality environment; to provide accessible and adaptable spaces that are valued and used by the local people; to promote a new neighbourhood shopping centre based around the Latimer Road London Underground Station; and to provide a community sports centre and new educational academy in the area. The Council does, however, recognise that difficult decisions will have to be made and that some renewal of the existing estates may be necessary if they are to have a long term and viable future. Whilst these decisions have yet to be made, the Council cannot evade its responsibility to its residents if a more prosperous and sustainable future for the Latimer area is to be achieved.</p> <p>Based on the Latimer 'Place' within the Core Strategy, the Council's long term ambitions for the area will be further developed through an Area Action Plan. Whilst the time scale for the production of this document has yet to be agreed, work is likely to start later this year. It will take three years to prepare. You are encouraged to get actively involved in the process, and to influence the final content of the Action Plan.</p> <p>If you, or any other signatories, would like to be kept up-to-date on the progress of the Latimer Area Action Plan and on the preparation of other planning documents please write to the above address, telephone 020 7361 3879 or email the planning department at planningpolicy@rbkc.gov.uk.</p> <p>Further information relating to the Council's emerging Core Strategy can be found at www.rbkc.gov.uk and by following the links to Planning and Conservation and then to Planning Policy. The Latimer Area is specifically considered in Chapter 9 of the Core Strategy. The reference to the Council's intention to produce an Area Action Plan for the Latimer Area also falls within this</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>chapter.</p> <p>The Latimer Area Feasibility study is quite separate from the Council's Core Strategy. Its remit has been to test the potential for differing types of development within the Latimer area. Whilst the study is not Council policy (and therefore has no 'weight' in planning) it has informed our thinking.</p> <p>Again, to re-iterate, there are no current plans for any large scale demolition and renewal within the Latimer area.</p> <p>Turning to your detailed concerns as set out in the petition:</p> <p><i>"The Council's consultants are proposing to destroy the very community that residents have built. We strongly disagree with the proposals for redevelopment .. and estate regeneration - the euphemism for demolition"</i></p> <p>As outlined above, the Consultants considered a wide range of possible future options for the Latimer area and some future scenarios, if pursued, would require an element of demolition to give effect to improvements. However, the Council has no current plans to pursue any regeneration in the Latimer area, other than on the Silchester Garage site and, at a later date, the provision of the new Academy on the wider North Kensington Sports Centre Site.</p> <p>The proposals for the Silchester Garage Site are connected to the outline planning permission already granted for this site. This permission includes the re-provision of the existing Latimer Family Centre and of at least 63 affordable housing units, associated with the pre-existing planning obligation from the Holland Park School development. The Council will continue to pursue this commitment, but does recognise that there is an opportunity to redesign the proposal to ensure that it gives more benefits to the wider area. It is, therefore, currently preparing a Planning Brief on the site to set out the appropriate uses and design principles which the Council should be adopting. This document is likely to be put out to a formal stage of public consultation in the summer.</p> <p>The Council is currently working with residents of the Silchester Estate to ensure that residents are fully engaged in, and contribute to, the successful delivery of this scheme for the benefit of the local community. This may include some element of demolition in the vicinity of the development, but the need for and degree of this will be subject to consultation with the residents on that estate.</p> <p>As outlined above, the Council's long term vision for the area may include some renewal of the existing estates in the Latimer area, and this could potentially entail a degree of demolition. The potential will be explored in more detail as the forthcoming Latimer Area Action Plan is developed. Residents will be involved throughout the evolution of this plan, right from its inception, through to its final testing at an independent examination.</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>The Council is proud of the flourishing communities which make up the Latimer area, and recognises that any changes to the area must support, not harm, the community cohesion so vital for a successful neighbourhood.</p> <p><i>We no longer have faith in the Tenant Management Organisation</i></p> <p>Both the Council and the TMO accept that there were problems with the TMO in some aspects of its service and performance. However, following the appointment of a new Chief Executive, Robert Black, and new executive officers, the TMO is committed to an improvement agenda and addressing past problems. A number of improvements have already been secured but this is only a first step and the TMO will continue to deliver a range of changes to the benefit of residents, overseen by the Council as Landlord. The Council hopes that you will give the TMO the opportunity to demonstrate the benefits from its recent changes.</p> <p><i>We are concerned that the EMB for Lancaster West is not mentioned in the review consultative leaflets</i></p> <p>The Council recognises the role of the EMB for Lancaster West. The reason why it is not mentioned in this particular literature is because both the Housing Stock Options review and the Feasibility Study were undertaken by the Council in its capacity as Landlord. The work had to be carried out in response to a particular problem which the Council, as a Landlord, was faced with a serious financial challenge in providing housing services due to changes in Government funding. Current legislation means that it is unlawful for the Council to use any of its other sources of money to pay towards housing investment and housing services. It is also unlawful for the Council to set a 'deficit' (overdrawn) budget for its housing finance account, so that is why the Council had to act to try and find the solution to this complex problem.</p> <p>The TMO was also not involved in managing these pieces of work.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the area where the Council now plans to initiate development work is not part of the Lancaster West EMB managed estate.</p> <p><i>We are alarmed at the information that the sports centre and/or Grenfell Tower might be lost to make way for new schools; we need more sports facilities; the site is too small for a secondary school; noise to surrounding homes would be unacceptable.</i></p> <p>Currently half the Borough's state educated children of secondary school age have to travel outside of the Borough for an education. The Council is, therefore, committed to providing a new school (an Academy) in the north of the Borough to meet local demand, better respond to residents' needs by providing greater choice, diversity and fair access for local parents and the local community.</p> <p>It is, therefore, examining the options to establish a new</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>Academy with up to six forms of entry (equivalent to 900 eleven to sixteen year old places) and up to 250 post sixteen places in North Kensington. The Council will carefully consider its options and any proposal would need to meet all its criteria, which would include both the provision of equivalent sports facilities (including a swimming pool) either on the site or in the vicinity and the need to respect the amenity of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The site identified for the new Academy is the North Kensington Sports Centre site. This would be on the area of football pitches and parking to the west of the sports centre, but this excludes Grenfell Tower. As a result of feasibility work carried out, the Council believes that this site is of a size and nature suitable for the Academy. However, the Council is still considering its options and no decision has as yet been made.</p> <p>Residents will be able to make their views known if/when an application was to be made. Residential amenity and the nature of facilities provided are both material planning matters to be considered when determining an application.</p> <p><i>The Eurostar site ... is more suitable for a school and there thirty of forty acres of sports and playing fields could be provided for the schools.</i></p> <p>The Academy needs to be constructed by 2018 if the Council is to benefit from central Government's 'Building Schools for the Future' capital programme. The Eurostar site is not owned by the Council, and therefore, its use for a school is simply not a feasible option. Delay would both jeopardise the necessary funding and ensure that large numbers of pupils have to continue to travel outside of the borough for schooling.</p> <p><i>We do not agree with the proposals to disrupt the relative tranquillity of the estates ..by creating more 'activity'.</i></p> <p>The opening up of the Latimer Area and the creation of a new neighbourhood shopping centre based on the Latimer Underground Station forms part of the Council's emerging Core Strategy. The final consultation on the Core Strategy has recently finished, and I have therefore taken the comments on this subject, endorsed in the petition, to be a formal objection to the Core Strategy. Your objections will be reported to the Independent Planning Inspector to be taken into account when the 'soundness' of the plan is assessed.</p> <p>The Latimer Area Action Plan will explore these matters in more detail, and residents will be given a number of opportunities to discuss their concerns with us and to help influence the final nature of the plan.</p> <p><i>The provision of a new school and extended leisure centre and a new park is dis-honest and unachievable, included to dupe residents into agreeing something otherwise unpalatable.</i></p> <p>The Council strongly believes in transparency and honesty in its dialogues and would seek to reassure</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											residents that it would not present any proposals which it believed to be unachievable. For this very reason the Council will produce an Area Action Plan for the Latimer Area which will explore many of these issues in more detail. This AAP will be subject of independent examination by a government planning inspector. It is also worth reiterating that the diagram within the Latimer Feasibility Study, which shows the park, and enhanced centre etc is, as set out in the document, a 'concept diagram'. Its purpose is not to set out what actual uses will be proposed in given locations, rather it shows what sort of uses could be provided in the area.	
Nottingdale Ltd	Nottingdale Ltd	London Planning Practice LLP	CV 9	Vision for Latimer in 2028		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS490	<p>CV9 -Vision</p> <p>Nottingdale Ltd support the Vision for the Latimer area. The Nottingdale Village development in the Freston Road Employment Zone (EZ) have provided significant regeneration and a radical improvement in the architectural quality of the area. Larger scale development addresses the west cross route and the later phases of development provide for the repair and re-establishment of a more traditional road network behind this in accordance and in advance of the 'Vision'. In terms of architectural quality, this is evidenced by the Yellow building which was shortlisted for the prestigious World Architecture Festival awards in the Office category and for an RIBA award. New development in the area should build on this success.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.3.15 recognises that the Nottingdale Village (NDV) development has changed the nature of the area and that the development provides a greater stimulus for local shopping. The development completed and approved to date therefore represents a positive element that will help to underpin the delivery of the new Latimer Town Centre.</p>		<p>Support for the Vision for the Latimer Area is noted</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Para 9.3.15</p> <p>The Proposed Submission Core Strategy recognises that the newly built headquarters office buildings in the Freston Road provide a stimulus for local shopping, and as such will help support the provision of a new neighbourhood centre in the vicinity. The suggested addition to para 9.3.15 is, therefore, considered unnecessary.</p>	No change
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social Council		CV 10	Vision for Earl's Court in 2028		No	Justified	PSubCS57	<p>10 and 26 EARLS COURT</p> <p>CV10 Vision for Earls Court in 2028</p> <p>The policy on Earls Court is unsound as no consideration has been given to the sustainability of the local residential community. There is no evidence base about the needs of the local residential community and how these needs have been responded to. These needs are set out below and were presented to the Local Authority at an earlier stage of the Plan:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All new developments at Earls Court should provide affordable housing, community facilities, and a youth sports centre which is affordable to use We need a community centre where people can meet and socialise. There are no community meeting spaces at present in Earls Court We need a swimming pool and after school clubs. There aren't any in the immediate area of Hammersmith & Fulham. The nearest is Chelsea, which is too far There are no places of worship for BME communities. For example, the nearest Mosque is far away and the nearest Ethiopian Church is in Battersea. The Council needs to provide prayer space and should join with Hammersmith & Fulham to carry out an assessment and make a wider case for premises for places of worship There is a need for a joint shopping & cultural area as at Queensway 		<p>Many of the land uses suggested, including affordable housing, community facilities, office provision, shopping and cultural facilities, are already set out in the requirements for the strategic site, which has been revised to include other land uses requires to deliver a sustainable and balanced mixed-use development</p> <p>The detailed provision of community facilities, such as swimming facilities, other sports facilities, places of worship and nurseries, will be considered as part of the infrastructure requirements identified through the planning brief.</p> <p>The Council is expecting a planning application in the beginning of 2011 and the time needed for an AAP will result in this being adopted too late to be considered as part of the planning application. The Council will continue extensive consultation with the local community through the preparation of the planning brief and in determining the planning application.</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
828 Pte Ltd	828 Pte Ltd	DP9	CV 11	Vision for Kensington High Street in 2028				PSubCS78	<p>This chapter of the document sets out the "Vision for Kensington High Street in 2028" under</p> <p>Policy CVII. The vision outlines that the centre will continue its tradition of serving residents,</p> <p>workers and visitors through a range of food and convenience retailing and a destination for</p> <p>fashion and niche markets.</p> <p>The 'vision' however, does not make reference to the potential of the centre to provide leisure</p> <p>type uses, as set out in PPS6 which will add to the vitality of the centre in serving residents and</p> <p>visitors alike. Accordingly, our clients consider that Policy CVII should include references to</p> <p>the full range of appropriate town centre uses, including leisure uses within Kensington High</p> <p>Street.</p> <p>Our clients note that Kensington High Street Underground Station is identified in the 'Key Issues</p> <p>and Potential Opportunities' plan as a 'potential development opportunity.' Our clients welcome</p> <p>the recognition in the document that the station has the potential for redevelopment for a mix of</p> <p>uses including retail on the ground floor level with town centre uses on the upper floors of the</p> <p>existing arcade.</p>		The vision does not make specific reference to leisure use types but this would not preclude more entertainment use as set out in PPS4.	No change required.
Hon. Secretary Carol Seymour-Newton	Knightsbridge Association		CV 12	Vision for South Kensington in 2028		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS224	<p>Chapter 12 South Kensington</p> <p>The chapter as drafted will not be effective in that the Vision CV12 (para 12.2), the Priorities for Action (para 12.3.12), the Policy CP11 and the monitoring section (para 12.4.7) fail to reflect the balance of priorities contained in the Vision for the Core Strategy as a whole (CV1).</p> <p>This is because, although the chapter recognizes the presence and importance of residential accommodation (in e.g. paras 12.1.3, 12.1.5), it presents the decisions and actions to be taken in the period as matters concerning either the Museums or the shopping centre clustered around South Kensington station. In fact if the Core Strategy is to be delivered in this area it will be as much about protecting and enhancing residential use, buildings and amenity. An example of the need to reinforce this third, residential element in the chapter is seen at para 12.3.8 where the Thurloe Street/Thurloe Place block is considered purely in terms of its ground floor uses. In fact much of the residential accommodation above is empty and an equally important action will be to secure the long-term residential future of this block.</p>		Residential amenity is a borough-wide issue that is covered by Policy CL5 in the Renewing the Legacy chapter. The example quoted as evidence of a need to further protect and enhance residential use, buildings and amenity is considered unnecessarily prescriptive.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Chapter 12 requires redrafting in a variety of places to reflect the importance that the Core Strategy places upon the residential function of the Royal Borough. For example we recommend that the policy (CP11) is redrafted as follows (additions in italics):</p> <p>'The Council will ensure the continued success of South Kensington as a premier public cultural destination, as a local shopping centre <i>and residential area</i>, by securing good quality public open spaces and significantly improving accessibility for the very large number of visitors the area receives, supporting proposals to uplift the quality of the retail offer, especially proposals likely to favour local and niche markets, <i>and by consolidating the residential element while enhancing its amenities.</i>'</p>			
Mr Brian Harvey	Royal Marsden Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	The Barton Willmore Planning Partnership	CV 13	Vision for Brompton Cross in 2028		Yes		PSubCS20		We support the recognition in Policy CV13 of the need for the Royal Marsden Hospital to maintain and improve its health care and medical facilities to remain at the forefront of its field. We conclude that the policy is justified and deliverable.	Support to the soundness of the Core Strategy. No further action required.	Support to the soundness of the Core Strategy. No further action required.
London Fire Brigade	London Fire Brigade	Drivers Jonas	CV 14	Vision for Knightsbridge in 2028	Yes	Yes		PSubCS320	<p>MAP 14</p> <p>THE LFB SUBMITTED REPRESENTATIONS TO THE PREVIOUS ROUNDS OF CONSULTATION AND CONTINUE THEIR SUPPORT FOR MAP 14, IN SO MUCH AS IT IDENTIFIES THE EXISTING FIRE STATION TO BE PART OF AN AREA THAT WOULD BE SUITABLE FOR IMPROVED RETAIL PROVISION. THE LFB WOULD WELCOME THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLORE THE OPTIONS FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE EXISTING FIRE STATION SITE TO MEET THIS VISIONFORTHHEAREA. THELFBWOULDALSOWELCOMETHEOPPORTUNITYTODISCUSSUITABLESITES FOR THE LOCATION OF THE NEW FIRE STATION IN ORDER TO MAKE SURE THE EXISTING SITE IS DELIVERABLE AND VIABLE.</p>		Support for soundness.	No further action required.
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturge on behalf of Metro Shopping Fund LP	CV 16	Vision for Notting Hill Gate in 2028		No	Justified	PSubCS6	<p>The Metro Shopping Fund objects to the final sentence of the first paragraph, which states that the centre will continue to be a major office location. This statement is not founded on robust evidence and it is a matter of fact that Notting Hill Gate is not a major office location.</p> <p>The Council's Employment Land Study identifies much of the office space within the Borough being concentrated in and around Kensington High Street and further south. Notting Hill Gate is not identified as a major office location within the Borough. That is because there are very few buildings in office use and indeed most office space is contained within just one building; namely Newcombe House, where the space is poor quality and has persistently been difficult to let and keep occupied. Furthermore, Newcombe House is identified by the Council as an "eye sore", which it would ideally like to be redeveloped.</p> <p>The Employment Land Studies will be before the Inspector, however, it should be noted that Roger Tym & Partners rightly draw attention to the GLA's London Office Policy Review that concludes that at any one time, outstanding planning permissions should equal at least 3.5 years supply. The updated research by Roger Tym finds that there is already an eight year supply of</p>		<p>Notting Hill Gate is considered a major office location due to the good public transport accessibility level and the large amount of flexible office accommodation in Newcombe House, which offers large and small floor plates.</p> <p>The Council recognises that the outstanding permissions for office floorspace will meet the predicted office need to 2017. Assuming all this floorspace is built out, a further 23,000 sq m will have to be provided within the plan period. Whilst the Council has allocated 20,000 of this floorspace, and does expect other windfall schemes to provide the remainder, these figures are reliant on the retention of the existing office floorspace. The loss of any existing floorspace will means that additional floorspace must found from additional windfalls over the plan period. This is by no means certain as there is a finite number of sites available within the Borough, and each will be subject to competition from a number of competing uses. Given the policy presumption in favour of new residential development, and the 'higher value of housing' there is no guarantee that significant additional windfall office sites will come through.</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>planning permissions.</p> <p>The revised analysis by Roger Tym published in September 2009 suggests that over the plan period to 2026, a total net addition of 69,000 m² of offices will be required. A net addition of 46,000 m² is already under construction or has planning permission, which is sufficient to meet office demand until 2017. This supply does not include allocations. Previously analysis undertaken by Roger Tym found that seven allocated sites within the Borough offered the potential for a net addition of a further 30,000 m², bringing the total supply to some 76,000 m², which is considerably more than the 69,000 m² required for the whole of the plan period to 2026. In addition, unallocated sites are likely to continue to come forward for office development. A good recent example of this is the Yellow Building off Freston Road, which provided 26,000 m².</p> <p>Furthermore, the Employment Land Study does not take into account the enormous amount of office development that is being promoted at Earls Court. The draft Core Strategy already suggests that 10,000 m² of offices would be acceptable and the plans are for several times this.</p> <p>As such, it would be appropriate for the Core Strategy to allow some flexibility in the future planning of poor quality existing office space in locations where demand is weak, so that such space would be better able to meet the Borough's other competing needs.</p> <p>The deletion of the last sentence in the first paragraph of CV16 would enable this element of the Core Strategy to be found sound.</p>		<p>It is, therefore, important that existing office floorspace is protected. This approach is supported by the Employment Land Review Update which does note in para 6.4 that "if forecast demand for offices ...are to be met, the Council needs to control losses of office sites to other uses".</p> <p>Furthermore para 6.9 is explicit in noting that "...demand can only be met if no existing sites are lost (without being replaced).</p> <p>The Employment Land Study does not take into account the office development being postulated at Earls' Court. It cannot given that this space has yet to have been permitted, or allocated by Hammersmith and Fulham Council (the majority of the site and employment floorspace lying in this borough.) The Core Strategy allocates 10,000 sq m of office space within this Borough, although I note that the owners for this site are seeking in their representations to get this figure reduced. The Council will update the ELPS on a regular basis to take changing predictions/ increases in supply into account.</p> <p>One of the purposes of the Core Strategy is to look across the lifetime of the plan, and to have the policies necessary to ensure that the employment needs of the Borough are met. A long term view is taken. The Council should not plan for the recession, but right up to 2026. If uses are lost as may not be 'needed' in the short term, there is very little chance that the original uses will be regained. Indeed in the case of housing, there will be a policy presumption against the loss of housing to other uses.</p> <p>However, the Council does recognise that viability is a material consideration, and the Council will have to take into account any evidence which shows that a given premises is not viable/suitable in the longer term.</p> <p>The Core Strategy recognises that the Council contains locally import concentrations of offices in the wards around Kensington High Street and South Kensington. There are also concentrations within the other higher order centres. The Council wishes to protect all offices in all areas where they exist, whether there is a particular concentration or not. The only exception being for large and medium offices (outside of Employment Zones) where there are not located in accessible areas. Notting Hill Gate is a district centre and an areas classified within the TfL PTAL map as having "excellent access to public transport". As such it is considered to be a suitable location for offices. Offices are a 'town centre use' which benefit from high accessibility, both in terms of their desirability, and in terms of trip generation.</p> <p>There is no contradiction with the Council's desire to protect small offices across the Borough. Large firms may provide the majority of B1 jobs within the Borough, but this does not mean that the majority of B1 premises cannot be small in scale. The 2007 ELPS estimates that only 11 % of units across the Borough have a floor area greater than 300 sq m. This illustrates the importance of protecting both large and small B1premises across the Borough.</p>	
Ms			CV 17	Vision for		No	Justified	PSubCS449	2.3.2 The Fulham Road (West) map in Chapter 17 shows an		The symbol representing opportunities for quiet	No changes to the Core Strategy are

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Bobbie Vincent Emery				Fulham Road in 2028					improved <i>pedestrian</i> route through and south of Brompton Cemetery annotated as a 'pedestrian & cycle link from cemetery to Thames '. This is not consistent with the adjacent area map of Lots Road and World's End in Chapter 18 which shows only pedestrian routes to and along the Thames, and no cycle routes. However, 'the number of new pedestrian and cycle links established in and to Brompton Cemetery' is an output indicator for the purposes of monitoring Chapter 17. Further, the Vision statement, CV 17, says that "Pedestrian and Cycle routes to the north and south will be improved." The related map shows a 'North-South cycle link' across Fulham Road although what it links to is unclear.		recreation and pedestrian and cycle link from cemetery to Thames, a green dotted line, is consistent in both maps. The map in Chapter 18 does not include any descriptive text as it is already included in the map in Chapter 17. However, in paragraph 18.3.11 (Chapter 18), it is stated that the Council will support enhanced pedestrian, cyclist and bus links in the area. The North-South cycle link across Fulham Road plotted on the map in Chapter 17 connects Fulham Road to the rest of the Borough.	recommended.
Mr Matthew Brown	Environment Agency		CV 18	Vision for Lots Road/World's End in 2028				PSubCS112	<p>Policy no: CV 18 Lots Road / World's End in 2028</p> <p>Page no: Page 122</p> <p>Paragraph:</p> <p>Why it is legally compliant or Sound?</p> <p>We consider this policy legally compliant and sound but would have preferred to have seen a greater emphasis on the Flood Risk associated with development this close to the River Thames. It is noted that the Thames Path has been taken into consideration along with ecological enhancements to Chelsea Creek.</p> <p>Paragraph 18.3.12 states "However, any development in this areas should consider the potential flood risk from the River Thames"</p> <p>This allocation largely complies with National and Regional policies (PPG1, PPG 9, PPG23, PPG25 and the London Plan.)</p>		These comments are noted by the Council. Consideration of flood risk in development is stated in paragraph 18.3.12 and therefore no further mention in the vision is needed.	No change proposed
Circadian Ltd	Circadian Ltd	DP9	CV 18	Vision for Lots Road/World's End in 2028		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS276	<p>Chapter 18 Lots Road /World's End</p> <p>Policy CV18 advises that improvements to the built and natural environment will transform the area into a place people choose to visit, which is an important part of investigating the potential of designating a conservation area in the Lots Road area. Paragraph 18.3.2 advises that there is a need to preserve and maintain the existing built environment by assessing the case for the industrial character of the Lots Road area to be made a conservation area.</p> <p>The rationale for potentially designating a conservation area in the Lots Road area is not fully explained in the Core Strategy. The existing industrial character of the area, which is subject to change through the implementation of development proposals, is not in itself a reason to consider a designation of a conservation area.</p> <p>As such, the Core Strategy is not considered to be Sound, as the methodology for designating a Conservation Area does not follow the guidance in PPG15.</p>		The vision for this place includes "investigating" the importance of the area and designating it a conservation area. Comprehensive research into the need and feasibility of designating a new conservation area would need to be undertaken and would include public consultation.	No change proposed
Ms Bobbie Vincent Emery			CV 18	Vision for Lots Road/World's End in 2028		No	Justified	PSubCS447	<p>A North-South cycle path</p> <p>1.1 The chain of development down the western edge of the Borough</p>		The following comments have originated from Chapter 32 Better Travel Choices - CT1f requires improvements to the walking and cycling environment, whilst CT1g requires development to	No change proposed

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>from the towpath on the grand union canal in Kensal, to Lots Road and the Thames Path in the south , provide a magnificent planning opportunity for a north/south safe cycle route.</p> <p>1.2 The three major development areas of Kensal, Warwick Road and Earls Court, with the redesign of the Latimer streets and the proposed pedestrian/cycle route south from Brompton Cemetery to the Thames, make such an idea more than feasible. Between the development sites there is railway land, the quiet roads of the St Quentin estate, and Hansard Mews and an existing contra-flow cycle route up Elsham Road in Holland Ward.</p> <p>1.3 The pupils of the two new Academies located on or near this route in Latimer and the Lots Road area would benefit from a north/south safe route. Boroughs to the centre of London, are likely to be west -east routes, and will not greatly assist cyclists travelling north or south <i>within</i> the Borough. East -west routes would however help through-cyclists. They would also contribute to the reduction of particulates, and improve air quality by encouraging non-resident through-travellers out of their cars and on to bikes.</p> <p>1.4.2 The only west-east continuous cycle path proposed is Westway (Chapter 8). There are no proposals for west-east routes between Westway and the Thames . Improved pedestrian links are addressed in most places and strategic sites, but not cycle links. An example is Notting Hill Gate (Chapter 16), a key location on an important east-west route. The Core Strategy proposes narrowed vehicle lanes and widened pavements for pedestrians, but no cycle path. A few hundred yards to the east of Notting Hill Gate are the dedicated cycle paths of Hyde Park which lead to central London, but there is no recognition of the need to connect to this major cycle route, or make cycling through Notting Hill Gate safer.</p> <p>Linked cycle routes</p> <p>2.1 Where specific cycle routes are shown on maps, they are not linked to other cycle routes . For example the South Kensington map (Ch 12) shows Imperial College Road is to be improved as a pedestrian and cycle route, but there is no vision to link it via the wide thoroughfare of Queens Gate to the cycling routes within Hyde Park. A safe north-south cycle route on the east of the Borough would greatly assist students at the many educational establishments in this area.</p> <p>2.2 Maps of 'places' and 'strategic sites' do not show the existing dedicated cycle paths, indicating that practical steps to make cycling an attractive option have been overlooked. For example the map of Kensington High Street which now has a central reservation bike park, does not show the north-south Holland Walk cycle path that connects the High Street to Ladbrooke Grove.</p> <p>2.3.1 Maps of some areas are not consistent with the text of the Core Strategy in relation to cycling. This makes the overall picture confusing, and suggests that cycle routes were initially seen as a minor planning issue. An example is the pedestrian and cycling improvements in the south of the Borough covered in Chapters 17 and 18.</p> <p>2.3.2 The Fulham Road (West) map in Chapter 17 shows an improved <i>pedestrian</i> route through and south of Brompton Cemetery annotated as a 'pedestrian & cycle link from cemetery to Thames '. This is not consistent with the adjacent area map of Lots Road and World's End in Chapter 18 which shows only</p>		<p>include measures to improve road safety for cyclists. No changes are proposed. The Council's policies on cycling in terms of street management are contained in other documents.</p> <p>Additional text has been added to 32.3.10 regarding north-south cycle routes.</p> <p>As pedestrian links and connectivity to the riverside is already mentioned in the vision, no further change is needed.</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>pedestrian routes to and along the Thames, and no cycle routes.</p> <p>However, 'the number of new pedestrian and cycle links established in and to Brompton Cemetery' is an output indicator for the purposes of monitoring Chapter 17. Further, the Vision statement, CV 17, says that "Pedestrian and Cycle routes to the north and south will be improved." The related map shows a 'North-South cycle link' across Fulham Road although what it links to is unclear</p> <p>2.3.3 The amended policy at CV 18 now includes a specific reference - to cycling and pedestrian routes over the Thames at Cremorne Bridge, But, the proposed bridge over the Chelsea Creek is pedestrian only. At 18.3.11 it says there will be pedestrian and cycling links along and across the Thames, but then a very general commitment to 'support enhanced pedestrian, cyclist and bus links in the area". So there are fragments of good intent but no coherent picture of a pattern of cycle routes .</p>			
Ms Bobbie Vincent Emery			CV 18	Vision for Lots Road/World's End in 2028		No	Justified	PSubCS450	<p>2.3.3 The amended policy at CV 18 now includes a specific reference - to cycling and pedestrian routes over the Thames at Cremorne Bridge, But, the proposed bridge over the Chelsea Creek is pedestrian only. At 18.3.11 it says there will be pedestrian and cycling links along and across the Thames, but then a very general commitment to 'support enhanced pedestrian, cyclist and bus links in the area". So there are fragments of good intent but no coherent picture of a pattern of cycle routes</p>		<p>The following comments have originated from Chapter 32 Better Travel Choices -</p> <p>CT1f requires improvements to the walking and cycling environment, whilst CT1g requires development to include measures to improve road safety for cyclists. No changes are proposed. The Council's policies on cycling in terms of street management are contained in other documents.</p> <p>Additional text has been added to 32.3.10 regarding north-south cycle routes.</p> <p>As pedestrian links and connectivity to the riverside is already mentioned in the vision, no further change is needed.</p>	No change proposed
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturge on behalf of Metro Shopping Fund LP	Policy C 1	Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS12	<p>The second half of the Policy C1 sets out the Council's position in respect of planning obligations, but is not consistent with national planning policy. There is no reference to the need for planning obligations to be directly related to the proposed development, nor for them to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development and reasonable in all other respects.</p> <p>As currently worded, Policy C1 appears to imply that the only test will be whether a development is able to deliver all requirements on the basis of viability.</p> <p>To make Policy C1 sound, the third paragraph should be amended by adding the words in bold below as follows:</p> <p>"Planning obligations will be negotiated, taking account of the proposed development and will be directly and fairly related to the development being proposed, and in ..."</p>		<p>Disagree that the policy is unsound. In order to demonstrate that the policy complies with national guidance, set out in Circular 05/2005, it is agreed that clarification could be assisted with a reference to the Circular, but without whole-sale repetition.</p>	Insert reference to Circular 05/2005.
Brookfield Developments	Brookfield Developments (UK) Ltd	DP9	Policy C 1	Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS65	<p>Policy C1</p> <p>The policy should clarify that benefits inherent to the development scheme will be taken in to account in considering appropriate mitigation measures. It is not appropriate for the draft GLA Crossrail SPD to be cited given it is not in force, is controversial and is any event a GLA matter. The proposed change as shown below is consistent with national guidance and provides clarity, in accordance with PPS12.</p> <p>29.2.4</p>		<p>Agree to reference to the Circular. As drafted, the Policy C1 and supporting text are consistent with national guidance.</p>	Insert reference to Circular 05/2005. No further changes.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Planning Obligations are intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. They might be used to prescribe the nature of a development: to secure a contribution from a developer to compensate for loss or damage created by a development; or to mitigate a development's impact. Such measures may (as appropriate and applicable to the relevant proposals) include</p> <p>Planning Obligations are intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. They might be used to prescribe the nature of a development: or to mitigate a development's impact. Such measures may (as appropriate and applicable to the relevant proposals) include provision of transportation facilities - including public transport and highway improvements to cater for the impact of the development.</p> <p>Policy C1</p> <p>Planning Obligations</p> <p>Planning obligations will be negotiated taking account of the proposed development, having regard to the benefits generated by the development and potential implications for the viability of the development project. In determining which measure receives priority, account will be taken of the individual characteristics of the site, the infrastructure needs of the site and surrounding area, and the London Plan. Proposals that form part of potentially wider sites will be assessed in terms of the capacity of the site as a whole.</p> <p>The viability of the development will also be taken into account. In the case of an enabling development, or where the development is unable to deliver all the policy requirements, or where the development is unable to deliver all the policy requirements for reasons of viability, a viability study will be required to accompany the planning applications. Contributions and related obligations and commitments will be reviewed in the context of this viability study. The viability study should use the GLA toolkit or an agreed alternative. The applicant <i>independent assessment of the viability study, or other technical studies requiring independent assessment, prior to the application being determined</i></p>			
Sun Life Assurance Plc	Sun Life Assurance Plc	DP9	Policy C 1	Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations	Yes	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS67	<p>Policy C1</p> <p>The policy should clarify that benefits inherent to the development scheme will be</p> <p>taken in to account in considering appropriate mitigation measures. It is not</p> <p>appropriate for the draft GLA Crossrail SPD to be cited given it is not in force, is</p> <p>controversial, and is any event a GLA matter. The proposed change as shown below is</p> <p>consistent with national guidance and provides clarity, in accordance with PPS12.</p> <p>29,2.4</p> <p>Planning Obligations are intended to make acceptable</p>		The Panel report into the SPG and London Plan changes has now been published, and is supportive of the approach. It is therefore entirely acceptable, and in conformity with changes to the London Plan, to refer to this within the relevant Core Strategy policy. The policy, as drafted, and its supporting text are consistent with best practice and government guidance in the relevant circular - a reference to which has been inserted at the recommendation of other representatives.	Insert reference to Circular 05/2005. No further changes.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. They might be used to prescribe the nature of a development; to secure a contribution from a developer to compensate for loss or damage created by a development; or to mitigate a development's impact.</p> <p>Such measures may (as appropriate and applicable to the relevant proposals)</p> <p>Delete [5] provision of transportation facilities including public transport and highway improvements to cater for the impact of the development,</p> <p><i>Planning Obligations</i></p> <p>Delete [and towards Gressrail wheel'[] development within the GAZ (48)]</p> <p>would require this as a and permit development]</p> <p>Planning obligations will be negotiated taking account of the proposed development, having regard to the benefits generated by the development and potential implications for the viability of the development project.</p> <p><i>In determining which measure receives priority, account will be taken of the individual characteristics of the site, the infrastructure needs of the site and the surrounding area, and the London Plan. Proposals that form part of potentially wider sites will be assessed in terms of the capacity of the site as a whole. The viability of the development will also be taken into account. In the case of an enabling development, or where the development is unable to deliver all the policy requirements for reasons of viability, a viability study will be required to accompany the planning application. s106 contributions and related obligations and commitments will be reviewed in the context of this viability study. The viability study should use the GLA toolkit or an agreed alternative. The applicant will fund the independent assessment of the viability study, or other technical studies requiring independent assessment, prior to the application being determined.</i></p>			

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		Policy C 1	Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations	Yes	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS132	<p>29.2 Infrastructure and Planning Obligations (s106), Paragraphs 29.2.1 - 29.2.4 and Policy C1 Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations.</p> <p>The recognition that "delivery of infrastructure is critical to the delivery of all the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy" is strongly supported. The inclusion of Policy C1: Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations within the Core Strategy is also supported, however Thames Water is concerned that the Policy makes no specific reference to utilities infrastructure.</p> <p>The LDF, in providing a strategy for the future development of the Royal Borough, has a key role in helping to co-ordinate new development with the requisite infrastructure. This includes the provision of adequate water resources together with the necessary treatment and distribution systems, and waste water treatment capacity and disposal routes. Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12) contains advice on the need for Local Planning Authorities, in preparation of development plan documents, to consider the requirements of utilities for land to enable them to meet demands placed upon them and the environmental effects of such additional uses.</p> <p>The LDF should provide a clear context within which the local planning authority can plan for the future. In doing so, the strategy will need to be sufficiently flexible to enable water supply and wastewater infrastructure to respond to the demand new development creates. For example, we may require a three to five year lead in time for provision of extra capacity to supply and drain new development sites, thus it should not be assumed that utility infrastructure will always be readily available.</p> <p>A utility infrastructure policy within the Core Strategy would be appropriate and should seek the phasing of new development with the appropriate utility infrastructure. This in accordance with consolidated London Plan (2008) Policy 4A.18.</p> <p>This will help to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property, or the pollution of land and watercourses. The policy should include considering land and premises utilities may require. A suggested policy is outlined below:</p> <p>"New development will be co-ordinated and phased inline with the provision of appropriate utility infrastructure.</p> <p>The local planning authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water, foul drainage and sewage treatment capacity to serve all developments. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users."</p>		<p>Amendments to include utility infrastructure have already been recommended in response to other representations from Thames Water.</p> <p>It is not considered, therefore, useful to insert an entirely new utility-based infrastructure policy. However, in recognition of the points raised, amendments to the reasoned justification of types of infrastructure are recommended to include necessary utility delivery.</p>	No change in response to this objection. Reference to utility infrastructure to be inserted within the list at para 29.2.4.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		Policy C 1	Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations		Yes		PSubCS179	<p>29.2 Infrastructure and Planning Obligations (s106)</p> <p>Policy C1 is supported, but we suggest that it refers to the list of measures in para 29.2.4.</p>		Support noted. The measures in the supporting text are not considered to be exhaustive, and the policy will not gain from a cross-referencing.	No change.
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		Policy C 1	Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS251	<p>Para 2.2.1.</p> <p>Para 35.3.1</p> <p>Policy C 1</p> <p>Policy CH 1, CH 2</p> <p>Policy CH 3 Para vi</p> <p>Policy CT 1 Para b</p>		While the representation does not appear to raise an issue of soundness <i>per se</i> it should be noted that Policy C1, and the assessed infrastructure requirements seek to ensure that new developments will assist in providing necessary infrastructure. In preparing an assessment of infrastructure requirements, best practice as provided by PAS has been used, with consultation and	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>HOUSING, ADDED POPULATION, DENSITY AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES</p> <p>The Core Strategy, taking its lead from the GLA and the London Plan, envisages some 6,000 new dwellings over a decade. (Population is forecast to rise by 20,000.) This housing expansion will occupy much of the developable land in the Borough and significantly increase the overall density of the densest local authority in Britain.</p> <p>But many of the ancillary social, medical and commercial services on which residents rely are already over-subscribed, have little of no room in which to expand and are faced by prohibitive K&C land values if they want to expand.</p> <p>If the Inspector was to talk to residents about this he would find them speaking of surgeries with waiting lists, standing room only on buses, long queues at post offices, lack of on-street visitor parking space, tiny flats and inhuman cramming on the Underground. These are, of course, the views of middle-income residents, not the rich. (But as Figure 8.3 shows, the Borough has a high proportion of residents with incomes of £35,000 and below.)</p> <p>The Society does not suggest that delivering additional houses on what are currently non-housing sites would be ineffective in meeting housing demand. The issue is the relationship between that new housing (and additional population) and the capacity of a wide range of social and physical facilities. There is insufficient evidence on the impact of this increase in population on social and community services. The question never seems to be addressed. It is assumed that higher population density is justified without exploring its side-effects.</p> <p>Policy C1 does, of course, require additional social facilities to be financed via S.106 Agreements. But there is no assessment of the scope for expanding the supply of the Borough's already overstretched infrastructure of public transport and roads, surgeries and post offices, playing fields and parks.</p> <p>How, for instance, will the construction of new flats on the site of the Earl's Court Exhibition solve the problems of acute congestion (due both to District/Circle/Piccadilly line interchanging passengers and heavy local demand) at Earl's Court Underground Station?</p> <p>How, furthermore, does the Plan reconcile all the proposed new residents with Policy CT1 (b). 'Ensure that development will not result in any material increase in traffic</p> <p>congestion....' ? Additional residents will lead to additional servicing vehicles ranging from refuse collection to plumbers, parcels delivery, computer technicians, lift engineers and building contractors. Additional residents will also generate additional business and family visitors. Even if residential development is 'permit free' it will still contribute to traffic.</p> <p>Increasing the Borough's population will put its social and community infrastructure under even greater pressure. This problem is not assessed. No evidence is advanced to justify the addition of 20,000 residents. The Society considers that the Plan is unsound.</p> <p>The plan needs either to scale down provision for increased population or show how the supply of social and community infrastructure should be expanded - or a mix of the two.</p>		<p>involvement of stakeholders. It is an on-going process, and so will evolve over time, while Policy C1 requires necessary infrastructure to be provided alongside development, and complies with Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>A Planning Obligations Supplementary planning Document has also been prepared to assist in formulating the required obligations to secure infrastructure, including necessary community facilities.</p> <p>The specific issue of transport capacity is also raised and queried. In the context of development at Earls Court these would be considered at the planning stage, with infrastructure requirements being assessed along side any planned development.</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
London Fire Brigade	London Fire Brigade	Drivers Jonas	Policy C 1	Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations	Yes	Yes		PSubCS318	<p>POLICY C1</p> <p>THE LFB SUBMITTED REPRESENTATIONS TO THE PREVIOUS ROUNDS OF CONSULTATION TO REQUEST THAT THE LFB IS CONSIDERED AS A STATUTORY CONSULTEE IN REGARD FOR PLANNING OBLIGATIONS. AS SUCH, THE LFB SUPPORT THE INCLUSION OF THE FIRE SERVICES IN POLICY C1.</p>		Support noted.	No change.
DP9	DP9		Policy C 1	Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS331	<p>Policy C1: Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations</p> <p><i>Unsound: Not consistent with National Policy</i></p> <p>The draft text needs to be clear that the examples of potential section 106 measures to be secured through s106 will need to be tailored to the relevant proposals as appropriate and in accordance with Circular 05/05. The policy should clarify that benefits inherent to the development scheme will be taken in to account in considering appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The following amended wording is proposed (as underlined and struck through):</p> <p><i>Planning obligations will be negotiated taking account of the proposed development, having regard to the benefits generated by the development and potential implications for the viability of the development project. [delete and i] In determining which measure receives priority, account will be taken of the individual characteristics of the site, the infrastructure needs of the site and the surrounding area, and the London Plan. Proposals that form part of potentially wider sites will be assessed in terms of the capacity of the site as a whole.</i></p> <p><i>The viability of the development will also be taken into account. In the case of an enabling development, or where the development is unable to deliver all the policy requirements for reasons of viability, a viability study will be required to accompany the planning application. s106 contributions and related obligations and commitments will be reviewed in the context of this viability study. The viability study should use the GLA toolkit or an agreed alternative. The applicant will fund the independent assessment of the viability study, or other technical studies requiring independent assessment, prior to the application being determined.</i></p> <p>Furthermore it is not appropriate for the draft GLA Crossrail SPD to be cited given it is not in force, is controversial and is any event a GLA matter. The proposed change as shown below is consistent with national guidance and provides clarity, in accordance with PPS12.</p>		<p>It should be noted that Policy C1, and the assessed infrastructure requirements seek to ensure that new developments will assist in providing necessary infrastructure. in preparing an assessment of infrastructure requirements, best practice as provided by PAS has been used, with consultation and involvement of stakeholders. It is an on-going process, and so will evolve over time, while Policy C1 requires necessary infrastructure to be provided alongside development, and complies with Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>A Planning Obligations Supplementary planning Document has also been prepared to assist in formulating the required obligations to secure infrastructure, including necessary community facilities.</p>	Insert refence to Circular 05/2005. No further changes.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy C 1	Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations		No	Effective	PSubCS394	<p>p161 para 29.2.4 and Policy C1 Infrastructure delivery and planning obligations</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>- The policy and supporting text require clarification to ensure that the range of measures that may be secured through s106 are tailored to the circumstances of a development proposal and its expected impacts.</p> <p>- In considering potential planning obligations it will be relevant to have regard to the planning benefits of a scheme and the extent to which imposition of planning obligations may have the undesired consequence of curtailing opportunities for other</p>		<p>It should be noted that Policy C1, and the assessed infrastructure requirements seek to ensure that new developments will assist in providing necessary infrastructure. in preparing an assessment of infrastructure requirements, best practice as provided by PAS has been used, with consultation and involvement of stakeholders. It is an on-going process, and so will evolve over time, while Policy C1 requires necessary infrastructure to be provided alongside development, and complies with Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>A Planning Obligations Supplementary planning Document has also been prepared to assist in formulating the required obligations to secure</p>	Insert reference to Circular 05/2005. No further changes.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>potential benefits to be realised</p> <p>- Viability issues will have a bearing on a range of types of planning obligations, in addition to section 106 contributions.</p> <p>- These changes will provide appropriate flexibility for development proposals to realise the Vision making the policy effective and sound.</p>		infrastructure, including necessary community facilities.	
Mr Matthew Brown	Environment Agency		Policy CA 1	Kensal Gasworks	Yes	Yes		PSubCS114	<p>Policy no: Policy CA1</p> <p>Page no: 132</p> <p>Paragraph: Part d</p> <p>Why it is legally compliant or Sound?</p> <p>We consider this policy legally sound as it accords with the themes of Planning Policy Statement 23 Planning and Pollution control.</p>		Noted.	No change
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		Policy CA 1	Kensal Gasworks				PSubCS134	<p>Site ID Strategic Site 1 Site Name Kensal Gasworks (sites north & south of railway)</p> <p>Water Response</p> <p>Depending on the type and scale of development proposed, there may be capacity issues in relation to the existing water supply network. It may therefore be necessary for Thames Water to undertake investigations to determine the impact of any development proposed. As such the following paragraph should be added to the relevant section of the Core Strategy:</p> <p>"Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water infrastructure."</p> <p>Waste Response</p> <p>Depending on the type and scale of development proposed, there may be capacity issues in relation to the existing sewerage network. It may therefore be necessary for Thames Water to undertake investigations to determine the impact of any development proposed. As such the following paragraph should be added to the relevant section of the Core Strategy:</p> <p>"Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure."</p> <p>During this period ongoing discussions with both the LPA and developer will be necessary to ensure the impact on Thames Water assets is not prejudicial.</p>		<p>Including this wording for these sites will be repetitious and over lengthy.</p> <p>The Council's policy for infrastructure provision, including water and sewer infrastructure, is contained with Policy C1 which considers site specific infrastructure requirements as part of the planning brief and planning application.</p>	No change
Mr NR Marsh	Heath and Safety Executive		Policy CA 1	Kensal Gasworks	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS468	The Health and Safety Executive has considered the contents of the plan in the light of an assessment of the potential risks from the activities at the Notifiable Installations in the area covered by the plan.		The Council is disappointed that given the history of the Kensal Gasworks site, as well as its status within the draft London Plan as an Opportunity Area, that the HSE have not provided a more specific and directly relevant	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>There may be a conflict between the development policies and the presence of the notifiable installations. Any proposed developments should take their presence into account.</p> <p>You are strongly advised to consult the listed pipeline operator, to confirm the exact location and route of their pipeline in the area covered by the plan and to ensure that your records are kept up to date.</p> <p>In view of the presence of notifiable installations in the area covered by the plan, it would be helpful to potential developers if the constraints likely to be imposed by their presence were indicated in a policy statement in the plan. The following paragraphs could form the basis of such statement which may avoid the submission of planning applications containing inappropriate proposals:</p> <p><u>Suggested General Statement on Notifiable Installations</u></p> <p>Certain sites and pipelines are designated as notifiable installations by virtue of the quantities of hazardous substance presence. The siting of such installations will be subject to planning controls, for example under the planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992, aimed at keeping these separated from housing and other land uses with such installations might be incompatible from the safety viewpoint. In accordance with Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions circular 04/2000 the local Authority will consult the Health and Safety Executive, as appropriate, about the siting of any proposed notifiable installations.</p> <p>The are covered by this Local Plan contains a number of installations handling notifiable substances, including pipelines. Whilst they are subject to stringent controls under existing health and safety legislation, it is considered prudent to control the kind of development permitted in the vicinity of these installations. For this reason the Planning Authority has been advised by the Health and Safety Executive of consultation distances for each of these installations. In determining whether or not to grant planning permission for a proposed development within these consultation distances the Planning Authority will consult the Health and Safety Executive about risks to the proposed development from the notifiable installation in accordance with Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions Circular 04/2000</p> <p>In addition, we suggest that the proposals maps be marked to show the locations of the notifiable installations consistently with paragraph 6.21 of Department of Environment Circular PPG 12. We particularly recommend marking the routes of the notifiable pipelines as, in our experience, most incidents involving damage to buried pipelines occur because third parties are not aware of their presence</p>		<p>response to this allocation.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the potential conflict between the development and the Gasholders. However, as the layout of the site is yet to be agreed, The Council will look to commence formal negotiations with the HSE regarding pipeline location and Consultation Zones during the production of a future SPD.</p> <p>Whilst the Council supports the principle of the annex provided by the HSE, however it is considered to be unnecessary to include this. The HSE are a statutory consultee and as such both the Council and the developers will be aware of the our responsibility to consult.</p> <p>The location of pipelines, though important is not considered to be appropriate for listing within a Proposals Map of a Core Strategy. If the HSE is of the opinion that this information should be more widely available, the Council would suggest that this is contained within a separate document produced by the HSE.</p>	
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		Policy CA 2	Wornington Green				PSubCS135	<p>Water Response</p> <p>Depending on the type and scale of development proposed, there may be capacity issues in relation to the existing water supply network. It may therefore be necessary for Thames Water to undertake investigations to determine the impact of any development proposed. As such the following paragraph should be added to the relevant section of the Core Strategy:</p> <p>"Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for</p>		<p>Thames Water raise this comment for most strategic sites. However, including this wording for these sites will be repetitious and over lengthy.</p> <p>The Council's policy for infrastructure provision, including water and sewer infrastructure, is contained with Policy C1 which considers site specific infrastructure requirements as part of the planning brief and planning application.</p> <p>Policy CA2(x) requires infrastructure and planning obligations to include sustainable development</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water infrastructure."</p> <p>Waste Response</p> <p>Depending on the type and scale of development proposed, there may be capacity issues in relation to the existing sewerage network. It may therefore be necessary for Thames Water to undertake investigations to determine the impact of any development proposed. As such the following paragraph should be added to the relevant section of the Core Strategy:</p> <p>"Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure."</p> <p>During this period ongoing discussions with both the LPA and developer will be necessary to ensure the impact on Thames Water assets is not prejudicial.</p> <p>Additional Comments: Site covers a large area, currently served by combined sewers. Impact will depend upon proposed points of connection. Overall flows to combined sewers should not exceed historic flows and this may often be achievable by agreed surface water retention.</p>		measures set out in the Wornington Green SPD. Para 8.8.1 of the Wornington Green SPD states that no development should commence until impact studies on the existing water and sewerage supply infrastructure have been submitted and approved by the Council in consultation with Thames Water. Policy CE1 requires major new development to meet Code for Sustainable Level 4, which limits water consumption to 105 litres per person per day. Policy CE2(d) requires development to incorporate sustainable urban drainage measures to control the rate at which surface water is discharged into the sewer network. Para 8.9.2 of the Wornington Green SPD also states that the FRA will require surface water run-off from the developed site to be no greater than the pre-development site to the satisfaction of the EA.	
English Heritage	English Heritage		Policy CA 2	Wornington Green	Yes	Yes		PSubCS462	<p>It would be our preference to have the following archaeological priority area implications identified in the stated site allocations:</p> <p>Notting Barns Farm APA in the Wornington Green site allocation</p>		EH have not informed the Council of this APA before and this has therefore not been included on the Council's proposals map. This Council has yet to see evidence of why this APD would be designated. The Council cannot make reference to an APA designation which does not exist on the proposals map.	No change proposed.
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CA 2	Wornington Green	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS502	<p>Policy CA 2: Wornington Green</p> <p>KHT supports the inclusion, through Policy CA 2, of Wornington Green as a strategic allocation within the Core Strategy. KHT notes the reference within part (a) of Policy CA 2 that RBKC will require development on Wornington Green to deliver a minimum of 538 affordable dwellings. KHT considers that this is not consistent with the adopted Wornington Green Planning Brief (Supplementary Planning Document) (November 2009) and fails to provide the flexibility which is critical in terms of meeting the objective of providing for the housing needs of the Estate's current tenants, and to ensure that the scheme is financially viable and ultimately deliverable.</p> <p>PPS3 sets out the broad approach to the provision of affordable housing, emphasising the importance of viability, and clarifies the need for flexibility within policies to reflect this. The London Plan notes that affordable housing targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability</p> <p>of public subsidy and other scheme requirements. The Mayor's Housing SPG notes that estate renewal proposals should be predicated on no net loss of affordable housing. In addition, the Mayor's Housing SPG notes that calculations on whether there is a loss of affordable housing can be based on habitable rooms rather than units, where the redevelopment of an estate is providing a housing mix more appropriate to the needs of both existing and prospective future residents. The Wornington Green Planning</p>		<p>The support of policy CA2, in principle, is noted. The representation considers that CH2(a0 is not consistent with the adopted Planning Brief (SPD), as it fails to provide flexibility to meet the housing needs of the current tenants. This approach ensures no net loss of housing, which is consistent with London Plan policies. It is expressed in terms of dwellings, while the SPD, which sets out the detailed mechanism for re-provision, and offers substantially more detail on the development of the site, includes, more appropriately, the reference to the number of habitable rooms. It is not considered appropriate to include such detailed reference within CA2, as part of the Core Strategy. In considering development at the site it will be necessary to take account of the Core Strategy and the SPD, and other material factors.</p> <p>Support for Council's ambition to provide some non residential uses as part of the Wornington redevelopment noted. The Council concurs with the consultees view that the exact quantum of A class uses should be based on identified need to be determined through the planning application process. Indeed the nature of the A Class development was been established by the recently granted permission. This permission has illustrated that the Council has allowed the degree of flexibility necessary to allow a successful, and viable, development</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Brief (Supplementary Planning Document) states that the Council will require the provision of at least 538 affordable units for rent (or 1,622 habitable rooms of affordable housing), and was drafted as such to provide the flexibility required to meet existing tenants' needs.</p> <p>The proposal for the redevelopment of Wornington Green is predicated on the reprovision of the existing 538 affordable units or 1,622 habitable rooms, as stated in the Wornington Green SPD, to meet the existing tenants' housing needs, based on up-to-date housing needs assessments.</p> <p>The objective is to seek to ensure that the redevelopment provides for the housing needs of KHT's existing tenants.</p> <p>KHT considers that Policy CA 2 should be amended to be consistent with the adopted Wornington Green Planning Brief (Supplementary Planning Document). KHT suggests that Policy CA2 is amended to state 'that RBKC will require development on Wornington Green to deliver at least 538 dwellings for rent (or 1,622 habitable rooms of affordable housing).'</p> <p>KHT notes that part (e) of Policy CA 2 requires development on the site to deliver A1 to A5 Uses in the order of approximately 2,000 square metres, provided that these animate the street frontage, extend the retail offering along Portobello Road and help reconnect the link from Portobello Road and/or Wornington Road</p> <p>to Ladbroke Grove with no unit being over 400 square metres. KHT supports the principle of providing a quantum of non-residential uses along Portobello Road as part of the comprehensive redevelopment of Wornington Green, and the London Plan positively encourages the provision of mixed used developments in</p> <p>accessible locations. KHT considers that the exact quantum of A1 to A5 uses should be based on identified need to be determined through the planning application process.</p> <p>In addition, KHT supports the principle of part 'e', but seeks clarification in respect of the reference to no unit being over 400 square metres. KHT considers that part 'e' should seek to avoid unnecessary prescription and should contain a degree of flexibility; the Core Strategy should also define what constitutes a unit for the purposes of Policy CA 2 (i.e. Gross Internal Area, Gross External Area, Net etc).</p> <p>KHT suggests that part (e) of Policy CA 2 is amended to state that the Council will require 'the provision of A1 to A5 Uses, in the order of approximately 2,000 square metres, the precise quantum to be determined based on need and demand, 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 generally over 400 square metres.'</p>			
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		Policy CA 3	Land Adjacent to Trellick Tower				PSubCS136	<p>Strategic Site 3: Land adjacent to Trellick Tower</p> <p>Water response: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.</p> <p>Waste response: Site covers a large area, currently served by</p>		<p>Thames Water raise this comment for most strategic sites. However, including this wording for these sites will be repetitious and over lengthy.</p> <p>The Council's policy for infrastructure provision, including water and sewer infrastructure, is contained with Policy C1, where site specific infrastructure</p>	No change proposed

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									combined sewers. Impact will depend upon proposed points of connection. Overall flows to combined sewers should not exceed historic flows and this may often be achievable by agreed surface water retention		requirements will be considered as part of the planning brief and planning application.	
Mr M I H Becket			Policy CA 4	North Kensington Sports Centre		No	Justified	PSubCS66	<p>Policy CA4 & CV9</p> <p>As I received this form on midday 9 Dec and have to return it to the Council within 24 hours I cannot cite details of paragraphs. My point is about the Walmer Road sport facility swimming pool, it should be retained on site.</p> <p>It does not take account of residents desires and did not canvas the people most likely to be affected by any change. So representations have not been noticed or complied with.</p>		The Council is yet to decide whether the Leisure Centre will be refurbished or redeveloped. Policy CA4(b) requires the reprovision of equivalent sports facilities, including a swimming pool. Para 9.3.13 also commits to the continued reprovision of a swimming pool. However, the extent and size of the reprovided swimming facilities will depend on design, space and consultation which will form part of demand assessment. This will be identified through the preparation of a planning brief for this site.	No change proposed.
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		Policy CA 4	North Kensington Sports Centre				PSubCS137	<p>Water Response</p> <p>Depending on the type and scale of development proposed, there may be capacity issues in relation to the existing water supply network. It may therefore be necessary for Thames Water to undertake investigations to determine the impact of any development proposed. As such the following paragraph should be added to the relevant section of the Core Strategy:</p> <p>"Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water infrastructure."</p> <p>Waste Response</p> <p>Depending on the type and scale of development proposed, there may be capacity issues in relation to the existing sewerage network. It may therefore be necessary for Thames Water to undertake investigations to determine the impact of any development proposed. As such the following paragraph should be added to the relevant section of the Core Strategy:</p> <p>"Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure."</p> <p>During this period ongoing discussions with both the LPA and developer will be necessary to ensure the impact on Thames Water assets is not prejudicial.</p> <p>Additional Comments: Site covers a large area, currently served by combined sewers. Impact will depend upon proposed points of connection. Overall flows to combined sewers should not exceed historic flows and this may often be achievable by agreed surface water retention.</p>		<p>Thames Water raise this comment for most strategic sites. However, including this wording for these sites will be repetitious and over lengthy.</p> <p>The Council's policy for infrastructure provision, including water and sewer infrastructure, is contained with Policy C1 which considers site specific infrastructure requirements as part of the planning brief and planning application.</p> <p>Policy CA4(i) states that the Council will identify detailed infrastructure requirements as part of the site specific planning brief. This will include consultation with Thames Water. Policy CE1 requires development to meet BREEAM Environmental Standards, which controls water consumption and manages sewer and surface water. Policy CE2(d) requires development to incorporate sustainable urban drainage measures to control the rate at which surface water is discharged into the sewer network.</p>	No change proposed.
Mr Peter Martindale			Policy CA 4	North Kensington Sports Centre				PSubCS453	We are alarmed at the information that the sports centre and/or Grenfell Tower might be lost to make way for new schools; we need more sports facilities not less to tackle bored youths; the site is too small for a secondary school which would thus have inadequate facilities, which makes it an irresponsible proposal, and		Grenfell Tower does not form part of the strategic site. Core Strategy Policy CA4(b) protects the leisure facilities, either in situ or relocated elsewhere on the site. An initial massing study for the site suggests that an academy and leisure centre can be accommodated on	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									the noise surrounding homes would be unacceptable. The Eurostar site farther North is more suitable for a school and there thirty or forty acres of sports and playing fields could be provided for the schools.		the site, with suitable facilities. The detailed design and masterplanning of the site will ensure the mitigation of any adverse effects on the residential amenity. The Council has already considered all available sites for the Academy.	
English Heritage	English Heritage		Policy CA 4	North Kensington Sports Centre	Yes	Yes		PSubCS466	We advise that there is archaeological potential, including the Notting Hill Roman cemetery, indicated in the Greater London Sites and Monuments Record in respect of the North Kensington Sports Centre site. Desk based assessment of this is requested as part of any planning application.		EH have not informed the Council of this APA before and this has therefore not been included on the Council's proposals map. This Council has yet to see evidence of why this APD would be designated. The Council cannot make reference to an APA designation which does not exist on the proposals map.	No change proposed.
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		Policy CA 5	Allocation for The former Commonwealth Institute				PSubCS138	Strategic Site 5 - Commonwealth Institute Water response: Comments as Strategic Site 1. Waste response: Comments as Strategic Site 1.		Thames Water raise this comment for most strategic sites. However, including this wording for these sites will be repetitious and over lengthy. The Council's policy for infrastructure provision, including water and sewer infrastructure, is contained with Policy C1, where site specific infrastructure requirements will be considered as part of the planning brief and planning application. Policy CA7(q) states that the Council will identify detailed infrastructure requirements as part of the site specific planning brief. This will include consultation with Thames Water. Policy CE1 requires development to meet BREEAM Environmental Standards, which controls water consumption and manages sewer and surface water. Policy CE2(d) requires development to incorporate sustainable urban drainage measures to control the rate at which surface water is discharged into the sewer network.	No change.
English Heritage	English Heritage		Policy CA 5	Allocation for The former Commonwealth Institute				PSubCS463	It would be our preference to have the following archaeological priority area implications identified in the stated site allocations: Roman Road/settlement APA covering the Commonwealth Institute site.		EH have not informed the Council of this APA before and this has therefore not been included on the Council's proposals map. This Council has yet to see evidence of why this APD would be designated. The Council cannot make reference to an APA designation which does not exist on the proposals map.	No change.
Brookfield Developments	Brookfield Developments (UK) Ltd	DP9	Policy CA 6	Warwick Road	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS64	Policy CA6 -Site Allocation Our client welcomes the allocation of a minimum of 350 new residential units on the 100 West Cromwell Road site. Under the planning obligations sub heading, our client suggests the following rewording: "g. maximise affordable housing on all the sites subject to viability in order to ensure a mixed and balanced community. " Our client seeks also clarification on the requirement for individual schemes to provide a contribution to facilitate the unraveling of the Earl's Court One-Way system. Existing Permissions Our client submits that this section should refer to the outline planning permission relating to the site and suggests the following additional wording within paragraph 25.4.6: "Outline planning permission was granted in 1996 for the redevelopment of the greater 'Fenelon Place' site to provide a three phase development. Phases one and three have been implemented and comprise the existing Tesco store with housing above and the Kensington Westside residential development respectively for a landmark office building (14.864 square metres) and has not been implemented. The Phase two site is now known as the 100 West Cromwell Road site. "		Whilst the Council agrees with the principle of maximising affordable housing as part of residential development on all the sites, the reference to viability is considered unnecessary as this is addressed in Policy CH2 (p) of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy and within Policy 3A.10 of the London Plan (2008), both of which would be considered together with Policy CA6 as part of the determination of any planning application submitted for these sites. The Council would agree that whilst outline planning permission was granted for the redevelopment of the Fenelon Place site for phases 1 and 3 as described, it should be noted that phase 2 involved the grant of outline planning permission for an office building of 14,864sqm. However, this planning permission did not include reference to a "landmark" building. Therefore, the inclusion of the word "landmark" is not considered appropriate within the suggested text. The Council can provide further clarification on the Earls Court One Way System contributions. The Earls Court One Way System currently represents a poor environment for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users (particularly bus users). Development that adds significantly to demand for these modes will be required to contribute to improvements in order to	Amend text to add wording as follows: "Outline planning permission was granted in : provide a three phase development. Phases one and three have been implemented and comprise the existing Tesco store with housing above and the Kensington Westside residential development respectively for a landmark office building (14.864 square metres) and has not been implemented. The Phase two site is now known as the 100 West Cromwell Road site"

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											better accommodate that demand. Additional traffic on the Earl's Court One Way System will worsen conditions in traffic capacity terms as well increasing the negative impacts of the Earls Court One Way System on residential amenity. It is therefore considered reasonable and consistent with government guidance to seek contributions in those circumstances to improve the road and public transport networks in the area as well as the environment for pedestrians and cyclists.	
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		Policy CA 6	Warwick Road				PSubCS139	<p>SiteID:Strategic Site 6</p> <p>Site Name: Warwick Road</p> <p>Water Response: Comments as Strategic Site 1.</p> <p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>Site covers a large area, currently served by combined sewers. Impact will depend upon proposed points of connection. Overall flows to combined sewers should not exceed historic flows and this may often be achievable by agreed surface water retention.</p>		<p>Thames Water raise this comment for most strategic sites. However, including this wording for these sites will be repetitious and over lengthy.</p> <p>The Council's policy for infrastructure provision, including water and sewer infrastructure, is contained with Policy C1, where site specific infrastructure requirements will be considered as part of the planning brief and planning application.</p> <p>Policy CA7(q) states that the Council will identify detailed infrastructure requirements as part of the site specific planning brief. This will include consultation with Thames Water. Policy CE1 requires development to meet BREEAM Environmental Standards, which controls water consumption and manages sewer and surface water. Policy CE2(d) requires development to incorporate sustainable urban drainage measures to control the rate at which surface water is discharged into the sewer network.</p> <p>Furthermore, the sites in Warwick Road have been sequentially tested and all sources of flooding taken into account.</p>	No change required.
English Heritage	English Heritage		Policy CA 6	Warwick Road	Yes	Yes		PSubCS464	<p>It would be our preference to have the following archaeological priority area implications identified in the stated site allocations:</p> <p>Roman Road APA partially within the Warwick Road site allocation.</p>		EH have not informed the Council of this APA before and this has therefore not been included on the Council's proposals map. This Council has yet to see evidence of why this APD would be designated. The Council cannot make reference to an APA designation which does not exist on the proposals map	No change.
Thames Water	Thames Water Property Services		Policy CA 7	Earl's Court				PSubCS140	<p>SiteID: Strategic Site 7</p> <p>Site Name:Earl's Court</p> <p>Water Response: Comments as Strategic Site 1.</p> <p>Waste Response: Comments as Strategic Site 1.</p> <p>Additional Comments: Site covers a large area, currently served by combined sewers. Impact will depend upon proposed points of connection. Overall flows to combined sewers should not exceed historic flows and this may often be achievable by agreed surface water retention.</p>		<p>Thames Water raise this comment for most strategic sites. However, including this wording for all the sites will be repetitious and over lengthy.</p> <p>The Council's policy for infrastructure provision, including water and sewer infrastructure, is contained with Policy C1, where site specific infrastructure requirements will be considered as part of the planning brief and planning application.</p> <p>Policy CA7(q) states that the Council will identify detailed infrastructure requirements as part of the site specific planning brief. This will include consultation with Thames Water. Policy CE1 requires development to meet various environmental standards, which controls water consumption and manages sewer and surface water. Policy CE2(d) requires development to incorporate sustainable urban drainage measures to control the rate at which surface water is discharged into the sewer network.</p>	No change proposed.
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		Policy CA 7	Earl's Court		No	Effective	PSubCS215	<p>London Plan Policy cross ref. 3C.20 Draft London Plan: 6.7</p> <p>Has this matter been raised previously? No (New Policy)</p> <p>The inclusion of a comprehensive list of infrastructure and planning</p>		Agree, there should a requirement for the provision of improved bus facilities within the Earl's Court regeneration area. Policy CA7(m) will be amended accordingly.	Propose change to Policy CA7(m) to require improved bus facilities.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									policy CA7 should state a requirement for this site to be fully accessible by bus. This will require providing the appropriate highway infrastructure, stand and turning facilities for an extended bus route.			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CA 7	Earl's Court		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS388	<p>Policy CA7</p> <p>Changes are proposed to ensure consistency with Capital & Counties' representations to other parts of the document. The text is importantly amended to clarify elements that relate purely to Earls Court as a strategic site within RBKC Core Strategy and those relating to the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area. In particular:</p> <p>- regarding (a) and (b) (as amended) these relate solely to RBKC part of the EC Regeneration Area, ie the allocation, with a quantum and mix of uses reflects the strategic role of the site as part of an Opportunity Area in the Replacement London Plan, as explained in the Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document</p> <p>- (c), (d) and (e) (as amended) relate to the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area and where on the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area they are precisely provided is subject to further masterplanning. (c), (d) and (e) (as amended) are therefore set out as land uses which the RBKC wishes to see incorporated in to the wider EC Regeneration Area as a whole. The proposed range of uses confirms that a scheme would involve residential and non residential uses. Reference to a convention or exhibition centre on redevelopment of the site is deleted as such a facility is no longer being actively pursued at this time. The text confirms that a significant destination use should be provided within the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area instead. In relation to (d) and (e) the changes seek to make the policy less prescriptive so that objectives for sustainable waste and energy solutions can be realistically achieved</p> <p>- in relation to (f), (g) and (h) (as amended), these are set out as key design principles to apply to either the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area or just the RBKC part of the EC Regeneration Area as applicable, subject to masterplanning. The proposed changes reflect more accurately the context for assessing improvements to the one way system and necessary provisos having regard to the information currently available, as explained in the Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p> <p>- in relation to (i) to (p) inclusive (as amended), these are set out as infrastructure and planning obligations to apply to either the wider Earls Court regeneration Area or just the RBKC part of the EC Regeneration Area as applicable, subject to masterplanning. Clarification is inserted that requirements for development related obligations will be covered by the Planning Framework Document (OAPF) for the EC Regeneration Area, as well as being informed by the Council's forthcoming Developer Obligations .</p>		<p>The Earl's Court Regeneration Area includes land within LBHF, which the Council cannot set policy for as part of the Core Strategy. However, the Council proposes changes throughout the 'place' and 'strategic site' to ensure the consistent naming. The Regeneration Area is a name given by LBHF, and does not apply to the RBKC portion of the Site. However, when discussing the entire site, the Council will refer to the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area, which is consistent with naming in the draft London Plan.</p> <p>It remains the ambition of the Council to maintain the "Earl's Court" Brand and as such, the retention of a cultural facility of at least national significance is considered to be crucial to the redevelopment of the wider earls court site. The existing exhibition space is located within the Royal Borough and therefore its loss, with subsequent reprovision on the wider site or at Olympia will be carefully controlled as part of the planning brief and planning application. In applying the land allocation policies in preparing the planning brief and determining the planning application, the Council will have regard to other material considerations which includes sound evidence justifying the suitable location of the facility elsewhere on the wider site or at Olympia. The proposed wording of "further land uses sought" does not give the Council sufficient control to guarantee the delivery of cultural facility of least international or national significance as a suitable replacement for the existing facility.</p> <p>Disagree with proposed changes to the number of residential units, as this is based on a sound calculation of development capacity on the RBKC Strategic Site. However, some of the non-residential land uses might be located on the LBHF part of the site, which may result in higher residential units being proposed. CA7 will be revised to reflect this.</p> <p>There is a forecast for a 15% growth in demand for office floorspace in Kensington and Chelsea. This equates to nearly 70,000sqm of new floorspace. Whilst Policy CF5 will protect offices, the need to satisfy this demand remains. The Core Strategy allocates 10,000sqm in two of its main strategic sites, namely Kensal and Earl's Court as these (Crossrail permitting) will be in two highly accessible locations. Furthermore the Draft London Plan proposes to designate Earl's Court as an Opportunity Area with a minimum employment capacity of providing a minimum of 7000 new jobs and it is considered that the most likely means of delivering this would be stimulated by office developments.</p> <p>The allocation will be revised to accommodate some other non-residential land uses, including education, leisure and hotels.</p> <p>Policy CA7(c) is clear that the retail provision and associated uses will need to serve the day to day needs</p>	Propose changes to CA7.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>of the new development, which could be residents of or visitors to the new development. The introduction to the policy will be revised to reflect the Council's support for designating the shopping centre uses as a neighbourhood centre in the future.</p> <p>The proposed wording of "subject to feasibility" does not need to be explicit in this policy, as the feasibility and viability of the proposal will be considered as part of the planning brief and as material planning consideration in determining the planning. The Council is also working with the LDA to develop decentralised energy masterplan, where Earl's Court is identified as a location for this facility. However, the requirements for waste and CCHP will be revised to reflect the potential for these to be located elsewhere in the Opportunity Area through the masterplanning as part of the SPD.</p> <p>The text will be revised to be consistent with amendments to Policy CT1, regarding returning the one-way to two-way working.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements and planning obligations will depend on the scale of development proposed, whether considered on the RBKC strategic site or the wider Earls Court area. The requirements will be considered in greater detail through the planning brief, having regard to this policy requirement and the Council's SPD. Proposed change to ensure requirements for improvements to the one-way are consistent with CT1.</p>	
Ms Bobbie Vincent Emery			Policy CA 7	Earl's Court		No	Effective	PSubCS448	<p>A North-South cycle path</p> <p>1.1 The chain of development down the western edge of the Borough</p> <p>from the towpath on the grand union canal in Kensal, to Lots Road and the Thames Path in the south , provide a magnificent planning opportunity for a north/south safe cycle route.</p> <p>1.2 The three major development areas of Kensal, Warwick Road and Earls Court, with the redesign of the Latimer streets and the proposed pedestrian/cycle route south from Brompton Cemetery to the Thames, make such an idea more than feasible. Between the development sites there is railway land, the quiet roads of the St Quentin estate, and Hansard Mews and an existing contra-flow cycle route up Elsham Road in Holland Ward.</p> <p>1.3 The pupils of the two new Academies located on or near this route in Latimer and the Lots Road area would benefit from a north/south safe route. Boroughs to the centre of London, are likely to be west-east routes, and will not greatly assist cyclists travelling north or south <i>within</i> the Borough. East-west routes would however help through-cyclists. They would also contribute to the reduction of particulates, and improve air quality by encouraging non-resident through-travellers out of their cars and on to bikes.</p> <p>1.4.2 The only west-east continuous cycle path proposed is Westway(Chapter 8). There are no proposals for west-east routes between Westway and the Thames . Improved pedestrian links</p>		<p>As suggested by the comment the various development proposals on the western boundary of the borough do offer the opportunity to improve north / south cycle and pedestrian routes in the borough. Changes are proposed in Better Travel Choices to reflect this.</p>	Changes proposed to CA7(n) and paragraph 32.3.9.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>are addressed in most places and strategic sites, but not cycle links. An example is Notting Hill Gate (Chapter 16), a key location on an important east-west route. The Core Strategy proposes narrowed vehicle lanes and widened pavements for pedestrians, but no cycle path. A few hundred yards to the east of Notting Hill Gate are the dedicated cycle paths of Hyde Park which lead to central London, but there is no recognition of the need to connect to this major cycle route, or make cycling through Notting Hill Gate safer.</p> <p>Linked cycle routes</p> <p>2.1 Where specific cycle routes are shown on maps, they are notlinked to other cycle routes . For example the South Kensington map (Ch 12) shows Imperial College Road is to be improved as a pedestrian and cycle route, but there is no vision to link it via the wide thoroughfare of Queens Gate to the cycling routes within Hyde Park. A safe north-south cycle route on the east of the Borough would greatly assist students at the many educational establishments in this area.</p> <p>2.2 Maps of 'places' and 'strategic sites' do not show the existing dedicated cycle paths, indicating that practical steps to make cycling an attractive option have been overlooked. For example the map of Kensington High Street which now has a central reservation bike park, does not show the north-south Holland Walk cycle path that connects the High Street to Ladbroke Grove.</p> <p>2.3.1 Maps of some areas are not consistent with the text of the Core Strategy in relation to cycling. This makes the overall picture confusing, and suggests that cycle routes were initially seen as a minor planning issue. An example is the pedestrian and cycling improvements in the south of the Borough covered in Chapters 17 and 18.</p> <p>2.3.2 The Fulham Road (West) map in Chapter 17 shows an improved <i>pedestrian</i> route through and south of Brompton Cemetery annotated as a 'pedestrian & cycle link from cemetery to Thames '. This is not consistent with the adjacent area map of Lots Road and World's End in Chapter 18 which shows only pedestrian routes to and along the Thames, and no cycle routes.</p> <p>However, 'the number of new pedestrian and cycle links established in and to Brompton Cemetery' is an output indicator for the purposes of monitoring Chapter 17. Further, the Vision statement, CV 17, says that "Pedestrian and Cycle routes to the north and south will be improved." The related map shows a 'North-South cycle link' across Fulham Road although what it links to is unclear</p> <p>2.3.3 The amended policy at CV 18 now includes a specific reference - to cycling and pedestrian routes over the Thames at Cremorne Bridge, But, the proposed bridge over the Chelsea Creek is pedestrian only. At 18.3.11 it says there will be pedestrian and cycling links along and across the Thames, but then a very general commitment to 'support enhanced pedestrian, cyclist and bus links in the area". So there are fragments of good intent but no coherent picture of a pattern of cycle routes .</p>			
Ms Bobbie Vincent Emery			Policy CA 7	Earl's Court		No	Justified	PSubCS451	<p>3.2 A better alternative would be practical wider planning solutions such as dedicated cycle paths and safe routes to encourage bike use by residents and through-travellers. In some chapters the cycling option has been completely overlooked. An example is the major housing development at Earls Court (Chapter 10). There is mention of pedestrian movement at 10.3.3 , but none of cycling. The Policy statement CA7n refers to improved pedestrian links - no mention of cycling links.</p>		Agree that development should contribute to enhancing north / south cycle routes and propose change to reflect this.	Propose change to CA7(n).

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
English Heritage	English Heritage		Policy CA 7	Earl's Court	Yes	Yes		PSubCS465	<p>It would be our preference to have the following archaeological priority area implications identified in the stated site allocations:</p> <p>Medieval hamlet and Jacobean mansion APA surrounding the Earl's Court site allocation</p>		EH have not informed the Council of this APA before and this has therefore not been included on the Council's proposals map. This Council has yet to see evidence of why this APD would be designated. The Council cannot make reference to an APA designation which does not exist on the proposals map.	No change proposed.
Mr T Nodder	K&C Environment Round Table		Policy CE 1	Climate Change		No	Effective	PSubCS5	<p>We consider Chapter 36 Respecting Environmental Limits to be well prepared and to be generally sound in most respects, and we strongly support its inclusion in the Core Strategy. However, we consider that the policies for requiring development to make a significant contribution towards the Government's targets to reduce national carbon dioxide emissions are unsound as not likely to be sufficiently effective. Policy CE1 (b) requires an assessment to demonstrate that conversions and refurbishment achieve relevant standards; in the case of residential development to achieve specific levels of the EcoHomes standards. This is applied to conversions and refurbishment defined as major development. We think that the policy should apply to conversions or refurbishments which produce 5 flats or more rather than 10 flats or more, because it would otherwise be ineffective as it would affect very few developments.</p> <p>Particular evidence cited in the strategy to justify the Policy as drafted is Residential Evidence Base Report dated 21 October 2009. This Report shows that how three different properties in the Borough could be retrofitted to the EcoHomes standard required. The number of dwelling units and floor areas in each of the properties is not clear, but they would most probably fall below the major development definition. They are nonetheless typical of many properties in the Borough, of the sort that will need to be retrofitted as soon as practicable. Similar houses, containing 5,6, or perhaps 7 apartments are quite frequently being put forward for conversion and refurbishment. The scale of such conversions, and the need to control developments is recognised in the Diversity of Housing Chapter of the Core Strategy, e.g. para 35.3.16. In our view no time should be lost in bringing such developments within the scope of Policy CE 1 (b) (i).</p> <p>The current London Plan Policy 4B.4 on retrofitting expects Boroughs to support measures to produce a lower environmental impact from the existing stock of buildings by supporting policies and programmes for refurbishment of buildings which will reduce carbon dioxide emissions etc. Para 4.111 states that the retrofitting of the existing building stock could make a significant contribution to achieving the sustainability aims of the Plan.</p> <p>The Mayor of London's Housing Strategy is to be published soon. The draft (May 2009) at Para 2.2.2 emphasises that the carbon reduction target cannot possibly be met without a major programme of retrofitting the existing housing stock.</p> <p>In the Mayor of London's proposals for a new London Plan (October 2009), Policy 5.4 on retrofitting expects Boroughs to identify opportunities for reducing carbon dioxide emissions from existing building stock.</p> <p>We suggest that the threshold for development by conversion or refurbishment to be subject to assessment under Policy CE 1 (b) (i) should be set to cover properties of 5 dwelling units or more. This should provide a satisfactory starting point for developers and the Council to follow through the findings of the Residential Evidence Base Report and obtain appropriate experience before rolling forward the work of retrofitting, as envisaged in Policy CE1 (i).</p>		Support noted. Agree with comment. However, the Council has taken a cautious approach, as this policy is new and fairly untested. However, the Council may choose to exercise Policy CE1(i), provides an opportunity to decrease the threshold to which this policy would apply, in accordance with the Evidence by Pittman Tozer.	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									In addition, we should like to see the further progress under Policy CE 1 (i) given a tighter timetable. The words "in due course" could be replaced by " within two years of the publication of this Core Strategy".			
53-56 Hans Place		London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CE 1	Climate Change		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS50	<p>Policy CE1 seeks the following in respect of sustainable development requirements:</p> <p>"a) <i>require an assessment to demonstrate that a/ new buildings and extensions defined as major development achieves the following Code for Sustainable Homes / BREEAM standards:</i></p> <p><i>Residential Development: Code for Sustainable Homes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Up to 2015: Level Three;</i> • <i>2015 to 2021: Level Four;</i> • <i>2021 onwards: Level Five.</i> <p><i>Non Residential Development: Relevant BREEAM Assessment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Up to 2015: Excellent;</i> • <i>2016 onwards: Outstanding;</i> <p>c) <i>require an assessment to demonstrate that the entire dwelling where subterranean extensions are proposed achieves Code for Sustainable Homes Level Four;</i></p> <p>h) <i>require development to incorporate measures that will contribute to onsite sustainable food production commensurate with the scale of development; "</i></p> <p>3.17 Currently there is only a Code Level 3 requirement for new homes. In 2010 this will become part of the Building Regulations and all new build development will be required to be built to Code Level 3. At this point it will be deliverable through another regulatory code and will then cease to be a proper subject for planning control. It would not therefore be necessary or reasonable to set a higher standard in planning legislation. Such a higher standard would therefore require a full appraisal of the viability and feasibility of incorporating such measures into new development. The Council should not try to restrict development to including technologies that are already covered by Building Regulations and should pay particular reference to the need to assess the Viability of a development should these be required.</p> <p>3.18 There is also reference in this policy for those developments proposing subterranean development to be compliant with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. It is wholly unreasonable for the Council to seek that Code Level 4 is achieved in developments seeking extensions to existing properties. In the conversion of existing buildings the Council acknowledge that it is unreasonable to seek Code for Sustainable Homes and retain the BREEAM levels of 'very good'.</p> <p>3.19 Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 achieves a high level of sustainable design techniques significantly above the building regulations standards and enshrined within the ability to achieve this level relates to the fabric of the building, renewable energy</p>		<p>PPS1 requires Development Plans to include policies which reduce energy use, reduce emissions, promote the development of renewable energy resources, and take climate change impacts into account in the location and design of development. The 2008 Planning Act also requires the Council to contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change. The Code for Sustainable Homes is the government promoted approach to assess the environmental performance of development. It is therefore right and reasonable to use the CfSH to assess the environmental performance of development in the Royal Borough. The Council has proposed setting ambitious targets for environmental sustainable throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy, going beyond statutory requirements (either as part of the Building Regulations or Homes and Community Agencies requirements). Current proposals for amendments to the Building Regulations will only result in improvements to the energy efficiency and water consumption and therefore not enforce any other factors in the CfSH, such as floodrisk, air quality and construction management. The HCA proposals only apply to social housing, where the HCA will be requested for funding.</p> <p>The Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study includes the consideration of costs associated with achieving the proposed CfSH levels, demonstrating that this is financially viable. High property prices and advances in technology, design and materials will make the CfSH requirements more financially viability in the future. In addition to this, the Council's proposals for reductions in carbon dioxide are also generally in accordance with those required by the Mayor of London in the draft London Plan.</p> <p>Given the complexity of calculating carbon dioxide emissions from subterranean development, the Council's policy is a pragmatic approach to mitigating the carbon dioxide emissions for this considerably high carbon intensive type of the development. However, propose change to ensure subterranean development meets the EcoHomes standards, which are better suited to existing buildings in accordance with the advice from Pittman Tozer.</p> <p>In any event, all planning applications will be considered against the Development Plan and other material considerations, which includes viability and feasibility having regard to the type and scale of development.</p>	Propose change to Policy CE1(c) to use EcoHomes, which is better suited to assessing the environmental performance of existing buildings where subterranean development is proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									technologies and water preservation. These elements are much more easily achieved in the construction of new development rather than the extension of existing buildings, hence the reason that the Code is not applied to conversions of existing buildings. Therefore there is no justification of the requirement for subterranean extensions to be compliant with Code Level 4 and this element of Policy CE1 is not justified.			
53-56 Hans Place		London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CE 1	Climate Change		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS58	<p><i>iii) Sustainability and Renewable Energy</i></p> <p>3.16 Policy CE1 seeks the following in respect of sustainable development requirements:</p> <p>"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 :</p> <p><i>Residential Development: Code for Sustainable Homes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 2015 : Level Three ;; • 2015 to 2021 : Level Four ; • 2021 onwards : Level Five . <p><i>Non Residential Development: Relevant BREEAM Assessment</i></p> <p>Core Strategy for the Royal Borough with particular emphasis on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 2015: Excellent; • 2016 onwards: Outstanding; <p>c) require an assessment to demonstrate that the entire dwelling proposed achieves Code for Sustainable Homes Level Four;</p> <p>h) require development to incorporate measures that will contribute production commensurate with the scale of development; "</p> <p>3.17 Currently there is only a Code Level 3 requirement for new housing Regulations and all new build development will be required to be deliverable through another regulatory code and will then cease to not therefore be necessary or reasonable to set a higher standard it therefore require a full appraisal of the viability and feasibility of in The Council should not try to restrict development to including technical Regulations and should pay particular reference to the need to assessment required.</p> <p>3.18 There is also reference in this policy for those developments proposed compliant with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. It is wholly unnecessary is achieved in developments seeking extensions to existing properties Council acknowledge that it is unreasonable to seek Code for Sustainable good'.</p> <p>3.19 Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 achieves a high level of sustainable building regulations standards and enshrined within the ability to a renewable energy technologies and water preservation. These elements construction of new development rather than the extension of existing Core Strategy for the Royal Borough with a particular emphasis on that the Code is not applied to conversions of existing buildings. The requirement for subterranean extensions to be compliant with Code CE1 is not justified.</p>		<p>PPS1 requires Development Plans to include policies which reduce energy use, reduce emissions, promote the development of renewable energy resources, and take climate change impacts into account in the location and design of development. The 2008 Planning Act also requires the Council to contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change. The Code for Sustainable Homes is the government promoted approach to assess the environmental performance of development. It is therefore right and reasonable to use the CfSH to assess the environmental performance of development in the Royal Borough. The Council has proposed setting ambitious targets for environmental sustainable throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy, going beyond statutory requirements (either as part of the Building Regulations or Homes and Community Agencies requirements). Current proposals for amendments to the Building Regulations will only result in improvements to the energy efficiency and water consumption and therefore not enforce any other factors in the CfSH, such as flood risk, air quality and construction management. The HCA proposals only apply to social housing, where the HCA will be requested for funding.</p> <p>The Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study includes the consideration of costs associated with achieving the proposed CfSH levels, demonstrating that this is financially viable. High property prices and advances in technology, design and materials will make the CfSH requirements more financially viable in the future. In addition to this, the Council's proposals for reductions in carbon dioxide are also generally in accordance with those required by the Mayor of London in the draft London Plan.</p> <p>Given the complexity of calculating carbon dioxide emissions from subterranean development, the Council's policy is a pragmatic approach to mitigating the carbon dioxide emissions for this considerably high carbon intensive type of the development. However, propose change to ensure subterranean development meets the EcoHomes standards, which are better suited to existing buildings in accordance with the advice from Pittman Tozer.</p> <p>Planning applications are considered against the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, which includes viability and feasibility having regard to the type and scale of development.</p>	Propose change to Policy CE1(c) to use EcoHomes, which is better suited to assessing the environmental performance of existing buildings where subterranean development is proposed.
Brookfield Developments	Brookfield Developments (UK) Ltd	DP9	Policy CE 1	Climate Change	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS75	<p>Policy CE1 (e)</p> <p>In order to ensure that climate change related measures are appropriately feasible and viable, the following changes are proposed:</p> <p>The Council recognises the Government's targets to reduce national carbon dioxide emissions by 26% against 1990 levels by</p>		<p>The Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study includes the consideration of costs associated with achieving the proposed CfSH levels, demonstrating that this is financially viable. High property prices and advances in technology, design and materials will make the CfSH requirements more financially viable in the future. In addition to this, the Council's proposals for reductions in carbon dioxide are also generally in accordance with</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>2020 in order to meet a 60% reduction by 2050 and will require development to make a significant contribution towards this target.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>e. subject to feasibility and viability 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:</p> <p>i. strategic site allocations at Kensal, Wornington Green, North Kensington Sports Centre and Earl's Court; and"</p>		<p>those required by the Mayor of London in the draft London Plan.</p> <p>Planning applications are considered against the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, which includes viability and feasibility having regard to the type and scale of development.</p>	
Morrison Supermarkets Plc	WM Morrison Supermarket Plc	Peacock and Smith Limited	Policy CE 1	Climate Change	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS85	<p>Our client objects to criteria a) of draft Policy CE1 which requires non-residential development to meet BREEAM standard 'Excellent' in the period to 2015 and BREEAM standard 'Outstanding' thereafter. The Council has not consulted with all sectors of industry to confirm whether BREEAM standards Excellent and Outstanding are achievable or realistic. Therefore we consider that it is crucial for draft Policy CE1 to incorporate some flexibility to ensure that it does not represent an unreasonable burden on companies which could jeopardise investment, regeneration and employment creation in the borough.</p> <p>As currently worded we consider that this policy is unsound as it contains no such flexibility. Accordingly, Morrisons request that Policy CE1 is modified by the insertion of text to confirm that the requirement to meet these BREEAM standards will be subject to tests of viability and suitability.</p>		<p>The Council has consulted on the requirements for BREEAM 'Excellent' and 'Outstanding' in the Core Strategy since July 2008.</p> <p>Planning applications are considered against the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, which includes viability and feasibility having regard to the type and scale of development.</p>	No change proposed.
Owners of 31 Holland Park		London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CE 1	Climate Change		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS91	<p>iv) Sustainability and Renewable Energy</p> <p>3.7 Policy CE1 seeks the following in respect of sustainable development requirements:</p> <p><i>"a) require an assessment to demonstrate that all new buildings and extensions defined as major development achieves the following Code for</i></p> <p><i>2016 onwards: Outstanding;</i></p> <p><i>c) require an assessment to demonstrate that the entire dwelling where subterranean extensions are proposed achieves Code for Sustainable Homes Level Four;</i></p> <p><i>h) require development to incorporate measures that will contribute to onsite sustainable food production commensurate with the scale of development;"</i></p> <p>3.8 Currently there is only a Code Level 3 requirement for new homes. In 2010 this will become part of the Building Regulations and all new build development will be required to be built to Code Level 3. At this point it will be deliverable through another regulatory code and will then cease to be a proper subject for planning control. It would not therefore be necessary or reasonable to set a higher standard in planning legislation. Such a higher standard would therefore require a full appraisal of the viability and feasibility</p> <p>of incorporating such measures into new development. The Council should</p>		<p>PPS1 requires Development Plans to include policies which reduce energy use, reduce emissions, promote the development of renewable energy resources, and take climate change impacts into account in the location and design of development. The 2008 Planning Act also requires the Council to contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change. The Code for Sustainable Homes is the government promoted approach to assess the environmental performance of development. It is therefore right and reasonable to use the CfSH to assess the environmental performance of development in the Royal Borough. The Council has proposed setting ambitious targets for environmental sustainable throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy, going beyond statutory requirements (either as part of the Building Regulations or Homes and Community Agencies requirements). Current proposals for amendments to the Building Regulations will only result in improvements to the energy efficiency and water consumption and therefore not enforce any other factors in the CfSH, such as floodrisk, air quality and construction management. The HCA proposals only apply to social housing, where the HCA will be requested for funding.</p> <p>The Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study includes the consideration of costs associated with achieving the proposed CfSH levels, demonstrating that this is financially viable. High property prices and advances in technology, design and materials will make the CfSH requirements more financially viability in the future. In addition to this, the Council's proposals for reductions in carbon dioxide are also generally in accordance with those required by the Mayor of London in the draft</p>	Propose change to Policy CE1(c) to use EcoHomes, which is better suited to assessing the environmental performance of existing buildings where subterranean development is proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>not try to restrict development to including technologies that are already covered by Building Regulations and should pay particular reference to the need to assess the viability of a development should these be required.</p> <p>39 There is also reference in this policy for those developments proposing subterranean development to be compliant with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. It is wholly unreasonable for the Council to seek that Code Level 4 is achieved in developments seeking extensions to existing properties. In the conversion of existing buildings the Council acknowledge that it is unreasonable to seek Code for Sustainable Homes and retain the BREEM levels of 'very good'.</p> <p>3.10 Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 achieves a high level of sustainable design techniques significantly above the building regulations standards and enshrined within the ability to achieve this level relates to the fabric of the building, renewable energy technologies and water preservation. These elements are much more easily achieved in the construction of new development rather than the extension of existing buildings, hence the reason that the Code is not applied to conversions of existing buildings. Therefore there is no justification of the requirement for subterranean extensions to be compliant with Code Level 4 and this element of Policy CE1 is not justified.</p> <p>Policy CE1</p>		<p>London Plan.</p> <p>Given the complexity of calculating carbon dioxide emissions from subterranean development, the Council's policy is a pragmatic approach to mitigating the carbon dioxide emissions for this considerably high carbon intensive type of the development. However, propose change to ensure subterranean development meets the EcoHomes standards, which are better suited to existing buildings in accordance with the advice from Pittman Tozer.</p> <p>Planning applications are considered against the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, which includes viability and feasibility having regard to the type and scale of development.</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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: Residential Development: Code for Sustainable Homes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 2015: Level three; 2015 - 2021: Level four; 2021 onwards : Level five. <p>Assessment</p> <p>Non Residential Development: Relevant BREEAM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 2015: Excellent; 2016 onwards : Outstanding; 			
Sun Life Assurance Plc	Sun Life Assurance Plc	DP9	Policy CE 1	Climate Change	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS121	<p>Policy CE1</p> <p>The Council needs to set realistic targets in relation to sustainability and ensure that they are technically feasible and will not impact on the viability of development.</p> <p>Targets proposed should also be in line with London Plan targets and timescales.</p> <p>Whilst the Council should commit to the principles of sustainability and high standards of energy conservation, special consideration should be given to the impact on listed buildings, conservation areas and the redevelopment within existing buildings as potential limiting factors.</p> <p>The following amendments to the draft policy are requested:</p>		<p>The Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study includes the consideration of costs associated with achieving the proposed CfSH levels, demonstrating that this is financially viable. High property prices and advances in technology, design and materials will make the CfSH requirements more financially viability in the future. In addition to this, the Council's proposals for reductions in carbon dioxide are also generally in accordance with those required by the Mayor of London in the draft London Plan.</p> <p>Any conflicting issues of planning proposals, including conservation and environmental sustainability, will need to be considered on the individual merits of the case, having regard to development plan policy and material planning considerations, such as viability and feasibility having regard to the type and scale of development. It will be up to the case officer to make a balanced decision, following advice from conservation on what's appropriate given the proposal and the site.</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>"The Council recognises the Government's targets to reduce carbon dioxide <i>emissions by</i></p> <p><i>26% against 1990 levels by 2020 and will require development to make</i></p> <p>significant contributions towards this target.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will where feasible and viable:</p>			
John Lewis Partnership	John Lewis Partnership	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CE 1	Climate Change		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS147	<p>Whilst the principle of seeking a high level of energy efficiency and carbon reduction is supported, we are concerned that the wording of policy CE1 is potentially too prescriptive. We consider that a degree of flexibility is introduced into this policy in order that proper regard is had to the scale, type and location of the proposed development.</p> <p>As currently worded, we do not consider that this policy accords with Planning and Climate Change (Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1) which at paragraphs 33 and 42 states that issues of feasibility and viability are taken into consideration, having regard to the overall costs of bringing sites to the market and the need to avoid any adverse impact on the development needs of communities. We therefore consider this policy to be unsound on the basis that it is not consistent with national policy.</p>		<p>Support noted. PPS1 requires Development Plans to include policies which reduce energy use, reduce emissions, promote the development of renewable energy resources, and take climate change impacts into account in the location and design of development. The 2008 Planning Act also requires the Council to contribute to the mitigation of, and adaption to, climate change.</p> <p>The Council has proposed setting ambitious targets for environmental sustainable throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy, going beyond statutory requirements (either as part of the Building Regulations or Homes and Community Agencies requirements).</p> <p>The Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study includes the consideration of costs associated with achieving the proposed CfSH levels, demonstrating that this is financially viable. High property prices and advances in technology, design and materials will make the CfSH requirements more financially viability in the future. In addition to this, the Council's proposals for reductions in carbon dioxide are also generally in accordance with those required by the Mayor of London in the draft London Plan.</p> <p>Planning applications are considered against the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, which includes viability and feasibility having regard to the type and scale of development.</p>	No change proposed.
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		Policy CE 1	Climate Change		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS207	<p>Climate change</p> <p>41. Policy CE1 of the Core Strategy has <i>developed</i> considerably. The policy is broadly consistent with the London Plan, however, there are areas where the policy could be strengthened and some technical errors that should be corrected.</p> <p>42. The following amendments are suggested to policy CE1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (point d) delete "including those from energy, heating and cooling" it is widely recognised that these are the key areas to be tested -the reference seems to overcomplicate the policy making it ambiguous. (point d) "CHP or CCHP" should be referenced. The cooling strategy should be a passive design solution in line with the energy hierarchy in the London Plan as a starting point. (point d) Where CHP is required, the Council should add "where feasible". (point d) unregulated energy usages should be referenced. (point f) the text is not technically correct as it is not the CHP plant that needs to be able to connect to other CHP plants. Instead, it is the building heating systems and infrastructure that need to be compatible/suitable for being able to connect to external heat 	<p>Support and general consistency with London Plan noted.</p> <p>41. Policy CE1 of the Core Strategy has <i>developed</i> considerably. The policy is broadly consistent with the London Plan, however, there are areas where the policy could be strengthened and some technical errors that should be corrected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with point 1; propose changes. Disagree with point 2, as the requirement for passive cooling is the first requirement in the hierarchy in Policy CE1(d), requiring energy efficient design. Disagree with point 3, as each application will be considered on its individual merits having regard to material planning considerations, such as viability and feasibility. Any flexibility will water down the requirement for applicants to deliver decentralised energy and heat. Agree with point 4; but no change proposed. The Council is relying on the CfSH/BREEAM to improve environmental sustainability. Until unregulated energy use becomes regulated or is considered as part of the CfSH/BREEAM, it will not be expedient for the Council to require 	Propose deletion of "including those from energy, heating and cooling" in CE1(d).	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>networks, where feasible. (possible for of words could be to 'require new developments to select heating systems that are compatible with connection to external district heating networks')</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (point g) reference "where feasible". <p>43. These matters seek to strengthen the Core Strategy and do not raise matters of non-conformity with the London Plan.</p>		<p>this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree with point 5, this policy seeks to create a network of CCHP / CHP or similar, where any excess heat and energy will contribute to the district heat network to be used by other land uses. The Council is currently working with the GLA/LDA to prepare a masterplan to deliver this. Disagree with point 6, as each application will be considered on its individual merits having regard to material planning considerations, such as viability and feasibility. Any flexibility will water down the requirement for applicants to connect and contribute to district heat and energy network. 	
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		Policy CE 1	Climate Change		No	Effective	PSubCS272	<p>28. Policy CE1 sets out ambitious policy guidance relating to sustainable development. Whilst we support your ambitions to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, the Council should be clear that the policy is not overly restrictive and therefore undeliverable. The Inspector will require a robust justification for this policy, for example to explain the hierarchy set out under bullet point d (i-iii).</p>		<p>PPS1 requires Development Plans to include policies which reduce energy use, reduce emissions, promote the development of renewable energy resources, and take climate change impacts into account in the location and design of development. The 2008 Planning Act also requires the Council to contribute to the mitigation of, and adaption to, climate change. The Code for Sustainable Homes is the government promoted approach to assess the environmental performance of development. It is therefore right and reasonable to use the CfSH to assess the environmental performance of development in the Royal Borough. The Council has proposed setting ambitious targets for environmental sustainable throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy, going beyond statutory requirements (either as part of the Building Regulations or Homes and Community Agencies requirements). Current proposals for amendments to the Building Regulations will only result in improvements to the energy efficiency and water consumption and therefore not enforce any other factors in the CfSH, such as floodrisk, air quality and construction management. The HCA proposals only apply to social housing, where the HCA will be requested for funding.</p> <p>The Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study includes the consideration of costs associated with achieving the proposed CfSH levels, demonstrating that this is financially viable. High property prices and advances in technology, design and materials will make the CfSH requirements more financially viability in the future. In addition to this, the Council's proposals for reductions in carbon dioxide are also generally in accordance with those required by the Mayor of London in the draft London Plan.</p> <p>Given the complexity of calculating carbon dioxide emissions from subterranean development, the Council's policy is a pragmatic approach to mitigating the carbon dioxide emissions for this considerably high carbon intensive type of the development. However, propose change to ensure subterranean development meets the EcoHomes standards, which are better suited to existing buildings in accordance with the advice from Pittman Tozer.</p> <p>In any event, all planning applications will be considered against the Development Plan and other material considerations, which includes viability and feasibility having regard to the type and scale of development.</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
The London Planning Practice LLP	The London Planning Practice LLP		Policy CE 1	Climate Change	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS287	<p>Currently there is only a Code Level 3 requirement for new homes. In 2010 this will become part of the Building Regulations and all new build development will be required to be built to Code Level 3. At this point it will be deliverable through another regulatory code and will then cease to be a proper subject for planning control. It would not therefore be necessary or reasonable to set a higher standard in planning legislation. Such a higher standard would therefore require a full appraisal of the viability and feasibility of incorporating such measures into new development. The Council should not try to restrict development to including technologies that are already covered by Building Regulations and should pay particular reference to the need to assess the viability of a development should these be required.</p> <p>There is also reference in this policy for those developments proposing subterranean development to be compliant with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. It is wholly unreasonable for the Council to seek that Code Level 4 is achieved in developments seeking extensions to existing properties. In the conversion of existing buildings the Council acknowledge that it is unreasonable to seek Code for Sustainable Homes and retain the BREEM levels of 'very good'.</p> <p>Therefore there is no justification of the requirement for subterranean extensions to be compliant with Code Level 4 and this element of Policy CE1 is not justified.</p>		<p>PPS1 requires Development Plans to include policies which reduce energy use, reduce emissions, promote the development of renewable energy resources, and take climate change impacts into account in the location and design of development. The 2008 Planning Act also requires the Council to contribute to the mitigation of, and adaption to, climate change. The Code for Sustainable Homes is the government promoted approach to assess the environmental performance of development. It is therefore right and reasonable to use the CfSH to assess the environmental performance of development in the Royal Borough. The Council has proposed setting ambitious targets for environmental sustainable throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy, going beyond statutory requirements (either as part of the Building Regulations or Homes and Community Agencies requirements). Current proposals for amendments to the Building Regulations will only result in improvements to the energy efficiency and water consumption and therefore not enforce any other factors in the CfSH, such as floodrisk, air quality and construction management. The HCA proposals only apply to social housing, where the HCA will be requested for funding.</p> <p>The Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study includes the consideration of costs associated with achieving the proposed CfSH levels, demonstrating that this is financially viable. High property prices and advances in technology, design and materials will make the CfSH requirements more financially viability in the future. In addition to this, the Council's proposals for reductions in carbon dioxide are also generally in accordance with those required by the Mayor of London in the draft London Plan.</p> <p>Given the complexity of calculating carbon dioxide emissions from subterranean development, the Council's policy is a pragmatic approach to mitigating the carbon dioxide emissions for this considerably high carbon intensive type of the development. However, propose change to ensure subterranean development meets the EcoHomes standards, which are better suited to existing buildings in accordance with the advice from Pittman Tozer.</p> <p>Planning applications are considered against the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, which includes viability and feasibility having regard to the type and scale of development.</p>	Propose change to Policy CE1(c) to use EcoHomes, which is better suited to assessing the environmental performance of existing buildings where subterranean development is proposed.
DP9	DP9		Policy CE 1	Climate Change	Yes	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS333	<p>Policy CE1: Climate Change</p> <p><i>Unsound: Not Effective or Consistent with National Policy</i></p> <p>It is considered that the Council should set realistic targets in relation to sustainability and ensure that they are technically feasible and will not impact on the viability of development. Targets proposed should also be in line with London Plan targets and timescales.</p> <p>Whilst the Council should commit to the principles of sustainability and high standards of energy conservation, special consideration should be given to the impact on listed buildings, conservation area and townscape as potential limiting factors.</p>		<p>The Council considers that the introduction of 'subject to viability' is unnecessary as all planning applications are determined according to the development plan and other material planning considerations, including viability, feasibility and being reasonable.</p> <p>Conflicting issues in planning proposals, including conservation and environmental sustainability, are considered on the individual merits of the case, having regard to development plan policy and material planning considerations, having regard to the type and scale of development. It will be up to the case officer to make a balanced decision, following advice from conservation on what's appropriate given the proposal and the site.</p> <p>The Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study includes</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>The following amendments to the draft policy are requested:</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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 subject to feasibility and viability:</i></p> <p><i>i. Residential Development: Code for Sustainable Homes:</i></p> <p><i>Up to 2012: Level Four;</i></p> <p><i>2013 to 2015: Level Five;</i></p> <p><i>2016 onwards: Level Six.</i></p> <p><i>ii. Non Residential Development: Relevant BREEAM Assessment</i></p> <p><i>Up to 2015: Excellent;</i></p> <p><i>2016 onwards: Outstanding</i></p> <p><i>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, subject to feasibility and viability:</i></p> <p><i>i. energy efficient building design...</i></p> <p><i>e. subject to feasibility and viability, 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></p> <p><i>f. subject to feasibility and viability, 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;</i></p> <p><i>g. subject to feasibility and viability, require development to connect into any existing district heat and energy network, where the necessary service or utility infrastructure is accessible to that development;</i></p> <p><i>h. subject to feasibility and viability, require development to incorporate measures that will contribute to on-site sustainable food production commensurate with the scale of development;</i></p> <p><i>i. require, in due course and subject to feasibility and viability, development to further reduce carbon dioxide emissions and mitigate or adapt to climate change, especially from the existing building stock, through financial contributions, planning conditions and extending or raising the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards for other types of development.</i></p>		<p>the consideration of costs associated with achieving the proposed CfSH levels, demonstrating that this is financially viable. High property prices and advances in technology, design and materials will make the CfSH requirements more financially viability in the future. In addition to this, the Council's proposals for reductions in carbon dioxide are also generally in accordance with those required by the Mayor of London in the draft London Plan.</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CE 1	Climate Change		No	Effective	PSubCS434	<p>p227 Policy CE1 Climate change</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>A new criteria is added (para i) requiring development proposals to be supported by a carbon footprint analysis. This will provide a more accurate reflection of the environmental footprint of the development taking in to account factors not covered by the Code for Sustainable Homes. The CfSH does not equate to zero carbon . Changes to the building regulations may not equate to CfSH definitions of Zero Carbon and current requirements for Code 6. Consequently, the changes sought in paras (a) and (b) propose minimum and aspirational targets. In addition, the current drafting goes beyond the building regulations between 2013 and 2015 by requiring Level 5. A further code is being developed for non domestic buildings to replace BREEAM . This is reflected in the proposed changes at paras (a) and (b).</p> <p>Policy CE1(e) should be expressed as subject to viability and feasibility constraints to reflect the need for a development's deliverability to be looked at holistically.</p> <p>Policy CE(h) should be subject to feasibility and good design to ensure feasible and appropriately well designed development.</p> <p>Policy CE(i) should be deleted as it appears to give the Council the ability to leverage financial contributions, impose planning conditions or extend or raise sustainability standards retrospectively in relation to existing development which is onerous.</p> <p>These changes will put in place deliverable targets and make the policy more effective.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CE1</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>(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:</p> <p>(i)Residential Development: Code for Sustainable Homes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 2012: Level Four; • 2013 to 2015: new development should seek to exceed Building Regulations on energy and water and aspire to achieve Level Five <p>• 2016 onwards: in addition to meeting Building Regulations on energy and water, new development should aspire to achieve Level Six</p> <p>(ii)Non Residential Development: Relevant BREEAM Assessment</p>		<p>PPS1 requires Development Plans to include policies which reduce energy use, reduce emissions, promote the development of renewable energy resources, and take climate change impacts into account in the location and design of development. The 2008 Planning Act also requires the Council to contribute to the mitigation of, and adaption to, climate change. The Code for Sustainable Homes is the government promoted approach to assess the environmental performance of development. It is therefore right and reasonable to use the CfSH to assess the environmental performance of development in the Royal Borough.</p> <p>The Council has proposed setting ambitious targets for environmental sustainable throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy, going beyond statutory requirements (either as part of the Building Regulations or Homes and Community Agencies requirements). Current proposals for amendments to the Building Regulations will only result in improvements to the energy efficiency and water consumption and therefore not enforce any other factors in the CfSH, such as floodrisk, air quality and construction management. The HCA proposals only apply to social housing, where the HCA will be requested for funding.</p> <p>The Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study includes the consideration of costs associated with achieving the proposed CfSH levels, demonstrating that this is financially viable. High property prices and advances in technology, design and materials will make the CfSH requirements more financially viability in the future. In addition to this, the Council's proposals for reductions in carbon dioxide are also generally in accordance with those required by the Mayor of London in the draft London Plan.</p> <p>Planning applications are considered against the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, which includes viability and feasibility having regard to the type and scale of development. This does not need to be explicitly stated in each policy. Reference to 'exceeding Building Regulations' is also not appropriate as this will result in only certain components of the CfSH and BREEAM standards being met, such as floodrisk, waste recycling and construction management.</p> <p>The use of carbon footprint analysis may be a useful and interesting analysis tool. However, the approach to calculating the proposed development's heat and energy demand must be calculated in accordance with the methodology used in preparing CfSH assessments, as this depends on predicted emissions. The Council would not expect the development to reduce energy consumption over the lifetime of the building, but be built to maximise reductions in heat and energy from the outset. The approach set out in (proposed i) would not be reasonable or enforceable, as the majority of the savings would depend on "upstream savings" where applicant does not have control. This approach would also be significantly more labour intensive than the approach for enforcing the CfSH and BREEAM standards.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CE1(i) is included as the Council's evidence suggests that the BREEAM / EcoHomes standards may be applied to minor and householder</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>or future replacement code</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 2015: Excellent; 2016 onwards: Outstanding; <p>(b) require an assessment to demonstrate that conversions and refurbishment defined as major development achieves the following relevant BREEAM standards or future replacement code:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(ii) Non Residential Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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); <p>e. require the provision, subject to feasibility and viability, of a Combined Cooling, Heat and Power plant, or similar, which is of suitable size to service the planned development and contribute as part of a district heat and energy network</p> <p>h. require development to incorporate, where feasible and part of good design, measures that will contribute to on-site sustainable food production commensurate with the scale of development</p> <p>[delete i. require, in due course, development to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and mitigate or adapt to climate change, especially from the existing building stock, through financial contributions, planning conditions and extending or raising the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards for other types of development]</p> <p>(i) require a carbon footprint analysis to demonstrate how a whole development will enable [delete achieve] an 80% reduction in total carbon footprint by 2050, taking account of planned reductions in the carbon-intensity of upstream energy generation and the wider economy. Implementation of the assessment recommendations will be monitored at key stages of the development process to ensure commitments to reducing carbon emissions are being met.</p>		<p>applications as well as major development. The implementation of this policy will be subject to consultation and the use of financial contributions will need to be in accordance with Circular 05/2005.</p>	
Mr Matthew Brown	Environment Agency		Policy CE 2	Flooding				PSubCS110	<p>Policy CE 2 Flooding.</p> <p>We are disappointed that this policy fails to mention the Sequential Test. We propose that the following additional point should be shown within this policy,</p> <p>" where required undertake the Sequential Test for planning applications within flood zones 2 and 3"</p> <p>This statement should preferably be located before point b. of Policy CE2 Flooding (Page 229-230). We acknowledge the fact that the sites allocated for development have been sequentially tested, but it would appear that the sequential approach has been</p>		<p>Regarding Policy CE2 Flooding: the Council have undertaken the Sequential test for the strategic sites. Moreover, the requirements to undertake the sequential test are set out in PPS25. We will include reference to the Sequential test in policy CE2 and the reasoning justification.</p> <p>In terms of the comments to point g of the policy (Thames Tunnel) we believe there is no need to remove it from the main policy and make it a separate policy as the Thames Tunnel will have an implication on the volume discharges of sewer water in the Thames which may also have an influence in flooding. No change required.</p>	<p>The inclusion of reference to the sequential test in the wording of Flooding Policy CE2 is recommended. The sentence 'where required undertake the Sequential Test for planning applications within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3' will be included as a new point in the policy (point c). A new paragraph in the reasoning justification will be also included and will read:</p> <p>"To ensure that development is directed first to sites at the lowest probability of flooding, the Council has carried out the 'Sequential Test' on a range of sites (http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/pdf/70%20RBKC%20Sequential%20Test%202009.pdf). Sites within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 that are not</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>been overlooked with regards to planning application.</p> <p>Policy CE2 Point G</p> <p>The Thames Tideway Tunnel policy is welcomed, but it would preferable to include this as an entirely separate policy. The Thames Tideway Tunnel will not have any implications for flood relief, but will have implications for water quality. As such this policy should be place elsewhere within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>We politely request that these additional comments are taken into consideration and are included in further drafts.</p>			included within this appraisal will have to undertake a 'Sequential Test' in line with PPS25".
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		Policy CE 2	Flooding		No	Effective	PSubCS242	<p>It fails to identify the areas at risk from surface water and sewer flooding</p> <p>The policies relating to flooding (CE2) fail to deal with safety measures when basements are proposed in areas of known to be at risk from surface water and sewer flooding. Whilst the policy deals with mitigating the impact of development on other developments through reducing the risk of surface water flooding through the use of sustainable urban drainage systems and controlling the use of impermeable paving of front gardens throughout the Borough, there is a need to ensure that basements proposed in areas of flood risk from surface water and sewer flooding are designed to avoid or control risk of flooding and, in particular, danger to life.</p> <p>Test of soundness:</p> <p>The Society believes that there is therefore a risk that this area of the plan will fail the effectiveness test of soundness, because what is intended may not be achieved. For this reason, we make the following proposal to rectify the soundness issue.</p> <p>Proposal</p> <p>The issue of flood risk from surface water flooding needs to be dealt with more fully:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include further areas of "indicative flood risk zones" (on the map on page 225) for areas which were affected by surface water and sewage flooding in July 2007 and previous incidents since 1980; insert a new policy in CE2 (d) require developments involving basements in areas known to be at risk of surface water and/or sewer flooding to incorporate safety measures to avoid flooding.; prepare a surface water management plan leading to an SPD on flood risk surface water and sewer flooding. 		Comment noted. The Council has adopted recently a Subterranean Development SPD which has regards to the risk of sewer and surface water flooding. Whilst the Council acknowledges the importance of these types of flooding and its devastating effects, we are not in the position to predict accurately which development will be at risk of sewer flooding. More evidence base is needed and we will be working in partnership with the Environment Agency and Thames Water to identify areas with critical drainage problems as explained in the corporate and partnership actions. Moreover, we will prepare a Surface Water Management Plan and a forthcoming flooding DPD to strengthen this policy once further evidence base is in place. No further change required.	No further change required.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		Policy CE 2	Flooding		No	Effective	PSubCS274	30. We note the reference to the Thames Tideway Tunnel in Policy CE2. You will be aware that DEFRA's Water Strategy for England (February 2008) sets out Government support for the construction of the Thames Tideway Tunnel to limit pollution from sewer overflows. This was preceded by a Ministerial Statement, by Ian Pearson, Minister for Climate Change and the Environment on 22 March 2007 on the decision to take the project forward. The Core Strategy should therefore include policy to support the principle of the Thames Tideway Tunnel.		Agred. We acknowledge that the project has Central Government and the Mayor's backing and on this basis reference to the Tunnel has been included at Policy CE2. Paragraph 36.3.19 will be amended to report the support of Central Government and the Mayor.	Amend paragraph 36.3.19 to read: 'Thames Water has been instructed by the Government to develop and implement a scheme, the Thames Tideway Tunnel, which will reduce the amount of untreated sewage that currently overflows directly to the river Thames after rainfall. The proposed Thames Tunnel will capture sewage discharges from existing Combined Sewage Overflows (CSOs) into a new tunnel and transfer the collected sewage for treatment. The importance and London-wide benefits of the Thames tideway Tunnel are recognised by the Government and the Greater London Authority. On this basis, the Council will ensure that the impacts of the works associated with the tunnel are carefully managed.'
Miss Robina Rose	(The Ladbroke Association)		Policy CE 2	Flooding		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS342	MAP p 225 Needs to include red area of Thames Water Counters Creek Study showing risk of sewer flooding in the North of the Borough. TEST of Soundness 4 Allows for departure from National Policy (in this case Environment Agency Fluvial Flood risk zones) as a result of local circumstance and study.		Noted. Information obtained from the Thames Water Counters Creek Study has been used in the production of the Sequential test. However, it is a model and therefore only indicative. Whilst the Council acknowledges the importance of sewer flooding and its devastating effects, we are not in the position to predict accurately which development will be at risk of sewer flooding. More evidence base is needed and we will be working in partnership with the Environment Agency and Thames Water to identify areas with critical drainage problems as explained in the corporate and partnership actions. Moreover, we will prepare a Surface Water Management Plan and a forthcoming flooding DPD once further evidence base is in place. No change required at this stage.	No change required at this stage.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CE 2	Flooding		No	Effective	PSubCS435	p229 Policy CE2 Flooding Reasons The change in (a) is proposed to be consistent with terminology in PPS25. As currently drafted the policy would resist uses such as hotels, health services and education uses in buildings within Zone 3. This is inconsistent with the findings of the SFRA which advises that land in Zone 3 should not be used for basement flats but is acceptable for most other uses The change in (d) is proposed to reflect more accurately deliverable solutions. The Council's response to Capital & Counties' earlier representations refer to its intention to strengthen the approach to reduce, the risk of flooding. However, the current drafting requires a reduction in the "volume" of discharge which in practice, is likely to be impossible to achieve in most instances. This is due to the impermeable ground conditions in areas underlain by clay, which is typical of the local area. The proposed drafting will make the policy effective and sound. Changes sought 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.		Noted. Table D1 of the PPS25 (page 23) states that in Flood Zone 3a (high probability): "The water-compatible and less vulnerable uses of land in Table D.2 are appropriate in this zone. The highly vulnerable uses in Table D.2 should not be permitted in this zone. The more vulnerable and essential infrastructure uses in Table D.2 should only be permitted in this zone if the Exception Test (see para. D.9) is passed". There is no need to repeat national policy in our policies and the Environment Agency has supported the wording of this policy as it tries to tackle the local issues that the Borough is facing. We therefore believe there is no need to change the wording of point a. In terms of point d, due to the surface and sewer problems the Borough faces, it is important that the use of SUDs is required to reduce <u>both</u> the volume and speed of water run-off. There is a large range of SUDs that could be implemented to achieve this such as landscaping areas, retention ponds, water tanks, etc. Changing the wording of this point will result in a weakening of the policy and will be against our resident's opinion. No change required.	No change required.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>(a) resist highly 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' 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;</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 sustainable urban drainage, or other measures, to reduce [delete 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 [delete volume and] speed of water run off to the drainage system;</p> <p>(e) resist impermeable surfaces in front gardens;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(g) require works associated with the construction of the Thames Tideway Tunnel to:</p> <p>(i) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cheyne, Royal Hospital and Thames Conservation areas;</p> <p>(ii) preserve the setting of listed buildings and Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest (i.e. the Royal Hospital grounds);</p> <p>(iii) not adversely impact on amenity;</p> <p>(iv) not compromise the future of Cremorne Wharf which is a Safeguarded Wharf.</p>			
Mr Matthew Brown	Environment Agency		Policy CE 3	Waste				PSubCS117	<p>Policy no: CE3 Waste</p> <p>Page no: 231</p> <p>Paragraph:</p> <p>Why it is legally compliant or Sound?</p> <p>This policy is legally compliant and sound by virtue of it making reference to the London Plan. The policy also states major application be supported by Site Waste Management Plans this is in line with national policy. It also states that there are plans for a DPD exclusively for waste. This is encouraged</p>		General support to the soundness of the Core Strategy. No changes required.	No changes required.
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		Policy CE 3	Waste		No	Effective	PSubCS273	29 Policy CE3 includes a commitment to meet the apportionment figure in the London Plan and to prepare a waste DPD to show how the apportionment figure will be met. We welcome this commitment. However, we also seek confirmation of the		Noted. The timetable for the proposed Waste DPD will be confirmed in the LDS. No change required.	No change required.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									proposed timetable for the DPD, given the risk of infraction proceedings by the EU Commission in 2010.			
Port of London Authority Lucy Owen	Port of London Authority		Policy CE 3	Waste	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS325	Policy CE3 is concerned with waste. It seeks to prepare a waste specific DPD which will safeguard the existing waste management sites along with Cremorne Wharf, maximising its use for waste management, water transport and cargo handling purposes. As the Council will be aware Cremone Wharf is safeguarded by Ministerial Direction and Policy 4C.9 of the <i>London Plan</i> seeks to protect safeguarded wharves for cargo handling uses and this includes for waste uses. Additionally Policy 4A.22 of the <i>London Plan</i> seeks for DPD's to safeguard waste sites, including wharves with an existing or future potential for waste management. The Council's approach to Cremone Wharf would therefore appear to broadly accord with <i>London Plan</i> policy.		This comment appears to support the soundness of the Core Strategy. No changes required.	No changes required.
Port of London Authority Lucy Owen	Port of London Authority		Policy CE 3	Waste	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS326	Paragraph 36.3.23 highlights how the Borough is very accessible by river which can provide opportunities for sustainable transportation of residual waste. Whilst this reference is welcomed it is considered that this section of the core strategy could go further. The use of the river is a sustainable mode of transport which could assist the Council in achieving its environmental aspirations through the transport of people and freight.		Noted. Reference to the use of waterways can be found in chapter 32: "Better Travel Choices", paragraph 32.3.11. Moreover, Policy CT1, <i>Improving alternatives to car use</i> , (located in the same chapter) includes a point (m) which "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". In addition, paragraph 36.3.23 explains that as the Borough is very accessible by river and rail, it can provide opportunities for sustainable transportation of residual waste. Therefore, the role the river could play in meeting the Council's environmental objectives has already been sufficiently explained. No further action required.	No further action required.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CE 3	Waste		No	Effective	PSubCS436	<p>p231 Policy CE3 Waste</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The proposed change in (b) brings the policy in line with terminology in the Respecting Environmental Limits map on page 225 and paras 36.3.22 and 36.3.25. Waste "treatment" plants (in their broad waste industry sense) are not appropriate to the EC Regeneration Area. A "sorting plant" would also not be suitable due to potential amenity impacts.</p> <p>The change in (d) provides flexibility for an effective policy as achieving this requirement will be dependent on third parties and may not be deliverable in all cases.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>(b) require on-site waste [delete treatment] management 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);</p> <p>(d) require that where feasible and viable development proposals make use of the rail and the waterway network for the transportation of construction waste and other waste;</p>		Noted. Point b of Policy CE3 Waste will be amended to read "waste management facilities" which could include recycling and anaerobic digestion. The SPD on Earl's Court will set out the requirements for the waste management facilities on site.	Change wording in policy CE3 (point b) to read "waste management facilities".
Mr Matthew Brown	Environment Agency		Policy CE 4	Biodiversity				PSubCS118	Policy no: CE4 Biodiversity		Support of the soundness of the Core Strategy noted.	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Page no: 232</p> <p>Paragraph:</p> <p>Why it is legally compliant or Sound?</p> <p>The policy is legally compliant and sound by virtue of it stating that it will protect the biodiversity in and adjacent to Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and producing Biodiversity Area Action Plans. The Blue Ribbon Network has been used to as evidence. This evidence has been used to inform Policy CE4 Biodiversity.</p>			
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		Policy CE 6	Noise and Vibration	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS306	<p>Policy CE6 refers to the impact on noise and vibration on amenity. Again amenity needs to be defined and linked to health and wellbeing (see Policy CL5). Reference should be made to noise transference between dwellings and the need for sound insulation and standards for vertical or horizontal positioning of noisy rooms or corridors (perhaps in Policy CH2).</p>		<p>Amenity is defined in the Glossary (section 45 of the Core Strategy). The impact of the Core Strategy policies on health and well being are examined in the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Noise transference between dwellings is generally controlled through Approved Document E of the Building Regulations. However, Policy CE6 of the Core Strategy refers to local noise and vibration standards, which are set out in the Noise SPD. The SPD also includes requirements for sound insulation and separation of habitable rooms in noise sensitive development.</p>	No change proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CE 6	Noise and Vibration		No	Effective	PSubCS437	<p>p233 para 36.3.42 Policy CE6 Noise and vibration</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The proposed changes provide flexibility for development proposals to meet the Core Strategy objectives. The Council's response to Capital & Counties' earlier representations state that additional flexibility is introduced in to this version of the policy but this does not seem to have occurred. The change proposed in (b) retains references to national and regional guidance in earlier draft of the policy and qualifies the factors to be taken in to account in considering exceptions. The change proposed in (d) is required for a deliverable policy. In practice it will not always be possible to "enhance" quiet areas.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CE6</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(b) resist developments which fail to meet national, regional and local noise and vibration standards guidance as contained in the Council's Noise SPD, without suitable justification having regard to the circumstances of the site and development proposal and the potential to achieve the Borough's strategic objectives;</p>		<p>Comments noted. Development proposals must meet the local standards set out in the Council's Noise SPD, adopted May 2009. This SPD is prepared in accordance with national policy and in general conformity with regional planning policy. Planning applications are also considered in accordance with national and regional policy. In nearly every case, Policy CE6 could be implemented without impacting on the potential to achieve the strategic objectives, through design and adequate sound insulation. This does not need to be explicit in the policy.</p> <p>In terms of flexibility, all applications are considered on their individual merits having regard to development plan policies and other material considerations, which include being appropriate and reasonable having regard to the site, scale of development and type of development. Again, this does not need to be explicit in the Core Strategy policy.</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>(c) resist all applications for noise and vibration generating development and plant that would have an unacceptable noise and vibration impact on surrounding amenity;</p> <p>(d) require that development protects, respects and where feasible enhances the attributes of the special significance and tranquillity of tranquil quiet areas.</p>			
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		Policy CF 1	Location of New Shop Uses		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS205	<p>Hotel protection</p> <p>The impact of reducing concentrations of hotels should not be at the expense of the borough contributing to meeting the need for more hotels (40,000 net additional hotel bedrooms) across London in more appropriate locations. London Plan policy 3D.7 seeks to "resist the loss of strategically important hotel capacity". Current drafting may result in harm to implementation of policy 3D.7 and emerging policy 4.5 of the draft consultation replacement London Plan. There is no commentary regarding the Council's specific concerns at Earl's Court or why specific reference to the area is made with in policy. Officers understand that there may be local issues with the management and amenity impacts of hotel provision in the area, which may support the Council's preferred approach. The approach within the policy is, however, not currently justified as required by PPS 12 and may harm the Mayor's target to deliver new hotel bedspaces and protect important strategic supply. Currently, therefore, this matter should be taken forward for discussion at any subsequent examination</p>		<p>Following discussions with officers of the GLA, officers have provided further information which the Council expects to satisfy the GLA that the policy which allows loss of hotels in the Earl's Court in not an issue of general conformity. This will be confirmed in a statement of common ground.</p> <p>The Council's hotel survey indicates that the hotels within the Earl's Court ward contains approximately 2,300 bedrooms. Whilst this is the theoretical number of rooms that could be lost, it remains just that - theoretical.</p> <p>Monitoring of permissions via the London Development Database (and implementation of these permissions) indicates that despite no policy protection of hotels in Earl's Court Ward, there have been just seven applications since 2006 for the loss of just 238 rooms. Three of these applications (the loss of 136 rooms) have been implemented to date.</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this situation will change, particularly when one takes the Major's estimates of a potential growth of the sector of a further 40,000 hotel bedrooms, into account.</p> <p>This minimal loss of bedspaces is extremely likely to be countered by the positive approach that the Core Strategy is taking to new hotels in Higher Order Town Centres across the Borough. In addition, the Council is expecting a significant amount of new hotel space in the wider Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity area. Whether this space lies within this Borough or in Hammersmith and Fulham remains to be seen. However, this is perhaps of limited importance given that the Mayor is concerned about the wider sub-regional picture.</p> <p>Therefore, the Council considers that there is likely to be a net increase of hotel bedrooms thought the Borough (and the wider area) rather than a loss. If there were to be any loss it is not of a scale that could not be described as "strategically important." Clearly, one of the advantages of the LDF system is that the Council could review its position if this proves necessary in the future.</p>	No change.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CF 1	Location of New Shop Uses		No	Effective	PSubCS401	<p>p171 Policy CF1 Location of new shop uses</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p> <p>The supporting text should acknowledge that town centre uses are proposed in the Earls Court Regeneration Area. The strategic</p>		<p>The Council concurs with the consultees that it would be appropriate to make reference within the supporting text to the ambitions for the Earl's Court Strategic Site and wider area (the site lying in both this borough and in Hammersmith and Fulham.) These ambitions include housing and a number of town centre uses, uses which include small scale retail, large scale offices and a significant cultural use. This has already been made explicit within Council's Earl's Court Strategic Place (para 10.4.2), and by the allocation for Earl's Court Place</p>	<p>Suggested new para after 31.5.5</p> <p>In addition a significant amount of development is expected within the plan period on the Earl's Court 'wider site'. This site, designated within the Revised London Plan as an Opportunity Area, straddles the boundary with Hammersmith and Fulham. Both the quantum of development, and its detailed nature (including whether the</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>site policy (with Capital & Counties proposed changes) confirms the site as a suitable location for cultural, leisure, hotel office and retail uses. There are a number of factors supporting a future town centre on the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the strategy refers to the site being able to meet existing retail deficiencies in the area (para 3.3.10) - the Council in its response to Capital & Counties' earlier representations recognises that new development on the site will generate additional demand for town centre uses - the Vision anticipates a cultural destination on the site - the Opportunity Area status of the site means it is a focus for high density mixed used development. The draft London Plan refers to the site having a strategic role - initial assessment work undertaken by Capital & Counties supports approx 720,000 sqm of town centre uses (office, retail, hotel, destination) on the Regeneration Area although the proposed quantum will be considered in greater detail as part of the forthcoming Planning Framework <p>The location of a new centre within the Regeneration Area will be determined through the Masterplan process and it may potentially be concentrated more within the LBHF part of the Regeneration Area.</p> <p>The Council's response to Capital & Counties' earlier representations advises that designating a new centre would be premature and that a new centre could only be designated if the Council is satisfied it would not have a detrimental impact on existing centres. It also is concerned to avoid an indication that the Council is giving carte blanche for retail uses on the site.</p> <p>Reference to an "Appropriate" centre together with the additional text in the proposed change makes it clear that the designation needs to be appropriate and is subject to further assessment. The Council in its response suggests that policy CF1 provides scope to permit out of centre retail development. However, the proposed designation is relevant as a Masterplan for the Regeneration Area will also include town centre uses other than retail. The Council recognises that town centres are about more than just shopping, providing important places where people live, work and visit for leisure activities (para 31.3.21). This is reflected in the strategic site allocation and inherent in promoting new cultural facilities that comprise a destination.</p> <p>The proposed change will comply with the "town centre first" approach advocated in para 31.2.1 and advice in PPS6 that boroughs should adopt a positive and proactive approach to planning for the future of centres. The change will provide clarity, making the strategy effective and sound</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>The Council will ensure vital and viable town centres through a town centre first approach to new retail floorspace.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p>		<p>(CA7). The development allocated is of the scale and nature suitable for a neighbourhood centre designation</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council is aware that much of the Earl's Court Strategic Site and 'wider area' does lie in an area more than 400 m from another centre. Parts of the Kensal and Latimer areas are in the same position and have been identified as suitable locations for new centres. The Earl's Court Strategic Site (and wider area) had not, which was an anomaly.</p> <p>The Council is, therefore, of the opinion that being explicit in its support for the creation of a neighbourhood centre on part of the Earl's Court Strategic Site (or wider site) to would add consistency to the document. The scale of the neighbourhood centre will have to comply with PPS4, in that it should not 'cannibalise' other centre. Its function will be to serve the day-today needs of local residents (both existing and that generated by the proposed development), and not as a centre for comparison retailing to compete with neighbouring centres.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate to designate the site as a centre given the uncertainty over the quantum of development, and the fact that the site may be located in Hammersmith and Fulham. These issues will be resolved by the planning brief currently being prepared on the wider opportunity area site. This brief is listed on the Council's LDS.</p> <p>The Council therefore, will support the provision a new centre, rather than 'designating' it as such. Any policy should make it clear that the centre will serve the day-today needs of residents of the area rather than being centre which serves a wider comparison role. The Retail Needs Assessment does not show a comparison need in this part of the borough in the next five years.</p>	<p>constituent parts lie in this Borough or within Hammersmith and Fulham) will be established within a future planning brief. However, it is likely that the wider area will include a significant amount of housing, as well as business uses, hotel floorspace, and a destination cultural facility. This development is likely to generate some retail 'need'. A neighbourhood centre in the area will, therefore, be appropriate, as long it is of a scale which does not harm the vitality of nearby centres. A new centre is 'supported' rather than 'required' as it is possible that its eventual location may be in Hammersmith and Fulham.</p> <p>CF1</p> <p>Add an additional criteria</p> <p>e) Support the establishment of a new neighbourhood centre in the Earl's Court Opportunity Area, to serve the day-to-day needs of residents of the development.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>(a) support the creation of new shop floorspace within town centres;</p> <p>(b) require new retail development with a floor area of 400 m² (4,300 ft²) (gross external) or more 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;</p> <p>(c) permit new shops (A1) of less than 400 m² (4,300 ft²)(gross external) in areas of retail deficiency as shown on the plan within Chapter 30 (<i>Keeping Life Local</i>) ;</p> <p>(d) require the establishment of new centres in the Latimer and Kensal areas and the Earls Court Regeneration Area to address identified retail deficiency;</p> <p>(e) require, where proposals for new retail development do not comply with parts (a) to (d), that it is demonstrated either:</p> <p>a.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the need for the proposal; and 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 ii. that the new floorspace would underpin the Council's regeneration objectives and the vitality of any existing centre will not be harmed. 			
Barclays Bank Plc	Barclays Bank Plc	Shireconsulting	Policy CF 1	Location of New Shop Uses	Yes	Yes		PSubCS481	<p>The 'Strategic Objectives' for the Core Strategy are set out on page 11 and the Bank firmly believes that improving the provision of financial services in shopping areas that are fully accessible to the public accords particularly with the Objectives of "<i>Keeping Life Local</i>", "<i>Fostering Vitality</i>", "<i>Better Travel Choices</i>" and "<i>Renewing the Legacy</i>". In this regard the Bank notes the broad direction of policies such as "<i>CF1 Location of New Shop Uses</i>" "<i>CF2 Retail Development within Town Centres</i>" and "<i>CF3 Diversity of uses within Town Centre</i>" in seeking to protect existing centres and direct new trip generating development towards existing centres as being the most sustainable locations. This should also help in minimising car use and thereby help to combat climate change.</p>		<p>The Council concurs with the view that banks are appropriate town centre uses. It is the proportion of shop/non shop uses which is important in maintaining diverse, vital and vibrant town centres.</p>	No change.
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CF 1	Location of New Shop Uses	Yes	Yes		PSubCS508	<p>Policy CF 1: Location of New Shop Use</p> <p>KHT supports the recognition within the Core Strategy that areas within the Borough not within a five minute walk of a centre are within an area of deficiency. KHT notes that paragraph 31.3.5 refers to Latimer and Kensal as areas of deficiency. KHT considers that paragraph 31.3.5 should refer to part of Wornington</p> <p>Green being within an area of deficiency, reflecting the 'Keeping Life Local: Social and Community Uses, Local Shopping Facilities and Walkable Neighbourhoods' diagram on page 164.</p> <p>KHT supports the principle of Policy CF 1 that new shops (A1) of less than 400 metres (gross external) will be permitted in areas of retail deficiency as shown within the diagram 'Keeping Life Local: Social and Community Uses, Local Shopping Facilities and Walkable Neighbourhoods' diagram on page 164. In addition, KHT supports the requirement that where proposals for new retail development do not comply with parts (a) to (d) that it</p>		<p>The Council notes that the consultees are not questioning the soundness of the document.</p> <p>Para 31,3,5 notes the areas which are deficient in shops and where a new centre is sought (or supported) by the Council. The Council does not support the provision of a new town centre in the Wornington area, rather just a parade to meet the needs of the area's residents. Policy CF1 is considered to offer the necessary flexibility to support such a parade. In addition CF1 notes the role that new retail floorspace can play in supporting the regeneration of the area.</p> <p>PPS6 gives LPAs a degree of flexibility with regard requiring the impact of new retail development on adjoin centres to be assessed. The Council considers that proposals for more than 400 sq m gross (a unit which approximately equates to a 'metro' sized unit) have the potential to harm adjoin centres. An impact assessment is therefore considered to be appropriate. This is not to say that all developments greater than 400 sq m will</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>is demonstrated either:</p> <p>I. That need for the proposal, and the development would meet the requirements of the sequential test, and the development would not have an unacceptable impact on existing centres; or</p> <p>II. That the new floorspace would underpin the Council's regeneration objectives and that the vitality of any existing centre would not be harmed.</p> <p>PPS1 recognises that retail provision may be appropriate as part of delivering mixed-use, balanced and sustainable development, where the provision would meet local needs. PPS6 recognises that the provision of retail units can aid redevelopment and that local retail needs should be met. The London Plan positively encourages the provision of retail as part of mixed use developments in accessible locations for local provision. KHT notes that part 'c' of Policy CF 1 permits new shops of less than 400 square metres (gross external) in areas of retail deficiency. KHT considers that part 'c' should seek to avoid unnecessary prescription and should contain a degree of flexibility in order to assist the provision of new retail development in areas of retail deficiency. KHT considers it may be appropriate for the Council to permit new shops (A1) exceeding 400 square metres (gross external) as part of delivering mixed-use, balanced sustainable development, where the provision would meet local needs.</p> <p>KHT suggests that the reference to 'need' within part 'e' (ii) of Policy CF 1 is removed. PPS6 requires impact tests to generally be undertaken for proposals in excess of 2,500 square metres gross floorspace, recognising that they may occasionally be necessary for smaller developments, such as those likely to have a significant impact on smaller centres, depending on the relative size and nature of the development in relation to the centre (paragraph 3.23). KHT suggests that this is reflected within Policy CF 1.</p> <p>KHT suggests that Policy CF 1 should be consistent with the suggested amendments to Policy CA 2 reflected within these representations.</p>		necessarily be refused, just that an impact assessment is carried out to the Council's satisfaction.	
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturge on behalf of Metro Shopping Fund LP	Policy CF 2	Retail Development within Town Centres		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS13	<p>The requirement set out in Policy CF2 for both a range of shop unit sizes and the provision of "affordable shops" is not justified by a robust and credible evidence base, nor is it effective and it is inconsistent with national planning policy.</p> <p>First, it will not always be appropriate for large-scale development to provide a range of shop unit sizes. What is important is that new retail development meets modern retailer requirements and thereby helps to strengthen the vitality and viability of the centre. To do otherwise in the absence of a robust and credible evidence base would prevent the development complying with other LDF requirements to promote the vitality and viability of town centres and would be inconsistent with national policy, which seeks an efficient and competitive retail sector.</p> <p>In order for criterion B of this policy to be sound, it should either be deleted or re-worded as follows:</p> <p>"Require shop units in new major retail development that are able to meet the needs of modern retailers and resist the loss of retail space where it would harm the vitality and viability of the town</p>		<p><i>Range of unit sizes</i></p> <p>The Council is concerned about maintaining vibrant, vital and diverse town centres, centres which retain their character and which provide a diverse range of shop types. The Council set up a Retail Commission to examine this issue. This Commission concluded that the provision of small shop units was one way of helping provide for this diversity. Different retailers require different retail units, some larger and some smaller. Therefore, by supporting the provision of a mix of unit sizes the Council can help maintain diversity within centres. This is one of the few tools that LPA have to achieve this aim.</p> <p>The newly published PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth) supports the Council's approach with Policy EC4.1 explicitly recognising that LPA "should plan to promote competitive town centre environments and provide consumer choice by ... (b) recognising that smaller shops can significantly enhance the character and vibrancy of the centre". The preservation of existing</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>centre.”</p> <p>The second objection is that large scale retail development or mixed-use development is required to provide affordable shops. Such a requirement is unsound. This is because the requirement for “affordable shops” is not justified by a sufficiently robust and credible evidence base, would not be effective as it would not be sufficiently flexible to deal with changing circumstances, would not be deliverable in achieving its aims, would be out of step with the strategies of the neighbouring authorities and the requirement would not be consistent with national policy, where there is no basis for the concept of “affordable shops”, with Government policy actively supporting a competitive and efficient retail sector, making it clear that it is not the role of the planning system to become involved in competition between retailers.</p> <p>In addition, the case against “affordable retail” can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retailers do not require “social support” in the same way as less fortunate members of our community require help with the provision of affordable housing. • Artificially supporting retailers who are unable to stand on their own two feet (because they do not attract enough shoppers to make them viable concerns) will weaken the vitality and viability of the town centre, not strengthen it. • If a proportion of new retail units in a development have to be supported, then in effect they will be subsidised by the other retailers in the scheme, which is clearly unfair and puts them at a competitive disadvantage. • This would simply be an additional tax on retail development, which would reduce the amount of shopping development within town centres, again harming their vitality and viability. What is important is that new retail development is encouraged as this is what will enhance centres. • Subsidies are not needed. The market already provides a large spectrum of rents within each centre. • The viability of a retail business is much more about getting the product right, effective merchandising, the ability to respond to demand and good marketing, than it is about rents. • The Council is not the one best placed to choose what local shoppers want. The customer is. • The concept of affordable shops is unworkable. It raises numerous questions such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How would one identify which retailers would be eligible for a subsidised unit? o What happens when that retailer is shown to be performing well – would they then have to vacate their business premises? o If not, then what would be the mechanism for stopping a subsidy to a strong profitable business? o Who would be responsible for monitoring and judging the performance of the subsidised retailers? 		<p>small units may be difficult as planning permission is not normally required for the amalgamation of small units into a smaller number of larger units. The use of s106 agreements or conditions to require the provision of small units therefore may have a role to play in maintaining diversity.</p> <p>Similarly part (f) of Policy EC4.1 states that LPAs should "take measures to converse and, where appropriate, enhance the established character and diversity of their town centres." As outlined above, the provision of small units is a central part of achieving the diversity required by the Council.</p> <p>The Council does, however, recognise that the provision of a range of unit sizes within large retail development may not always be appropriate. The supporting text for this policy (para 31.3.18) was amended following the Publication Draft Core Strategy to explicitly recognise that whilst the starting point was that all large scale retail development would provide a mix of unit sizes, they may be cases where this could not be appropriate. Council will only seek the provision of a mix of unit sizes where "the viability of the wider scheme is not jeopardised".</p> <p><i>Affordable shops</i></p> <p>The creation of affordable shops (to be managed under the Council's neighbourhood shopping policy) is one of the few tools in the Council's possession which allows it to take an active role in helping shape the nature of retailers within our town centres. It is a policy position that was initially put forward by the Council's Retail Commission.</p> <p>It is also a policy position which since has been supported by the Mayor for London, with Policy 4.9 of the Consultation Draft Replacement London Plan (Small shops) stating that "In considering proposals for large retail developments, the Mayor will seek contributions through planning obligations where appropriate, feasible and viable, to support the provision of affordable shop units suitable for small or independent retailers." Although this policy has yet to have been examined it clearly shows intended direction of the London Plan, a document which this Council will have to be in general conformity with, and a document which will form part of this Council's development plan.</p> <p>As with the requirement to provide a mix of unit sizes, the Council recognises that the provision of affordable shops will not always be appropriate, not where this will jeopardise the viability of the wider scheme. Furthermore, the provision of an affordable unit is one of a series of benefits which could be sought under the s106 system for suitable developments.</p> <p>With regard the specific objections:</p> <p><i>" Retailers do not require "social support" in the same way as less fortunate members of our community require help with the provision of affordable housing."</i></p> <p>One of the purposes of planning is to shape the nature</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Such interference in the market should not be supported, when it has not been justified with robust and credible evidence, would not be effective and would be inconsistent with national policy.</p> <p>In order for Policy CF2 to be sound, criterion C should be deleted. In addition, the eleventh point in the summary table on page 168 (against which representations cannot be made separately), should be deleted.</p>		<p>of development and to provide uses which Council and the community consider to be valuable but which the market is not providing. Supporting particular types of retailers is therefore considered to be a useful tool in maintaining the diversity of the Boroughs town centres.</p> <p><i>Provision of affordable shops will weaken the vitality and viability of the town centre</i></p> <p>It is not correct to suggest that the provision of an 'affordable shop' will necessarily weaken the vitality and viability of a town centre. The 'affordable shop' could diversify the draw of a centre, thereby increasing both its viability and vitality. Furthermore, affordable shops will be of particular value in those centres which are so "vibrant" that high rents price out all but those able to afford high rents. In such centres weakening of viability is unlikely.</p> <p>Furthermore, the shop provided could be of a type of particular importance in maintaining the character of the centre in which it lies. It is the character of the centres which attracts the visitors that they do and makes the centres the valued places that they are. For example, the antiques trade (and antique arcades) is one the Portobello Road's retail strengths. However, there is concern that antique dealers are finding it increasingly difficult to compete with other retailers who are more able to afford increasing rents. The provision of an affordable shop, were it occupied as an antique arcade, could therefore play a significant contribution in maintaining the character of the centre and assist in maintaining its diversity and in attracting visitors in to the wider centre.</p> <p>Alternatively, the affordable use (for example a convenience shop of some type) may simply provide a valued service to local people, which is not being provided by the market. This service may be justified as may be of value in itself but may also attract people into the centre.</p> <p><i>If a proportion of new retail units in a development have to be supported, then in effect they will be subsidised by the other retailers in the scheme, which is clearly unfair and puts them at a competitive disadvantage .</i></p> <p>The principle of subsidising units exists within the planning system, in the form of affordable housing. There is no reason why this principle cannot be extended to retail units as long as the tests in circular 5/05 are met.</p> <p><i>This would simply be an additional tax on retail development, which would reduce the amount of shopping development within town centres, again harming their vitality and viability. What is important is that new retail development is encouraged as this is what will enhance centres.</i></p> <p>The Council has explained that affordable shops will only be sought where the viability of the proposal would not be jeopardised. The provision of an affordable unit would be offset against the provision of alternative s106 contributions, where the provision of the unit is</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>considered of more value than the alternative.</p> <p><i>Subsidies are not needed. The market already provides a large spectrum of rents within each centre.</i></p> <p>Whilst a range of rents may be provided across a centre the Council recognises that the range of shops needed to serve needs of both residents and visitors is not always met.</p> <p><i>The viability of a retail business is much more about getting the product right, effective merchandising, the ability to respond to demand and good marketing, than it is about rents.</i></p> <p>Whilst merchandising etc is important so is the level of rents (and associated rates). This has been established by a number of discussions of retailers within the Borough.</p> <p><i>The Council is not the one best placed to choose what local shoppers want. The customer is.</i></p> <p>The Council Council's neighbourhood shopping policy has successfully operated for some time, providing a range of the convenience shops needed by local people.</p> <p>It is a not correct to suggest that the market always provides what "local shoppers want". In reality the market tends to provide the occupiers who can afford the highest rents. Whilst this may be the type of occupier wanted by local people this is not necessarily the case.</p> <p>The market tends to provide shops occupied by retailers which can afford the greatest rents. This is not always the same as the types of retailers which necessarily contribute greatest to the diversity of the centre, which provide for the particular day-to-day needs of local people. With affordable shops, the Council would be in a position to use its knowledge of its centre to let units to occupiers who add to its 'wider attraction'.</p> <p><i>The concept of affordable shops is unworkable. It raises numerous questions such as how would one identify which retailers would be eligible for a subsidised unit?</i></p> <p>Retail units provided would be handed over to the Council who would manage these under the 'Neighbourhood Shopping Scheme'. Under this scheme The Council lets units to types retailers who meet the criteria set out in the scheme. Rents reflect the nature of the occupier.</p> <p><i>Not sufficiently flexible to deal with changing circumstance.</i></p> <p>Affordable shops would be managed over the Neighbourhood Shopping Policy. This is considered to provide the necessary flexibility.</p> <p><i>Out of step with the strategies of the neighbouring authorities</i></p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>The lack of a similar policy, at this time, within neighbouring polices is no reason for the Borough not to have a policy. Policies should meet the particular needs and circumstances of an area. There is particular concern in this Borough about the maintenance of the special character of the own centres. Furthermore, the principle of affordable shops now appears within the Consultation Draft Replacement London Plan.</p> <p><i>Requirement would not be consistent with national policy, where there is no basis for the concept of "affordable shops"</i></p> <p>There is nothing within national policy which precludes the provision of affordable shops. Indeed PPS4 actively encourages LPA to take measures to conserve and enhance the established character an diversity of their town centres.</p> <p><i>Government policy actively supporting a competitive and efficient retail sector, making it clear that it is not the role of the planning system to become involved in competition between retailers.</i></p> <p>The principal role of the 'affordable shops' policy is to provide types of retailers not provided by the market, not to support one retailer above another.</p>	
John Lewis Partnership	John Lewis Partnership	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CF 2	Retail Development within Town Centres		No	Justified	PSubCS143	<p>Whilst JL generally supports the Core Strategy, there are certain elements of this which we do not consider to be sound and therefore require further analysis and/ or amendments.</p> <p>Policy CF2 (Retail Development within Town Centres)</p> <p>In representations to earlier stages of the Core Strategy consultation we have set out concerns regarding the impact a section 106 requirement to fund small affordable units can have on development viability. As previously stated, JL consider that a vibrant and varied retail sector shouldbe encouraged through mechanisms such as investment in high streets and the public realm to retain local character, greater public and private collaboration and support for business improvement districts.</p>		<p>The Council recognises that there are a number of mechanisms which can be used to assist in the provision of a vibrant and varied retail sector. Some of these are can be achieved using the planning system (and form part of this Core Strategy) whilst other require a wider approach. The Council has taken both approaches with the recent appointment of a Town Centre Initiatives officer and the drawing up of town centre plans for the some of the Borough's higher order town centres. However, the Council considers that creation of affordable shops (to be managed under the Council's neighbourhood shopping policy) is one of the few tools in the Council's possession which allows it to take an active role in helping shape the nature of retailers within our town centres. It is a policy position that was initially put forward by the Council's Retail Commission.</p> <p>It is also a policy position which since has been supported by the Mayor for London, with Policy 4.9 of the Consultation Draft Replacement London Plan (Small shops) stating that "In considering proposals for large retail developments, the Mayor will seek contributions through planning obligations where appropriate, feasible and viable, to support the provision of affordable shop units suitable for small or independent retailers." Although this policy has yet to have been examined it clearly shows intended direction of the London Plan, a document which this Council will have to be in general conformity with, and a document which will form part of this Council's development plan.</p> <p>As with the requirement to provide a mix of unit sizes, the Council recognises that the provision of affordable shops will not always be appropriate, not where this will jeopardise the viability of the wider scheme. Furthermore, the provision of an affordable unit is one of a series of benefits which could be sought under the s106 system for suitable developments.</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
John Lewis Partnership	John Lewis Partnership	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CF 2	Retail Development within Town Centres		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS145	<p>Whilst JL generally supports the Core Strategy, there are certain elements of this which we do not consider to be sound and therefore require further analysis and/ or amendments.</p> <p>The wording of policy CF2(b) and (c) is however prescriptive in its requirement for large scale retail development to provide a range of shop unit sizes and affordable shops. These policies give no indication that the appropriateness of these requirements for individual schemes will be assessed on a case by case basis, with reference to development viability. We consider that the wording of policy CF2(b) and CF2(c) as it stands is not in accordance with the Circular 05/2005 as it does not take into consideration the requirement as set out in this Circular that planning obligations are only sought where they meet all the following tests:</p> <p>(i) relevant to planning</p> <p>(ii) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms</p> <p>(iii) directly related to the proposed development</p> <p>(iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development</p> <p>(v) reasonable in all other respects.</p> <p>For these reasons, we consider policies CF2(b) and CF2(c) to be unsound as they are not consistent with national policy.</p>		<p><i>Range of unit sizes</i></p> <p>The Council is concerned about maintaining vibrant, vital and diverse town centres, centres which retain their character and which provide a diverse range of shop types. The Council set up a Retail Commission to examine this issue. This Commission concluded that the provision of small shop units was one way of helping provide for this diversity. Different retailers require different retail units, some larger and some smaller. Therefore, by supporting the provision of a mix of unit sizes the Council can help maintain diversity within centres. This is one of the few tools that LPA have to achieve this aim.</p> <p>The newly published PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth) supports the Council's approach with Policy EC4.1 explicitly recognising that LPA "should plan to promote competitive town centre environments and provide consumer choice by ... (b) recognising that smaller shops can significantly enhance the character and vibrancy of the centre". The preservation of existing small units may be difficult as planning permission is not normally required for the amalgamation of small units into a smaller number of larger units. The use of s106 agreements or conditions to require the provision of small units therefore may have a role to play in maintaining diversity.</p> <p>Similarly part (f) of Policy EC4.1 states that LPAs should "take measures to converse and, where appropriate, enhance the established character and diversity of their town centres." As outlined above, the provision of small units is a central part of achieving the diversity required by the Council.</p> <p>The Council does, however, recognise that the provision of a range of unit sizes within large retail development may not always be appropriate. The supporting text for this policy (para 31.3.18) was amended following the Publication Draft Core Strategy to explicitly recognise that whilst the starting point was that all large scale retail development would provide a mix of unit sizes, they may be cases where this could not be appropriate. Council will only seek the provision of a mix of unit sizes where "the viability of the wider scheme is not jeopardised".</p> <p><i>Affordable shops</i></p> <p>The creation of affordable shops (to be managed under the Council's neighbourhood shopping policy) is one of the few tools in the Council's possession which allows it to take an active role in helping shape the nature of retailers within our town centres. It is a policy position that was initially put forward by the Council's Retail Commission.</p> <p>It is also a policy position which since has been supported by the Mayor for London, with Policy 4.9 of the Consultation Draft Replacement London Plan (Small shops) stating that "In considering proposals for large retail developments, the Mayor will seek contributions through planning obligations where appropriate, feasible and viable, to support the provision of affordable shop units suitable for small or independent</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>retailers." Although this policy has yet to have been examined it clearly shows intended direction of the London Plan, a document which this Council will have to be in general conformity with, and a document which will form part of this Council's development plan.</p> <p>As with the requirement to provide a mix of unit sizes, the Council recognises that the provision of affordable shops will not always be appropriate, not where this will jeopardise the viability of the wider scheme. Furthermore, the provision of an affordable unit is one of a series of benefits which could be sought under the s106 system for suitable developments.</p> <p>As both the provision of 'affordable shops' and the provision of unit sizes are both tools to contribute to "planning for a strong retail mix" (EC4.1(b) of PPS4) and are "measures to conserve and enhance the established character and diversity of ... town centres" they are considered, in principle, to meet the tests set out within Circular 05/2005.</p>	
Welcome Trust		Cluttons LLP	Policy CF 2	Retail Development within Town Centres		No	Effective	PSubCS157	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding Policy CF2 and affordable retail units we believe that this policy is unsound. If implemented this will create a two tier retail market which may lead to unwanted adverse effects on retail occupation, thus making the objective of the proposed policy ineffective and undeliverable. A major problem in implementing this policy would be the definition of which types of retailers could benefit from affordable shops. This threatens its deliverability. 		<p>The creation of affordable shops (to be managed under the Council's neighbourhood shopping policy) is one of the few tools in the Council's possession which allows it to take an active role in helping shape the nature of retailers within our town centres. It is a policy position that was initially put forward by the Council's Retail Commission.</p> <p>It is also a policy position which since has been supported by the Mayor for London, with Policy 4.9 of the Consultation Draft Replacement London Plan (Small shops) stating that "In considering proposals for large retail developments, the Mayor will seek contributions through planning obligations where appropriate, feasible and viable, to support the provision of affordable shop units suitable for small or independent retailers." Although this policy has yet to have been examined it clearly shows intended direction of the London Plan, a document which this Council will have to be in general conformity with, and a document which will form part of this Council's development plan.</p> <p>As with the requirement to provide a mix of unit sizes, the Council recognises that the provision of affordable shops will not always be appropriate, not where this will jeopardise the viability of the wider scheme. Furthermore, the provision of an affordable unit is one of a series of benefits which could be sought under the s106 system for suitable developments.</p> <p>As both the provision of 'affordable shops' and the provision of unit sizes are both tools to contribute to "planning for a strong retail mix" (EC4.1(b) of PPS4) and are "measures to conserve and enhance the established character and diversity of ... town centres" they are considered, in principle, to meet the tests set out within Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>Retail units provided would be handed over to the Council who would manage these under the existing 'Neighbourhood Shopping Scheme'. Under this scheme The Council lets units to types retailers who meet the criteria set out in the scheme. Rents reflect the nature of the occupier.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		Policy CF2	Retail Development within Town Centres		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS270	<p>26. Policy CF2 promotes the introduction of affordable shops in the Borough " <i>the Council will...require 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</i> " (Policy CF2). In addition, we note that the Council reports the view of the Retail Commission that it may be appropriate to use s106 agreements to provide affordable units. However, we would question whether such provision would comply with <i>Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations</i>. At the very least, Circular 05/05 should be clearly referred to in Policy CF2.</p>		<p>Following discussions with officers with GOL, GOL are satisfied that there is nothing within national policy which precludes the provision of affordable shops. Indeed PPS4 actively encourages LPA to take measures to conserve and enhance the established character and diversity of their town centres. At the request of GOL the Council is happy to add a reference to the need to comply with circular 5/05 within section 29.2 <i>Infrastructure and Planning Obligations</i>. This will be confirmed in a statement of common ground.</p>	<p>If the Inspector is minded to approve the change, the Council would support adding a reference to the need to comply with the requirements of Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations within section 29.2 of the Core Strategy.</p>
Cadogan Estates Ltd	Cadogan Estates Ltd	Gerald Eve	Policy CF2	Retail Development within Town Centres		No	Effective	PSubCS292	<p>The Cadogan Estate is one of the largest single land holdings in London comprising some 38 hectares of one of the Capital's most fashionable districts, stretching from Knightsbridge in the north to Cheyne Walk in the South and from Cadogan Place in the east to Beaufort Street in the west. The King's Road and Sloane Street are bywords for the location of the most fashionable shops.</p> <p>Today, the Estate currently comprises some 1,800 flats, 370 houses, 200 shops and stores, 5 schools and approximately 40,000 sq m of office accommodation. The shops and stores include world famous fashion names. In addition to ongoing management of property, CEL is also a highly experienced developer and brought forward the development of the Duke of York's headquarters which involved developing the former Territorial Army headquarters in the heart of the King's Road to create a new vibrant commercial destination including a mix of retail, commercial and residential property totalling in the order of 500,000 sq ft.</p> <p>It is against this background that CEL considers the Royal Borough's requirement to provide both small and affordable shops as part of Section 106 Agreements relating to any new large scale retail development, is wholly inappropriate and will in fact be counter productive to its objectives.</p> <p>CEL take a flexible approach to the construction and assignment of leases to retail occupiers on a case by case basis taking in account the quality of the retailer; the need to ensure a varied retail offer and also the need to maintain occupancy at the highest level in order to create an appropriate level of vitality and vibrancy throughout the principal shopping parades within the Estate. Therefore, in some circumstances, the Estate offers a lower level of rent where it is considered the particular type of retail or tenant will make a significant contribution to the retail offer <i>overall</i>.</p> <p>The critical difference between the approach the Estate takes on this matter and the approach that the Royal Borough are now proposing is that the Estates ' strategy is based on identifying the right retailer that might be appropriately encouraged to occupy the retail unit through a lower level of rent rather than simply identifying retail units that should provide discounted rents in perpetuity.</p> <p>If the Royal Borough's intention is to try to attract more independent boutique retailers who might not otherwise be able to compete with the larger national and multiple retailers, the strategy is substantially flawed. Unlike the principle of affordable housing where there is clear criteria for the tenant occupation, it will be impossible to impose criteria for the occupation of the discounted units. Importantly, the Royal Borough has <i>very few</i> opportunities for new large scale retail development to be achieved and yet there is an overwhelming need for new retail accommodation to be brought forward in the Borough in order to compete with much larger out of town centres such as Westfield.</p>		<p>The creation of affordable shops (to be managed under the Council's neighbourhood shopping policy) is one of the few tools in the Council's possession which allows it to take an active role in helping shape the nature of retailers within our town centres. It is a policy position that was initially put forward by the Council's Retail Commission.</p> <p>It is also a policy position which since has been supported by the Mayor for London, with Policy 4.9 of the Consultation Draft Replacement London Plan (Small shops) stating that "In considering proposals for large retail developments, the Mayor will seek contributions through planning obligations where appropriate, feasible and viable, to support the provision of affordable shop units suitable for small or independent retailers." Although this policy has yet to have been examined it clearly shows intended direction of the London Plan, a document which this Council will have to be in general conformity with, and a document which will form part of this Council's development plan.</p> <p>As with the requirement to provide a mix of unit sizes, the Council recognises that the provision of affordable shops will not always be appropriate, not where this will jeopardise the viability of the wider scheme. Furthermore, the provision of an affordable unit is one of a series of benefits which could be sought under the s106 system for suitable developments.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Clearly, a requirement to provide an element of affordable retail units as part of larger retail schemes will <i>have</i> a substantial impact on viability and may in fact discourage many landowners and developers from considering such projects which, in the current climate are already marginal.</p> <p>In addition to this, a requirement to provide a range of shop unit sizes in new major retail developments and resist the amalgamation of shop units as specified in Policy CF2(b) would compound the problem further. Onerous and prescriptive restrictions will ultimately prohibit investment in this particular land use which needs to be flexible and be able to respond to quickly to the requirements of modern occupiers.</p> <p><i>Overall</i>, CEL do not consider that either the requirement for affordable shop units or the introduction of a policy approach which reduces the flexibility on both retailers and landowners for managing and responding to the needs of modern retailer requirements represent the most <i>effective</i> strategy for the delivery of vital and vibrant retail areas and, indeed, it is considered such an approach is likely to be counterproductive to this objective.</p>			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CF 2	Retail Development within Town Centres		No	Effective	PSubCS402	<p>p174 Policy CF2 - neighbourhood shops</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>Changes are proposed to have regard to other planning objectives and benefits that development proposals qualifying under para (c) may deliver and also to take in to account impacts on viability. The proposed change provides some flexibility for the policy to be applied effectively.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CF2</p> <p>The Council will promote vital and viable town centres and ensure that the character and diversity of the Borough's town centres is maintained.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>(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 Section1b <i>Places</i> (Chapters 4-18);</p> <p>(b) require a range of shop units sizes in new major retail development, and resist the amalgamation of shop units, where the retention of the existing units contributes to achieving the vision for the centre;</p> <p>(c) require 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. In applying this part of the policy the Council will have regard to viability and wider planning benefits to be realised by the development including meeting strategic regeneration objectives.</p>		The Council does recognise that viability will be an issue when considering the provision of affordable shops. This is already explicitly recognised in para 31.3.18.	No change.
Metro Shopping	Metro Shopping	King Sturge on behalf of	Policy CF 3	Diversity of uses within		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS14	Policy CF3 seeks to restrict non-A1 uses to no more than 20% of the units in primary retail frontages and to no more than 34% of		The treatment of Notting Hill within CF3 concerns the protection of shops uses within the centre. The starting	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Fund LP	Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP		Town Centres					<p>the units in secondary retail frontages.</p> <p>In both cases the policy treats Notting Hill Gate differently to the other centres by virtue of the fact that in addition to the 20% and 34% restrictions, any additional estate agents, bureau-de-change or hot food takeaways are ruled out. However, what is also different about Notting Hill Gate, but which is not mentioned in the policy, is that there is a need for both high quality shops AND restaurants. This need for additional restaurants is recognised in paragraph 16.14 in chapter 16 on Notting Hill Gate and again within the Vision, which seeks to significantly strengthen Notting Hill Gate as a district shopping centre "with improved shops and restaurants that reflect the needs of the local catchment". Restaurants fall within Use Class A3 and would therefore be prevented with the current wording of Policy CF3. This inconsistency between Chapter 16 and draft Policy CF3 has not been justified. Furthermore, Policy CF3 would prevent the vision for Notting Hill Gate being deliverable.</p> <p>The policy could be made sound by amending the text of a(ii) to read:</p> <p>"... 80% of the ground floor units in the relevant street frontage will remain in an A1 or A3 (shop or restaurant) use and the non-shop use is not adjacent to another non-A1/ non-A3 use;"</p> <p>and b(ii) amended to read:</p> <p>"... 66% of the ground-floor units in the relevant street frontage will remain in an A1 or A3 (shop or restaurant) use and where there are no more than three non-A1/non-A3 uses in a row".</p>		<p>point for all centres is that the Council will only permit the change of use from shops to other town centre uses where a certain proportion of shop units remain. In the Notting Hill Centre there is concern that there are particular concentrations of estate agents, bureaux de change (both Class A2) and hot food takeaways (Class A5), and that the introduction of more such uses is likely to harm the continued vitality of the centre.</p> <p>This does not preclude the introduction of A3 uses into existing frontages (as long as the criteria are met). Similarly it does not preclude the introduction of additional A3 floorspace as part of large mixed use development within or at the edge of the existing centre, where no existing retail is lost.</p> <p>As such the Council considers that Policy CF3 is consistent with CV16, the vision for the Notting Gill Gate Place, as a centre with 'premium quality retail' and with 'improved restaurants'.</p>	
828 Pte Ltd	828 Pte Ltd	DP9	Policy CF 3	Diversity of uses within Town Centres				PSubCS81	<p>Policy CF2 - Diversity within Town Centres</p> <p>Paragraph 31.3.20 sets out the guidance in PPS6 that states that main town centre uses includes, amongst others, leisure and entertainment uses. Policy CF3 referring to 'Diversity of uses within Town Centres' does not refer to the full range of town centre uses, but rather advises that a diverse range of shops will be "supported, but not dominated by, a range of complimentary town centre uses." Accordingly, our clients consider that that policy should be amended to refer to the provision of all town centre uses, including leisure and entertainment uses, and not just retail use.</p>		<p>The purpose of CF3 is to maintain the Borough's town centres as competitive town centres. The Core Strategy explicitly recognises that a range of 'town centre uses' will be appropriate within the town centres, including both leisure and entertainment uses. (para 31.3.21) This is also explicit with PPS6 and its replacement PPS4.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Council recognises that it should plan for "a strong retail mix" within the Borough's centres "so that the range and quality of the comparison and convenience retail offer meets the requirements of the local catchment area." (EC4.1(b) of PPS4). The purpose of CF3 is to set the criteria by which this strong retail mix can be maintained.</p> <p>CF3 does not preclude the introduction of other town centre uses, (including leisure and entertainment uses), into the town centres. Indeed it states that the shops should be supported by complimentary town centre uses. The intension of the policy is to ensure that these complementary uses should not be provided at the expense of existing retail, and not to be of a scale that dominate the main retail function.</p>	No change.
Welcome Trust		Cluttons LLP	Policy CF 3	Diversity of uses within Town Centres		No	Effective	PSubCS159	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We believe that Policy CF3a is too onerous and that the current UDP criteria regarding non shop uses in primary shopping frontages should remain. The Core Strategy does not appear to have maps defining the primary and secondary retail frontages to which Policy CF3a and b refer. The policy is therefore currently unsound because it will be ineffective. 		<p>Para 31.3.23 notes that the primary and secondary retail frontages equate to the core and non-core frontages, respectively, of the Borough's Principal Shopping Centres as set out within the Council's UDP.</p> <p>Any expansion of the centres are included in section 42.6 of the Core Strategy, and explained in the relevant 'Place' section.</p> <p>I note that the consultee states that the Core Strategy should revert to the criteria used in the UDP, or only</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>permit the loss of a shop when this will not result in more than 75% of the parade being in a non shop; are more than two adjoining units in the same use class as proposed. The Core Strategy has raised this threshold to 80%, and will resist changes of use where the non shop use would be adjacent to another non shop use.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the criteria used to determine the appropriate mix of shop /non shop town centre uses within the higher order centres is appropriate. There is less 'freedom' for non retail uses within the primary shopping frontages than the secondary. This reflects the role that the primary frontages have in providing the critical mass of shops within a centre. It also offers the necessary flexibility to allow the introduction of some non-shop uses in to the existing frontages.</p> <p>The raising of the threshold reflects the particular circumstances of the Borough, where it will be a challenge for the Borough to accommodate the 'retail need' identified by the Retail Needs Assessment within the plan period. The Core Strategy illustrates how the need to 2015 is likely to be accommodated, but there is less certainly as to how this need will be met in the longer term. This will be considered in the necessary detail by updated retail need assessments and by the regular revisions to the Core Strategy. Clearly the loss of existing retail floorspace within centres would not assist the Council in meeting the identified retail need.</p> <p>This approach supported by the Retail Needs Assessment which in para 22.12 states that even in those parts of the Borough where less 'need' is indicated' (the north and centre) the strategy, should be to "concentrate on retaining existing Class A1 retail uses..." In the south of the Borough, where retail need is higher, retention of existing A1 will be even more important.</p>	
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		Policy CF 3	Diversity of uses within Town Centres		Yes		PSubCS190	Policy CF3 (ii) is supported, but the supporting text should recognise the potential health benefits of limiting the proliferation of hot food takeaways.		Support for policy approach is noted. Whilst the Council acknowledges the health impacts identified by HUDU, the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the Core Strategy clearly identifies the causes and likely impact of various arisings. It is considered that this is the correct location to explicitly refer to health impacts. The health benefits and cost are implicit throughout the document and their direct inclusion within the main body of text adds no strategic value.	No change.
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		Policy CF 3	Diversity of uses within Town Centres		No	Effective	PSubCS237	<p>CF3: Diversity of uses within town centres</p> <p>This policy only seeks to protect (CF3 (a) office uses in town centres (CF3 (a)) and permit, and fails to promote office uses, especially on upper floors, in town centres in line with PPS6 and recycle the "intention" of the UDP policies to locate offices in principal centres. Some of the "place" chapters recognise that certain town centres - usually those identified in the UDP, but not all of them - should be preferred locations for offices. Policy CF5 only protects or permits medium-sized and large-scale offices in high-order centres.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>The main centres should be places where town centre uses are promoted not just protected or permitted. The dichotomy - protect or permit - is insufficiently positive. The concept of</p>		<p>The Council considers that the policies within the Core Strategy are sufficiently positive with regard offices within town centres. Policy CF3 notes that the success of a town centre can be secured by protecting town centre uses, and by ensuring that these will be supported by a range of complimentary town centre uses. These town centre uses include offices. CF5 protects all offices within town centres (subject to certain circumstances where changes to other town centre uses may be permitted), and requires large offices to be located in higher order town centres and other accessible areas.</p> <p>Policy CF5 could however be amended if this is not considered to be sufficiently clear.</p> <p>The Council considers that the Core Strategy makes it explicit that conversion of offices within Higher Order Town Centres to residential will be resisted. Policy</p>	<p>If the Inspector is minded to approve the change, the Council would support re wording of Policy CF5: Location of Business Uses to read</p> <p>The Council will ensure that there are a range of business premises within the Borough to allow businesses to grow and thrive; to <u>promote</u> the <u>consolidation</u> of large and medium offices within town centres; support <u>their location</u> in areas of high transport accessibility; and protect and promote Employment Zone for a range of small and medium business activities which directly support the function of the zone</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>"preferred locations", see above, would promote offices in those locations.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Society strongly supports the retention of offices on the upper floors in these centres, and conversion to housing should be resisted. This is not sufficiently clear.</p>		CF5(a) states that the Council will protect all offices within Higher Order Town Centres. Furthermore, Policy CH3(c)(Protection of Residential Uses) states that the Council will permit new residential use and floorspace everywhere except (vii) where replacing offices within a higher order town centre..."	
Barclays Bank Plc	Barclays Bank Plc	Shireconsulting	Policy CF3	Diversity of uses within Town Centres	Yes	Yes		PSubCS479	<p>The Bank is already a major stakeholder within the Borough, with a number of branches within the Council's area, such as Kensington High Street, Notting Hill Gate, Brompton Road, Earl's Court and Sloane Square. Other than the committed 'flagship' branch on Kensington High Street (which opens soon), there are no firm proposals as yet, but it is likely that the Bank's representation within some of these centres will need to evolve over the life of the emerging LDF.</p> <p>In view of the likely requirement for improved provision of banking services the Bank would like to continue to contribute to the emerging plan process so that its views are heard and policy will take its future business needs into account. On behalf of the Bank we have already submitted representations upon previous consultation drafts of LDF documentation including the "<i>Core Strategy and North Kensington Plan - Towards Preferred Options</i>" on the 30th September 2008, upon "<i>Places</i>" & "<i>Strategic Sites</i>" on the 3rd June 2009 and finally "<i>Draft Core Strategy with a particular focus on North Kensington</i>" on the 30th July 2009. Within those earlier representations we drew attention to the key role played by financial services retailers generally and the Bank in particular within the Borough's various shopping centres. The comments made in the Bank's previous representations still stand, especially relating to the need to allow the provision of financial services to improve and evolve alongside other improvements to shopping provision.</p> <p>Whilst on occasions the Council clearly recognises the value of, and essential role played by, banks and other financial services operators within shopping centres (see for instance the recent grant of planning permission for Barclays at Kensington High Street, as well as the encouragement of additional banking facilities in the North and South of the Borough at paragraphs 7.3.15 & 15.5.3), there remain many elements within the draft plan that demonstrate a failure in some parts of the Council to understand how banks operate in the wider retail market.</p>		<p>As set out above the Council concurs with the view that banks are an appropriate town centre use and that their provision within the Borough's Town Centres can contribute to their vitality and viability.</p> <p>The definition of town centre uses reflects that of PPS6, and repeated in PPS4. However, the Council does recognise that A2 uses such as banks and building societies are town centres uses, and therefore, for the sake of clarity is happy to include them in both the definition of in para 31.3.20 and the glossary. Both sections should also be amended to reflect the superseding of PPS6 by PPS4.</p> <p>The Council does not however concur with the consultees in their view that banks should always be welcomed within town centres there and that there" is no good planning reason to restrict the presence of Class A2 uses in town centres.</p> <p>The success of the Borough's town centres is related to the mix of shop and non shop A1 uses which maintains both the centres retail draw and the range of other uses (banks included) which serve the non-shopping needs of visitors. The use of thresholds to control this mix is considered appropriate to ensure that the non-retail A class uses do not increase to such a degree that the critical mass necessary for successful shops is reduced. A 'free for all' for all A class uses would be likely to result in many parts of the Borough's centres seeing significant reductions in A1 shop offer. This would be problematical as would both harm the "strong retail mix" endorsed within Policy EC4(b) of PPS4, and would also make it more difficult for the "retail need" identified within the Retain Needs Assessment to be met.</p> <p>Maintenance of the retail character of the Borough's centres is imperative, as it is the shops which are the centres' driving force. This is an approach endorsed by the RNA which does state (para 22.12 that the strategy for the north and centre of the Borough (the parts with lower projected need to 2015) should be to "concentrate on retaining existing Class A1 retail uses and the reoccupation of existing vacant units, through the continued implementation of shop frontage policies and restrictions on changes of use." This will be of even greater relevant in centres to the south of the Borough where predicted retail need is greater.</p> <p>Despite the representations of the consultees the Council considers that PPS4 (Policy EC3d) continues to endorse the use by LPA of primary and secondary frontages to determine the appropriate mix of town centre uses. Policy CF3 does as the PPS suggests, and "makes clear which uses will be permitted at such locations". Furthermore the use of thresholds will, as endorsed by Policy EC4.1(a), ensure that the diverse range of uses suitable to town centres are distributed throughout the centre.</p>	If the Inspector is minded to approve the change, the Council would support rewording of para 31.2.20 to read, "PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth) list the main town centre uses. These are retail, banks, building societies and other professional services, leisure and entertainment etc.... The PPS also notes that housing can be a possible town centre use on upper floors.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>A threshold for 20% non shop uses in a given frontage within a primary retail frontage is considered necessary to ensure that the critical mass of shops in the centre remains. Greater flexibility is given in the secondary shopping areas.</p> <p>Policy CF3 needs little explanation as the threshold policy is not complicated. However, para 31.3.23 does explain what the 'relevant' street frontage is. The Council remains confused as to where the "uncertainty" referred to in the representation comes from. Indeed the policy has been simplified for that in the existing UDP to offer this clarity.</p> <p>Whilst the Council does not consider it necessary, it would not object to the addition of further reasoned justification to explain in greater detail Policy CF3, should the planning inspector consider this necessary.</p> <p>One of the intentions of CF3 is to stop the creation of large areas of non-shop frontage. If this stops existing users from expanding into adjoining shop units (as it will in the primary shopping frontages) so be it. If an A2 operator wishes to expand into adjoining shop premises they should locate in the secondary retail frontages.</p> <p>The Core Strategy states that the primary/secondary frontages will be reviewed in the future. Clearly the time to determine the nature of the methodology to be used at this review will form part of the review. In the meantime, the Council will, as explained in the Core Strategy, adapt the core/non-core frontages of the UDP. A reference is made within the Council's LDS to the need to carry out this review. The nature of the 'review LDD' will be decided at a later date as will the nature of the associated consultation.</p> <p>The consultee is concerned that the Council's policy to maintain the diversity of uses within Town Centres has been developed without the consideration of alternatives. The Council notes that PPS12 requires a LPA to examine 'reasonable alternatives'. It considers that this has been done, as the Core Strategy has evolved. The public were initially asked in the Issues and Options consultation (Issue 29) (Nov 2005) what the function of town centres should be. This was asked again in the Interim issues and options consultation (5.4a) how the Council should best maintain the diversity of uses in centres. The Council's initial view, that the loss of all shops in primary shopping frontages should be resisted (toward preferred options and the Draft Core Strategy for the Royal Borough with a particular focus on North Kensington was then amended on the proposed submission draft.</p> <p>The consultee appears concerned that the provision of a new bank in King's Road (West) will somehow preclude a new bank in King's Road (East) centre. The two are not linked, with any application being assessed separately within CF3.</p>	
Barclays Bank Plc	Barclays Bank Plc	Shireconsulting	Policy CF3	Diversity of uses within Town Centres	Yes	No	Justified	PSubCS482	The creation of the Barclays' 'flagship' branch upon Kensington High Street and the associated £3m investment into this conservation area location meets with all these strategic objectives and can be seen as meeting the Council's ambition		As set out above the Council concurs with the view that banks are an appropriate town centre use and that their provision within the Borough's Town Centres can	If the Inspector is minded to approve the change, the Council would support rewording of para 31.2.20 to read, "PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth)

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>(mentioned at paragraph 11.3.2) to work with stakeholders to help this centre build upon its strengths, by attracting and underpinning footfall at time when it faces the potential of heavy competition from the Westfield Centre. It is noted that substantial qualitative and quantitative improvements are proposed for the Council's main central areas over the plan period and the Bank would point out that other supporting services should also be part of any increase in central area shopping floorspace. Improvements to shopping provision should be matched by commensurate improvements to financial services provision and the Bank recommends that the definition of 'retail' and 'town centre uses' in the draft plan's glossary be widened to include the financial services sector expressly.</p> <p>The Bank also notes the overall support given to promoting a mix of uses in the Borough's centres as the best means of protecting and enhancing their vitality and viability (see for instance Policy CF1). Part A of the Use Classes Order (UCO) contains the "shopping area uses" which should be acceptable without any need for restriction or qualification. This is particularly the case for the financial services sector. According to paragraph 38 of Circular 03/2005 ("Changes of Use of Buildings And Land" which accompanied the last major revisions to the UCO) this sector is "very much a part of the established shopping street scene, and which is expanding and diversifying....[being] ...uses which the public now expects to find in shopping areas". The wider role played by town centres than a pure shopping function is also recognised throughout PPS6. There should be scope for improving the provision of all shopping area activities within all of the Borough's existing centres to ensure those centres remain vital and viable and provide the services needed by residents, businesses and visitors. Class A2 retailers such as the Bank routinely experience very high levels of customer visitation, contributing significantly towards pedestrian movement and therefore the vitality and viability of town centres. The Bank has undertaken many footfall surveys in connection with its current acquisitions programme at its branches in various towns and cities in the UK. These conclusively show that the level of footfall associated with bank branches is commensurate with, and often higher than, the best known national multiple Class A1 traders. Banks have also moved away from the traditional style of frontage for their premises, preferring to have an open, visually interesting and attractive face to the 'high street'. The Bank has become increasingly retail in its presentation and has recently introduced an innovative branch design, which has been developed in association with its customers, to transform banking into what it terms as "a retail focused experience". The Bank estimates that some 10 million customers use its branches each week and through listening to their feedback, a design has been developed that meets their requirements for modern banking and provides branches similar in appearance and operation to retail shops. An important focus has been to install technology to reduce queue times and waiting times for consultation, including new offerings such as Foreign ATMs, new queue call systems, and what is termed the 'Specialist Lounge', for the Bank's Premier customers. Whilst the design of every new branch has to be flexible in order to be sensitive to the requirements of each building occupied, the aim is generally to ensure that some 80% of the internal space at ground floor is accessible to customers.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the generally positive approach set out in the initial part of draft Policy CF3 towards the promotion of a mix of uses in the Borough's centres, a closer examination of the later elements of the policy shows that restrictive policies relating to non-shop uses in the defined shopping frontages are to be introduced in the LDF. An arbitrary 20% ceiling for non-shop use is set for any primary frontage in the Borough's main centres</p>		<p>contribute to their vitality and viability.</p> <p>The definition of town centre uses reflects that of PPS6, and repeated in PPS4. However, the Council does recognise that A2 uses such as banks and building societies are town centres uses, and therefore, for the sake of clarity is happy to include them in both the definition of in para 31.3.20 and the glossary. Both sections should also be amended to reflect the superseding of PPS6 by PPS4.</p> <p>The Council does not however concur with the consultees in their view that banks should always be welcomed within town centres there and that there" is no good planning reason to restrict the presence of Class A2 uses in town centres.</p> <p>The success of the Borough's town centres is related to the mix of shop and non shop A1 uses which maintains both the centres retail draw and the range of other uses (banks included) which serve the non-shopping needs of visitors. The use of thresholds to control this mix is considered appropriate to ensure that the non-retail A class uses do not increase to such a degree that the critical mass necessary for successful shops is reduced. A 'free for all' for all A class uses would be likely to result in many parts of the Borough's centres seeing significant reductions in A1 shop offer. This would be problematical as would both harm the "strong retail mix" endorsed within Policy EC4(b) of PPS4, and would also make it more difficult for the "retail need" identified within the Retain Needs Assessment to be met.</p> <p>Maintenance of the retail character of the Borough's centres is imperative, as it is the shops which are the centres' driving force. This is an approach endorsed by the RNA which does state (para 22.12 that the strategy for the north and centre of the Borough (the parts with lower projected need to 2015) should be to "concentrate on retaining existing Class A1 retail uses and the reoccupation of existing vacant units, through the continued implementation of shop frontage policies and restrictions on changes of use." This will be of even greater relevant in centres to the south of the Borough where predicted retail need is greater.</p> <p>Despite the representations of the consultees the Council considers that PPS4 (Policy EC3d) continues to endorse the use by LPA of primary and secondary frontages to determine the appropriate mix of town centre uses. Policy CF3 does as the PPS suggests, and "makes clear which uses will be permitted at such locations". Furthermore the use of thresholds will, as endorsed by Policy EC4.1(a), ensure that the diverse range of uses suitable to town centres are distributed</p>	<p>list the main town centre uses. These are retail, banks, building societies and other professional services, leisure and entertainment etc.... The PPS also notes that housing can be a possible town centre use on upper floors.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>regardless of use class of the proposal (i.e. whether the use is a 'shopping area use' within Part A of the Use Classes Order), or whether this threshold is already attained (or even surpassed) in these frontages. The origin of this threshold is not explained anywhere in the draft plan and we would also question the practicality of operating the policy for development control purposes, as there is no explanation as to how the policy will operate in practice. For instance it is unclear whether frontage gaps are included in the overall derivation of frontage length and precisely where each relevant frontage starts and finishes (are the return frontages to be included, and if so by how much). Such detailed considerations will affect the outcome of the calculation, particularly when the opportunities for non-A1 occupiers are so restricted. Because of the level of uncertainty we have strong objections to the use of thresholds.</p> <p>The opportunities for many necessary town centre operators to improve the quality of their representation are further proscribed by the proposed prohibition upon the siting of a non-shop use in a primary frontage when there is one there already. This would immediately preclude any successful occupier from extending an existing operation into an adjacent unit, even if such an expansion would promote visitation, strengthen pedestrian flows and thereby enhance overall town centre vitality and viability.</p> <p>On the matter of policy formulation PPS12 (June 2008) is clear that all DPDs must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and</i> • <i>the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives"</i> (paragraph 4.36 of PPS12). <p>Despite the intention to operate outdated restrictive policies relating to defined shopping frontages in the LDF, none of the proposed primary frontages are set out in the consultation document being submitted to the Secretary of State. The plan merely states, at paragraph 31.3.23, that the primary and secondary retail frontages will <i>"equate to the core and non-core frontages, respectively, of the Borough's Principal Shopping Centres as set out within the Council's UDP (2002)"</i>. That paragraph then continues <i>"These will be reviewed"</i>. However, the plan does not elaborate as to when this review is to take place and also what method of assessment is to be used. Proper assessment should be an essential part of the evidence gathering process. PPS6 is very clear, at paragraph 2.17, when it says that local planning authorities <i>"may"</i> (it is not obligatory) define frontages in their central areas, but these assessments must be <i>"realistic"</i>. The work done by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (NLP) in the 2008 Retail & Leisure Needs Study would not be a sufficient evidence base as this detailed exercise did not form part of the brief. As the Bank has repeatedly pointed out in its previous representations, the matter does not seem to have been examined with any degree of rigour for many years and until the frontages have been properly assessed the Council is in no position to set any threshold limits. Similarly unsupported by any evidence are the comments that the draft plan makes at paragraph 15.1.4 that the two elements of King's Road <i>"function as one"</i> and that certain non-shop uses (including some within Class A2) are <i>"over-subscribed"</i> in Notting Hill Gate (paragraph 16.3.3). Neither statement is supported by the 2008 Retail & Leisure Study, which examined the whole Borough. The Study dealt with the two King's Road centres separately as, although they are physically proximate, they perform entirely different roles in the shopping hierarchy. Thus, even should the need for a new bank be satisfied on the western part of King's Road (see Core Strategy paragraphs 15.3.13 & 15.5.3), this would not affect the need for improved banking services along the eastern sector.</p>		<p>throughout the centre.</p> <p>A threshold for 20% non shop uses in a given frontage within a primary retail frontage is considered necessary to ensure that the critical mass of shops in the centre remains. Greater flexibility is given in the secondary shopping areas.</p> <p>Policy CF3 needs little explanation as the threshold policy is not complicated. However, para 31.3.23 does explain what the 'relevant' street frontage is. The Council remains confused as to where the "uncertainty" referred to in the representation comes from. Indeed the policy has been simplified for that in the existing UDP to offer this clarity.</p> <p>Whilst the Council does not consider it necessary, it would not object to the addition of further reasoned justification to explain in greater detail Policy CF3, should the planning inspector consider this necessary.</p> <p>One of the intentions of CF3 is to stop the creation of large areas of non-shop frontage. If this stops existing users from expanding into adjoining shop units (as it will in the primary shopping frontages) so be it. If an A2 operator wishes to expand into adjoining shop premises they should locate in the secondary retail frontages.</p> <p>The Core Strategy states that the primary/secondary frontages will be reviewed in the future. Clearly the time to determine the nature of the methodology to be used at this review will form part of the review. In the meantime, the Council will, as explained in the Core Strategy, adapt the core/non-core frontages of the UDP. A reference is made within the Council's LDS to the need to carry out this review. The nature of the 'review LDD' will be decided at a later date as will the nature of the associated consultation.</p> <p>The consultee is concerned that the Council's policy to maintain the diversity of uses within Town Centres has been developed without the consideration of alternatives. The Council notes that PPS12 requires a LPA to examine 'reasonable alternatives'. It considers that this has been done, as the Core Strategy has evolved. The public were initially asked in the Issues and Options consultation (Issue 29) (Nov 2005) what the function of town centres should be. This was asked again in the Interim issues and options consultation (5.4a) how the Council should best maintain the diversity of uses in centres. The Council's initial view, that the loss of all shops in primary shopping frontages should be resisted (toward preferred options and the</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									In the discussion of the services represented in Notting Hill Gate, the 2008 NLP retail study found that there is a below average provision of banks and financial services (see Table 10.3), but in any event if such uses were "over-subscribed" as the Council asserts then presumably the Core Strategy should be planning to increase supply. Without any evidence to support the policy stance, or discussion of the reasonable alternatives (previous drafts of this LDF document were similarly opaque regarding their approach to frontage definition) the document must fail the 'tests of soundness' at the public examination.		Draft Core Strategy for the Royal Borough with a particular focus on North Kensington was then amended on the proposed submission draft. The consultee appears concerned that the provision of a new bank in King's Road (West) will somehow preclude a new bank in King's Road (East) centre. The two are not linked, with any application being assessed separately within CF3.	
Barclays Bank Plc	Barclays Bank Plc	Shireconsulting	Policy CF3	Diversity of uses within Town Centres	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS485	<p>Closing Comments</p> <p>The opportunity provided by the preparation of the main elements of the LDF should be taken to reappraise out of date policies and give greater encouragement to 'appropriate' Part A uses to invest and improve the quality of their representation. In the light of how financial services provision has evolved in recent years, the Bank believes that there is no good planning reason to restrict the presence of Class A2 uses at ground floor level in any shopping frontages and that the Council should recognise the important contribution of financial services such as banks in both bringing investment and acting as attractors for investment by others, in the wording and application of policies in all the relevant LDF documents. Pursuing restrictive policies to keep significant generators of footfall out of central areas will actively work against the achievement of the Core Strategy's strategic objectives and is inconsistent with national policy. In fact there is nothing in Government policy that recommends or supports imposing arbitrary thresholds upon acceptable town centre uses at all. The continuation of the historic primary frontage policy is unjustified by any robust and credible evidence and the Council has provided no explanation for the decisions it has taken about the most appropriate strategy to follow when considered against the reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>To succeed a strategy should set clear goals which should be both measurable and attainable. Thus, the evidence gathering process is essential to being able to produce a strategy, rather than a set of aspirations. In the Bank's many previous representations upon the Borough's emerging LDF it has repeatedly drawn attention to the many failings of the documents and explained that to be 'sound', the LDF must be consistent with national policy. It was recommended that the Council address these deficiencies as a matter of urgency, but the Council's documents show no indication that it has gone through an objective process and audit trail of assessing alternatives, or indeed that alternatives have even been considered at all. The experience of other authorities which have been advised by the Government Office/Inspectors to withdraw LDF documents prior to the examination taking place, is that documents such as the subject one are unlikely to be judged as being 'sound', without further rigorous evaluation of evidence and analysis of the selection of viable options. The helpful comments we have made have again been ignored and the Bank again strongly recommends that the Council rethinks its position before moving to final submission of the current document to avoid wasting resources in arranging a public examination into LDF document that is likely to fail.</p> <p>In view of the Bank's likely requirement for improved provision of banking services in the Royal Borough during the life of the LDF it would like to confirm its continued interest in LDF process and in that regard we would be grateful if the Council would continue to notify us of the progress of the submitted document as well as</p>		Comments considered in specific parts.	Changes as recommended in specific parts.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									upon any other emerging LDDs.			
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturge on behalf of Metro Shopping Fund LP	Policy CF 5	Location of Business Uses		No	Justified	PSubCS15	<p>Proposing a blanket restriction protecting all large offices in all the town centres is not founded upon a sufficiently robust evidence base. Whilst the Employment Land Study is cited as the evidence base, this restricted stance within the Core Strategy precedes the updated review published in September 2009.</p> <p>The Employment Land Studies will be before the Inspector, however, it should be noted that Roger Tym & Partners rightly draw attention to the GLA's London Office Policy Review that concludes that at any one time, outstanding planning permissions should equal at least 3.5 years supply. The updated research by Roger Tym finds that there is already an eight year supply of planning permissions.</p> <p>The revised analysis by Roger Tym published in September 2009 suggests that over the plan period to 2026, a total net addition of 69,000 m² of offices will be required. A net addition of 46,000 m² is already under construction or has planning permission, which is sufficient to meet office demand until 2017. This supply does not include allocations. Previously analysis undertaken by Roger Tym found that seven allocated sites within the Borough offered the potential for a net addition of a further 30,000 m², bringing the total supply to some 76,000 m², which is considerably more than the 69,000 m² required for the whole of the plan period to 2026. In addition, unallocated sites are likely to continue to come forward for office development. A good recent example of this is the Yellow Building off Freston Road, which provided 26,000 m².</p> <p>Furthermore, the Employment Land Study does not take into account the enormous amount of office development that is being promoted at Earls Court. The draft Core Strategy already suggests that 10,000 m² of offices would be acceptable and the plans are for several times this.</p> <p>As such, it would be appropriate for the Core Strategy to allow some flexibility in the future planning of poor quality existing office space in locations where demand is weak, so that such space would be better able to meet the Borough's other competing needs.</p> <p>Having regard to this and the fact that the Employment Land Study found that it was the existing main commercial centres of Knightsbridge, Kensington High Street and the Kings Road which were the centres for office development, Policy CF5 needs to be amended to replace the references to "Higher Order Town Centres" with the reference to "the existing commercial centres of Knightsbridge, Kensington High Street and the Kings Road". The Council also has insufficient justification to give additional protection to smaller offices. Indeed, the actual evidence runs entirely contrary to the Council's conclusions on the importance of small offices to the economic base of the Borough. Whilst the Council extols the fact that over three quarters of the businesses in the Borough have fewer than five employees, over 80% of the total number of jobs are actually provided by larger firms.</p> <p>Part (a) of Policy CF5 should be reworded as follows:</p> <p>"a. Protect viable offices in the existing commercial centres of Knightsbridge, Kensington High Street and the Kings Road, together with primary commercial mews, except where: ..."</p> <p>This change to Policy CF5 would enable it to be found sound.</p>		<p>The Council recognises that the outstanding permissions for office floorspace will meet the predicted office need to 2017. Assuming all this floorspace is built out, a further 23,000 sq m will have to be provided within the plan period. Whilst the Council has allocated 20,000 of this floorspace, and does expect other windfall schemes to provide the remainder, these figures are reliant on the retention of the existing office floorspace. The loss of any existing floorspace will mean that additional floorspace must be found from additional windfalls over the plan period. This is by no means certain as there is a finite number of sites available within the Borough, and each will be subject to competition from a number of competing uses. Given the policy presumption in favour of new residential development, and the 'higher value of housing' there is no guarantee that significant additional windfall office sites will come through.</p> <p>It is, therefore, important that existing office floorspace is protected. This approach is supported by the Employment Land Review Update which does note in para 6.4 that "if forecast demand for offices ...are to be met, the Council needs to control losses of office sites to other uses".</p> <p>Furthermore para 6.9 is explicit in noting that "...demand can only be met if no existing sites are lost (without being replaced).</p> <p>The Employment Land Study does not take into account the office development being postulated at Earls' Court. It cannot be given that this space has yet to have been permitted, or allocated by Hammersmith and Fulham Council (the majority of the site and employment floorspace lying in this borough.) The Core Strategy allocates 10,000 sq m of office space within this Borough, although I note that the owners for this site are seeking in their representations to get this figure reduced. The Council will update the ELPS on a regular basis to take changing predictions/ increases in supply into account.</p> <p>One of the purposes of the Core Strategy is to look across the lifetime of the plan, and to have the policies necessary to ensure that the employment needs of the Borough are met. A long term view is taken. The Council should not plan for the recession, but right up to 2026. If uses are lost as may not be 'needed' in the short term, there is very little chance that the original uses will be regained. Indeed in the case of housing, there will be a policy presumption against the loss of housing to other uses.</p> <p>However, the Council does recognise that viability is a material consideration, and the Council will have to take into account any evidence which shows that a given premises is not viable/suitable in the longer term.</p> <p>The Core Strategy recognises that the Council contains locally import concentrations of offices in the wards around Kensington High Street and South Kensington. There are also concentrations within the other higher order centres. The Council wishes to protect all offices in</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>all areas where they exist, whether there is a particular concentration or not. The only exception being for large and medium offices (outside of Employment Zones) where there are not located in accessible areas. Notting Hill Gate is a district centre and an areas classified within the TfL PTAL map as having "excellent access to public transport". As such it is considered to be a suitable location for offices. Offices are a 'town centre use' which benefit from high accessibility, both in terms of their desirability, and in terms of trip generation.</p> <p>There is no contradiction with the Council's desire to protect small offices across the Borough. Large firms may provide the majority of B1 jobs within the Borough, but this does not mean that the majority of B1 premises cannot be small in scale. The 2007 ELPS estimates that only 11 % of units across the Borough have a floor area greater than 300 sq m. This illustrates the importance of protecting both large and small B1 premises across the Borough</p>	
Mr Graham King	Westminster Council		Policy CF5	Location of Business Uses	Yes	Yes		PSubCS33	We continue to support your policy approach towards supporting small business and light industrial in North Kensington as this is consistent with uses identified in the North Westminster Economic Development Area. The clustering of these uses will benefit both boroughs. Both Core Strategies promote better connectivity and legibility along the Westway and along borough boundaries this will create improved physical connections for the residents, workers and visitors.		Support noted and welcomed.	No change.
828 Pte Ltd	828 Pte Ltd	DP9	Policy CF5	Location of Business Uses				PSubCS82	<p>Policy CF5 - Location of Business Uses</p> <p>Paragraph 31.3.2 advises that in respect of the supply of office floorspace, there is a net addition of 46,000 sq m (500,000 sqft) under construction and from outstanding planning permissions across the Borough. The document advises that this level of building will meet office demand until 2017.</p> <p>The Council therefore recognises that a further 23,000 sqm of office floorspace needs to be developed within the Borough, within the plan period for the predicted need to be met. The Council has allocated 20,000 sqm (215,000 sqft) of business floor space within the Strategic Site Allocations for the Earl's Court and the Kensal Gasworks sites. Any remaining need would be likely to be met by other smaller windfall sites, particularly by very small and small office developments across the Borough.</p> <p>Policy CF5 seeks to protect medium sized offices (300 sqm - 1,000 sqm) in town centres.</p> <p>However, the policy is too restrictive in protecting office use, as some premises may be outdated or unsuitable for continued office use and so should be re-used or redeveloped for other alternative uses.</p> <p>Furthermore, existing office buildings may be in an unsuitable location, for example, within close proximity to residential uses which may cause amenity issues in respect of noise and disturbance to local residents. In such cases, where the office building is poorly located and is not in a suitable office location and is no longer considered suitable for office use, the policy should refer to the potential for re-use or redevelopment of</p>		<p>The Council recognises that the outstanding permissions for office floorspace will meet the predicted office need to 2017. Assuming all this floorspace is built out, a further 23,000 sq m will have to be provided within the plan period. Whilst the Council has allocated 20,000 of this floorspace, and does expect other windfall schemes to provide the remainder, these figures are reliant on the retention of the existing office floorspace. The loss of any existing floorspace will mean that this must be found from additional windfalls over the plan period. This is by no means certain a there is a finite number of sites available within the Borough, and each will be subject to competition from a number of competing uses. Given the policy presumption in favour of new residential development, and the 'higher value of housing' there is no guarantee that significant additional windfall office sites will come through.</p> <p>It is therefore important that existing office floorspace is protected. This approach is supported by the Employment Land Review Update which does note in para 6.4 that "if forecast demand for offices ...are to be met, the Council needs to control losses of office sites to other uses".</p> <p>Furthermore para 6.9 is explicit in noting that "...demand can only be met if no existing sites are lost (without being replaced).</p> <p>One of the purposes of the Core Strategy is to look across the lifetime of the plan, and to have the policies</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									medium offices for alternative uses.		<p>necessary to ensure that the employment needs of the Borough are met. A long term view is taken. The Council should not plan for the recession, but right up to 2026. If uses are lost as may not be 'needed' in the short term, there is very little chance that the original uses will be regained. In deed in the case of housing, there will be a policy presumption against the loss of housing to other uses.</p> <p>However, the Council does recognise that viability is a material consideration, and the Council will have to take into account any evidence which shows that a given premises is not viable/suitable in the longer term. Furthermore, the Council also recognises that impact of uses on residential amenity is material when determining applications, with the Core Strategy containing policies which concern noise and traffic generation.</p> <p>As drafted, Policy CF5 recognises that offices with a floor area greater than 300 sq m will not generally be appropriate outside Higher Order Town Centres, commercial mews or accessible areas (PTAL 4 of greater). Smaller offices are however, by their very nature, unlikely to have a detrimental impact on amenity. This is illustrated by the successful juxtaposition of small office and residential uses across the Borough.</p>	
Lionsgate Properties Lionsgate Properties	Lionsgate Properties	Planning Works Ltd	Policy CF 5	Location of Business Uses	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS119	<p>The Core Strategy is considered to be unsound because Policy CF5 is inconsistent with national policy as expressed in Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres (PPS6). Neither is the policy considered to be the most appropriate strategy compared to alternatives and, additionally, is not flexible.</p> <p>PPS6 lists the main town centre uses. These are retail, leisure and entertainment (including cinemas, restaurants, bars and pubs, night-clubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres and bingo halls), offices, arts, culture and tourism (including theatres, museums, galleries, concert halls, hotels and conference facilities). Additionally, housing is recognised as an important element in mixed-use, multi-storey developments.</p> <p>The Government's key objective for town centres is to promote their vitality and viability by (i) planning for the growth and development of existing centres and (ii) promoting and enhancing existing centres, by focussing development in such centres and encouraging a wide range of services in a good environment, accessible to all (PPS6, paragraph 1.3). Attention is drawn particularly to the encouragement of a wide range of services.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.22 of PPS6 states:</p> <p>"A diversity of uses in centres makes an important contribution to their vitality and viability. Different but complementary uses, during the day and in the evening, can reinforce each other, making town centres more attractive to local residents, shoppers and visitors. Local planning authorities should encourage diversification of uses in the town centre as a whole, and ensure that tourism, leisure and cultural activities, which appeal to a wide range of age and social groups, are dispersed throughout the</p>		<p>Through the Core Strategy the Council supports a diverse range of uses within its town centres. The consultee is correct in noting that the Core Strategy includes policies which specifically identify offices, hotels, and arts and cultural uses as being suitable non-shopping retail uses for the Higher Order Town Centres. There is, however, no 'hierarchy' as such for new uses on upper floors with the suitability of each been determined on a case by case approach, having regard to the particular vision for each centre.</p> <p>The Council does, however, recognise that existing town centre uses should be given the opportunity to grow and that CF5 as worded is overly restrictive. Change of use from offices to A1 is acceptable. Loss of offices to allow the expansion of an existing (not residential) town centre premises would also be appropriate. The Council would therefore support the rewording of CF5 to make this clear.</p> <p>The Council does not however support a more permissive approach which would allow the loss of offices to any other town centre use, in all circumstances, given the particular need for office floorspace within the borough, and within town centres particularly. This need, and the importance of protecting existing office space is supported by the Council's Employment Land and Premises Study, with para 6.9 being explicit in noting that "...demand can only be met if no existing sites are lost (without being replaced)."</p>	<p>If the Inspector is minded to approve the change, the Council would support rewording CF5a(ii) to read,</p> <p>"ii) the office is within a town centre and being replaced by a shop or shop floorspace, or another (not residential) town centre use where this allows the expansion of an adjoining premises.</p> <p>An additional sentence could be added to the reason justification in para 31.3.33 to explain the Council's position.</p> <p>"The protection of offices within town centres should not however be at the expense of existing town centre occupiers who are in need of expansion. Meeting the needs of growing businesses is integral to the fostering the vitality of the Borough. For the sake of clarity, the expansion of residential uses at the expense of offices within town centres is not supported.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>centre."</p> <p>Policy CF5 provides too great an emphasis on the protection of offices in the higher order town centres at the expense of achieving a diversity of uses envisaged by PPS6.</p> <p>In preparing their development plan documents local planning authorities are required to assess not only the need for office floorspace over the development plan period but should also consider the needs for other main town centre uses (PPS3, paragraphs 2.39 and 2.40). Policies CF7 and CF8 of the Core Strategy lend support to the development of arts and cultural uses and new hotels within the higher order town centres, but Policy CF5 would not permit such development if it resulted in the loss of any town centre offices. The only loss of town centre offices that would be permissible under Policy CF5 would be to provide retail floorspace but this is not a realistic alternative on upper floors in the majority of cases. This approach is too restrictive and is not consistent with achieving a diversity of uses as envisaged by PPS6.</p>			
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		Policy CF 5	Location of Business Uses		No	Effective	PSubCS234	<p>The premises needs of voluntary organisations (3A.19)</p> <p>The London Plan requires boroughs "assist the voluntary and community sector in delivering the objectives of this plan. In particular, boroughs should, when preparing their DPDs consult voluntary and community organisations and include policies, which address their need for accessible and affordable accommodation. The process for doing so should be spelt out in Statements of Community Involvement. "</p> <p>Voluntary and community organisations are integral to the provision of suitable social infrastructure. Boroughs should provide for appropriate space, including access for disabled people, to meet the necessary operational requirements of voluntary and community organisations. This will only be achieved through active engagement with the voluntary and community organisations operating within the Borough.</p> <p>While the Core Strategy does include references to the need for premises for voluntary and community organizations (eg para 29.2.4 (1) with regard to possible contributions through planning obligations), the Council has not yet established an evidence base of the various needs for premises. It is likely, however, that because of the high cost of property in Kensington and Chelsea, the main requirement may be affordable office accommodation.</p> <p>Test of soundness:</p> <p>The Society believes that there is therefore a risk that this area of the plan will fail the effectiveness test of soundness, because what is intended may not be achieved. For this reason, we make the following proposal to rectify the soundness issue.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>The Core Strategy needs to have amend Policy CF5 to include a new policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to require provision of a proportion of affordable office space in large-scale office developments to provide affordable space for voluntary and community organisations. <p>To underpin this policy the Council should support the Council for Voluntary Service - Kensington and Chelsea Social Council - to</p>		<p>The Core Strategy does recognise the role that voluntary organisations play in the life of the Borough. Where a voluntary organisation is also a 'social and community uses' as defined within <i>Keeping Life Local</i>, it is protected by policy CK1. This policy seeks to ensure that social and community uses are protected or enhanced, and new facilities are supported.</p> <p>The Council does however recognise that voluntary organisation do not fall into their own class, largely requiring small B1(a) units. The purpose of Policy CF5 is to ensure that there a range of business premises within the Borough and the Council considers that this is the most appropriate way to support voluntary and community organisations.</p> <p>Whilst the Council does not object to the principle of affordable premises (and indeed supports 'affordable shops') there has not, however, been much support for affordable business premises throughout the plan making process. The concept does not appear in the London Plan (or its emerging successor).</p> <p>The Core Strategy does however recognises that planning obligations can be uses to support the "provision of community, social and health facilities", including premises for voluntary and community organisations. (para 29.2.4(4)). It does not specify what these contributions could be. There is no reason why they could not include affordable business premises where the particular circumstances of the case means that it would meet the requirements of Circular 5/05.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									undertake a study and maintain a register of the accommodation needs of the voluntary and community sectors.			
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		Policy CF 5	Location of Business Uses		No	Effective	PSubCS235	<p>location of high trip-generating uses;</p> <p>London Plan Policy 3C.1 supports high trip-generating development only at locations with both high levels of public transport accessibility and public transport capacity, sufficient to meet the transport requirements of the development. (Note that this is in line with PPG13)</p> <p>The current UDP (para 6xiv) seeks to concentrate large-scale office developments within 400m walk of high-capacity underground stations and interchanges with high frequency bus services at South Kensington, Earl's Court, High Street Kensington, Notting Hill Gate, Gloucester Road, Knightsbridge and Sloane Square. These are all PTAL6 locations (see map on page 184 on the Core Strategy). This is supported by policy STRAT21, but Policy E1 failed to give priority to public transport accessibility and has resulted in most new large-scale office developments going to locations with poor public transport accessibility, such as the Freston Road area.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has chosen PTAL4 and above to define areas appropriate for high trip-generating uses (see paras 31.3.34, 32.3.3) and proposes to use this as a basis for assessing proposals (eg Policy CF5). Whilst it is policy to protect large offices (over 1,000 sqm) in higher-order town centres and "other accessible areas" (CF5 (a)) - not even "highly accessible areas" - the policy for the location of large-scale offices no longer focuses on locations with the highest public transport accessibility and capacity as required by PPG13, PPS6 and the London Plan - within 400m walk of high-capacity underground stations and interchanges or even in higher-order centres. Even widening that area to include all areas in PTAL6 would provide a much larger area suitable in public transport accessibility terms (see PTAL map) and a very large area of search for highly-accessible locations. The Core Strategy has widened this area to all areas with PTAL4 or above - which adds large areas of Chelsea and North Kensington - making most of the Borough "highly accessible" when in fact it is no more than "good". The strategy has lost any spatial focus.</p> <p>While PTAL4 may be regarded as a very high public transport accessibility level in other parts of London, it is the high "background" level of public transport accessibility, but, given that a high proportion of employees come from outside the Borough and arrive by underground, locations as much as 800m or more, even if a bus service is available, are not "highly accessible" in terms of PPG13 or PPS6. While the high general accessibility raises the "background level" of accessibility - the key test is how far an office worker has to travel on after arriving at a station. As a key town centre use in terms of PPS6, these uses should be in or on the edge of town centres or close to stations. PPS6 defines edge-of-centre for offices as within 300m of a town centre boundary or within 500m of a public transport interchange. The approach used in the UDP represents a local interpretation of that approach. The approach in the Core Strategy fails to provide this spatial focus.</p> <p>Test of soundness:</p> <p>The Society believes that there is therefore a risk that this area of the plan will fail the effectiveness test of soundness, because what is intended may not be achieved.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>The Core Strategy should provide a stronger focus on both high</p>		<p>The Council's strategy concerning the location of high trip generating uses is clearly articulated within the Core Strategy, with Policy CT1 (a) stating that high trip generating development must be located in areas of the Borough with a PTAL score of 4 or above and where there is sufficient public transport capacity, or that will achieve PTAL4 and provide sufficient capacity as a result of committed improvements to public transport. This approach complies with Policy 3C.1 of the London Plan. This policy does not specify what it considers to be an appropriate level of public transport accessibility, other than state "high". This is confirmed in para 3.200 of the London Plan which notes that "high density development should be located at points of "good" public transport capacity. PATAL 4 is "good".</p> <p>Whilst it does not consider commercial development the London Plan's density matrix is helpful as does give an indication of what the Mayor considers to be differing levels of public transport accessibility. The matrix includes three levels of accessibility, PTAL 0 to 1, PTAL 2 to 3 and PTAL 4 to 6. It is reasonable to equate PTAL 4 to 6 with 'good' or "high" Public Transport Accessibility.</p> <p>The PTAL map is the recognised London wide approach to public transport accessibility. It seems illogical to suggest that an area considered to have "good public transport accessibility" in the PTAL map, is somehow not accessible, just because it lies more than 400 m from a high-capacity underground station. Clearly access to (and from) bus services is also significant.</p> <p>The Council has taken PTAL 4 and above ('good' to 'most excellent') to be suitably "accessible".</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the Mayor for London has not objected to the Council's approach to high trip generating uses in any representations received</p> <p>The central part of the consultees objection would therefore appear to be that high trip generating uses should be located in higher order town centres (agreed) and areas with a PTAL 6. The Council considers the latter part of this approach to be too restrictive and to go beyond the requirements of the London Plan. It would also make it difficult for the Borough to meet the office 'need' outlined in the Employment Land and Premises Study, rendering many areas well served by public transport, (but not within existing higher order centres or immediately adjoin these) unacceptable for offices. There are only limited sites for development in these areas, and these sites/floorspace are in the greatest demand for a variety of other 'town centre' uses</p> <p>Policy EC2, of PPS4 seeks to make the most efficient use of land. Retail uses requires a town centre location. A town centre in turn requires a critical mass of shops to make them successful. An office use is suited to a town centre location, but does not require it. Of greater significance is good public transport accessibility. This is available outside a centre. Requiring town centre locations for retail, and other A class uses, but not for offices is therefore a suitable approach reflecting local circumstances. New offices in accessible areas (but</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>PTAL and capacity in the choice of preferred locations for high trip-generating developments, as proposed by PPG13, PPS6, the London Plan and the UDP, with the main focus being high-order centres and high-capacity underground stations. Even focus on all area with PTAL6 (or even PTAL5 or above) would provide more focus for developments. Many of the PTAL4 and PTAL5 locations are not served by more than a bus or are a long walk (eg more than 800m) from underground stations. This liberal definition of "highly accessible" needs to be changed to one of defining named preferred locations for development to give more spatial focus to the core strategy. The current approach would designate more than half the Borough as suitable for large-scale office development - the whole purpose should be to provide spatial focus.</p> <p>To achieve this changes will be needed to the text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to focus large-scale office development in higher-order town centres and within 400m walk of named high-capacity underground stations - by designating them as preferred locations where offices will be both protected and promoted. This has been done in the place chapters for Notting Hill Gate (16.3.4) and Kensington High Street (11.3.3), but has been omitted for other centres (eg Knightsbridge); to delete all references to "PTAL4 and above" in relation to offices and replace with "within higher-order town centres and within 400m walk of named high-capacity underground stations" (eg 31.3.34) adapting PPS6 to the context of this Borough; change Policy CF5 introduction and (a) to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "within town centres and areas of highest public transport accessibility" (introduction) "in higher-order town centres and areas of highest public transport accessibility (PTAL6)" references in Chapter 32: Better Travel Choices will also need revision, especially 32.3.2 - in the context of this Borough, "good" public transport accessibility" is not the same as "high" public transport accessibility let alone "appropriate locations for high trip-generating uses". <p>the references in Policy CT1 (a) to "require high trip-generating development to be located within town centres and areas where public</p>		<p>outside the town centres) contributes to the borough's vitality, helps ensure that 'office need' is provided, does not increase reliance in the private car (given that off street parking is not permitted with new offices), and ensures that scarce floorspace/potential remains available for the range of town centre uses that are dependent on a highly accessible town centre location.</p> <p>The Council does not concur with the consultees approach that its approach "has lost any spatial focus". The spatial focus is clear, with CF5 stating that the Council seeks to consolidate large and medium offices with the Higher Order town centres and other areas of high transport accessibility; and to promote and protect Employment Zones for range of small and medium business premises. This is an appropriate local interpretation of a sequential approach. Given the lack of sites with Higher Order Town centres, accessible areas outside the Higher Order Town Centres may also be appropriate for large and medium offices. If it is considered to be appropriate, the Council would not object to making an amendment to CF5 (Location of Business Uses) to make it clear that office uses will be encouraged within the higher Order Town Centres.</p> <p>Area which are not well served by public transport will never be appropriate for large scale offices (unless the PTAL level is improved). Locating large scale offices outside higher order town centres will not normally have a detrimental impact on the centres, given that the primary role of the centres remain as shopping centres. Existing offices (which will be protected), support this primary role.</p>	
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		Policy CF 5	Location of Business Uses		No	Effective	PSubCS236	<p>Location of large-scale development:</p> <p>London Plan Policy 3C.2 requires boroughs to consider proposals for major development in terms of existing transport capacity, and where it is not sufficient to allow for travel generated by proposed developments, and no firm proposals exist for a sufficient increase in capacity to cater for this, boroughs should ensure that development proposals are appropriately phased until these</p>		<p>The Council's strategy concerning the location of high trip generating uses is clearly articulated within the Core Strategy, with Policy CT1 (a) stating that high trip generating development must be located in areas of the Borough with a PTAL score of 4 or above and where there is sufficient public transport capacity, or that will achieve PTAL4 and provide sufficient capacity as a result of committed improvements to public transport.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>requirements can be met.</p> <p>This has implications for major developments and major intensification of development in areas that are identified for development but where public transport accessibility and capacity is currently poor - especially western part of North Kensington and south west Chelsea.</p> <p>There are considerable problems of public transport accessibility and public transport capacity in the western part of North Kensington. In the case of the Freston Road/Latimer Road area public transport accessibility is currently PTAL 2 and is optimistically projected to rise to 2/3. Public transport capacity may not be stretched at present, but increasing amounts of large-scale office development contrary to both the UDP and London Plan is inappropriate and, with proposals for estate renewal, may stretch capacity.</p> <p>Proposed major development at Kensal relies heavily on achieving a Crossrail station by 2016. Apart from any uncertainty that may still be resolved, phasing of completion of this major development will be essential. The Core Strategy is silent about this uncertainty, public transport capacity and the need for very careful phasing.</p> <p>Test of soundness:</p> <p>The Society believes that there is therefore a risk that this area of the plan will fail the effectiveness test of soundness, because what is intended may not be achieved. For this reason, we make the following proposal to rectify the soundness issue.</p> <p>Proposal</p> <p>The quantity and type of development in areas where public transport accessibility and capacity is currently poor/low needs to be acknowledged and the likely public transport accessibility and capacity after any improvements needs to be assessed. Where large-scale development is proposed that is dependent on a significant improvement in public transport, there is a need to demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the transport improvements are committed and programmed; the scale of development is proportionate to the transport improvements; and the developments are phased to avoid a long period in which people have poor public transport. <p>The current "proposals", especially for Kensal, are very uncertain as to scale and timing. The station has yet to be confirmed. Any development is likely to be primarily residential with a local centre based around Sainsbury's and a range of local facilities, such as health, education and leisure. The proposal needs a strong injection of realism. At present they are not sound.</p>		<p>This approach complies with Policy 3C.1 of the London Plan. This policy does not specify what it considers to be an appropriate level of public transport accessibility, other than state "high". This is confirmed in para 3.200 of the London Plan which notes that "high density development should be located at points of "good" public transport capacity. PATAL 4 is "good.</p> <p>With regard to Crossrail, the comment is accurate in that a degree of uncertainty remains, however, the delivery of a Crossrail station represents more than a mere aspiration and is a very real possibility. In spite of this, the Council acknowledges the risk and impact on both scale of development and alternate public transport provision with 20.3.1 and as part of the Contingencies and Risks chapter of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy and it is not considered appropriate to move this text into the site allocation as this will potentially dilute the overarching vision.</p>	
Metropolitan Police	Metropolitan Police	C G M S	Policy CF 5	Location of Business Uses		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS349	Therefore in order to ensure Policies CF5 and CKI of the emerging RBKC Core Strategy comply with the national guidance and the strategic development plan, thereby ensuring 'soundness', the relevant policy framework is set out. I then refer to the operational background in respect of particular policing uses and finally propose minor alterations to Policies CF5 and CKI.		Due to the nature and size of our Employment Zones and the demand for higher value uses, we will have to stop short of openly permitting the loss of light employment uses however We have added a paragraph to the reasoned justification in Keeping Life Local to highlight the specific operational needs of the Met Police. It is considered that this will provide the flexibility required by the Met Police should a suitable	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Relevant Planning Policy</p> <p>PPSI states at paragraph 27 (iii) (Delivering Sustainable Development), 'in preparing development plans, planning authorities should seek to: promote communities which are healthy, safe and crime free ...',</p> <p>London Plan Policy 3A.17 (Addressing the needs of London's diverse population) of the states:</p> <p><i>'Policies in DPDs should identify the needs of the diverse groups in their area. They should address the spatial needs of these groups, and ensure that they are capable of being met wherever possible, both through general policies for development and specific policies relating to the provision of social infrastructure including healthcare and social care (Policy 3 A.18), safety and security (Policy 4B . 6), policing facilities (my emphasis), the public realm (Policy 4B.3)'</i></p> <p>Policy 3A.18 (Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure and community facilities) states:</p> <p><i>' Policies in DPDs should assess the need for social infrastructure and community facilities in their area (my emphasis), and ensure that they are capable of being met wherever possible . These needs include primary healthcare facilities , children 's play and recreation facilities, services for young people , older people and disabled people, as well as libraries , sports and leisure facilities, open space , schools , nurseries and other childcare provision, training facilities, fire and policing facilities (my emphasis), community halls , meeting rooms, places of worship, public toilets , facilities for cyclists , convenience shops , banking facilities and post offices (also see Chapter 3 D). Adequate provision for these facilities is particularly important in major areas of new development and regeneration .</i></p> <p>London Plan Policy 3.B4 states:</p> <p><i>With strategic partners, the Mayor will promote, manage and where necessary protect the varied industrial offer of the Strategic Industrial Locations (SILs - Policy 2 A.10), set out in Annex 2 as London 's strategic reservoir of industrial capacity . Boroughs should identify SILs in DPDs , and develop local policies and criteria to manage Locally Significant and other , smaller industrial sites outside the SILs , having regard to (inter alia) :</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>the potential for surplus industrial land (as defined in assessments) to help meet strategic and local requirements for a mix of other uses such as housing and social infrastructure and where appropriate , contribute to town centre renewal .</i> <p>Furthermore, emerging London Plan Policy 2.17 defines inter alia 'other industrial related activities' as being acceptable within Preferred Industrial Locations..</p> <p>Having outlined relevant government guidance and strategic development plan policies, the requested minor alterations are made within the context of the MPA's operational need</p>		<p>site become available:</p> <p>"Metropolitan Police, ambulance and fire services have very specific operational circumstances, unlike those of other social and community uses. As a result, their needs will be assessed on a case by case basis and in line with their individual strategies."</p> <p>With regard to CK1, the Council understands MPA's position, however, as written it is considered to provide the support and flexibility for police facilities whilst also remaining water-tight in protecting other (potentially more vulnerable) uses. Whilst the wording proposed by MPA may be suitable for the needs of the police, the Council is concerned that it would not provide the necessary protection for the full range of social and community facilities defined in Keeping Life Local. This could significantly weaken our position should applications come forward for the loss of a social and community use without the re-provision of certain facilities. The wording as written has been through both our QC and in-house legal team to ensure both soundness and practical usability.</p> <p>The third bullet-point of CK1c iii. protects against the net loss of facilities in line with LP policy 3A.18 and allows for the off-site re-provision of facilities where it is demonstrated that there is a greater benefit to the borough. The Core Strategy is explicit in its support for the MPA Estate Strategy (Corporate and Partnership Actions of Keeping Life Local on page 168). As any application relating to the loss of police facilities would presumably be in line with the Estate Strategy, it would almost certainly be supported by the Council. Therefore, an application for a change of use of a policing facility to a non-social and community use would be supported providing the MPA could demonstrate that the proposal, as part of the wider Estate Strategy, results in significant improvement to policing across the borough through off-site re-provision.</p>	
Metropolitan Police	Metropolitan Police	C G M S	Policy CF5	Location of Business Uses		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS351	<p>Policy CF5 Location of Business Uses</p> <p>The MPA are content in principle with the approach in Policy CF5 Location of Business Uses which promotes the protection of Light Industrial land and Employment Zones in the borough however this is on the basis that policing facilities are considered acceptable on such land. The National and Strategic policy</p>		<p>Due to the nature and size of our Employment Zones and the demand for higher value uses, we will have to stop short of openly permitting the loss of light employment uses however We have added a paragraph to the reasoned justification in Keeping Life Local to highlight the specific operational needs of the Met Police. It is considered that this will provide the</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>framework supporting this is referred to above.</p> <p>The MPA have identified the potential of relevant employment space in helping them meet the goals of their estate strategy. In particular, the provision of patrol bases, custody centres and relevant pan-London policing facilities are vital to the successful implementation of the MPA's estate strategy. The nature of these uses are similar to that carried out on most industrial sites and therefore are ideally suited to Light Industrial Land and Employment Zone locations.</p> <p>Whilst falling outside the 'B' Use Class definition, these policing uses are employment-generating uses. Generally the policing uses represent no material alteration from an Employment (B1) or Warehousing (B8) use as they possess an employment density similar to or in excess of 'B' Class uses. Vehicle movement will also be similar to a typical employment/industrial use. These facilities do not require continued public access and therefore have no requirement to be located in town centre areas.</p> <p>It is demonstrated above that the policy requirement to provide employment uses within designated existing light industrial land and employment zones can be met through the provision of appropriate policing facilities on such land. Mindful of this, policing uses can be appropriately located within employment designated land. Furthermore, it is considered that a planning policy basis as suggested below to support appropriate policing facilities on designated employment and industrial land in RB Kensington and Chelsea would not prejudice current or future employment land supply across the borough, as such uses are compatible with the requirement to provide employment opportunity. This is supported by a number of London Borough's which have approved policing facilities on employment/industrial land, including Enfield (Cambridge Business Park), Haringey (Quicksilver Place) and Greenwich (Warspite Road).</p> <p>This approach is supported by the strategic development plan within Policy 3B.4. Industrial Locations which states that policies in DPD's 'should develop local policies and criteria to manage industrial sites having regard to helping meet strategic and local requirements for... social infrastructure.' Furthermore, Policy 2.17 Strategic industrial locations of the Emerging London Plan defines inter alia 'other industrial related activities' as being acceptable within Preferred Industrial Locations. It is clearly demonstrated above that particular policing uses are essentially industrial and that the emerging Core Strategy should</p> <p>therefore reflect this. It is also further demonstrated that certain policing uses will also fulfil the strategic requirement regarding the provision of social infrastructure.</p> <p>In order to comply with the Strategic Development Plan in this regard the following alterations to Policy CF5 are recommended below.</p> <p><i>Recommended Alteration</i></p> <p>It is recommended that the following change is made to Policy CF 5 (additional wording in italics) to ensure that surplus employment and industrial land can be used for police uses:</p> <p>m. promote employment zones as locations for small businesses, workshops <i>workshops</i> (whether stand alone or part of a</p>		<p>flexibility required by the Met Police should a suitable site become available:</p> <p>"Metropolitan Police, ambulance and fire services have very specific operational circumstances, unlike those of other social and community uses. As a result, their needs will be assessed on a case by case basis and in line with their individual strategies."</p> <p>With regard to CK1, the Council understands MPA's position, however, as written it is considered to provide the support and flexibility for police facilities whilst also remaining water-tight in protecting other (potentially more vulnerable) uses. Whilst the wording proposed by MPA may be suitable for the needs of the police, the Council is concerned that it would not provide the necessary protection for the full range of social and community facilities defined in Keeping Life Local. This could significantly weaken our position should applications come forward for the loss of a social and community use without the re-provision of certain facilities. The wording as written has been through both our QC and in-house legal team to ensure both soundness and practical usability.</p> <p>The third bullet-point of CK1c iii. protects against the net loss of facilities in line with LP policy 3A.18 and allows for the off-site re-provision of facilities where it is demonstrated that there is a greater benefit to the borough. The Core Strategy is explicit in its support for the MPA Estate Strategy (Corporate and Partnership Actions of Keeping Life Local on page 168). As any application relating to the loss of police facilities would presumably be in line with the Estate Strategy, it would almost certainly be supported by the Council. Therefore, an application for a change of use of a policing facility to a non-social and community use would be supported providing the MPA could demonstrate that the proposal, as part of the wider Estate Strategy, results in significant improvement to policing across the borough through off-site re-provision.</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									large business centre) <i>and for police and emergency service uses where appropriate</i> .			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CF5	Location of Business Uses		No	Effective	PSubCS405	<p>p178 Policy CF5 Location of business uses</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>Additional text is proposed to refer to the acceptability of office development on the Earls Court and Kensal Gasworks strategic sites, as stated in para 31.3.32. Added flexibility is proposed in (f) (formerly (e)) to take account of other factors that will have a bearing on the nature and type of business space appropriate in a particular development scheme. The alteration provides clarity and consistency for an effective policy.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CF5</p> <p>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 and medium offices 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.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will, with regard to:</p> <p>Offices</p> <p>(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:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(ii) the office is within a town centre and is being replaced by a shop or shop floorspace;</p> <p>(b) permit very small offices anywhere in the Borough save for ground floor level of town centres;</p> <p>(c) permit small offices anywhere in the Borough; require medium offices to be located in town centres, in other accessible areas, in Employment Zones and in commercial mews; require large offices to be located in higher order town centres and other accessible areas, except where the proposal:</p> <p>(i) results in shared communal residential/ business entrance;</p> <p>(ii) results in the net loss of any residential units or floorspace; or</p> <p>(iii) in the case of a town centre, harms the retail function of that centre;</p> <p>(d) permit office development on the Earls Court and Kensal</p>		The strategic site allocations states that both the Kensal and Earl's Court sites are appropriate locations for office uses. Earl's Court is an 'accessible area' in terms of PTAL, and therefore a suitable location for large scale offices. No change to CF5 is therefore necessary.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Gasworks strategic sites;</p> <p>(e) permit business centres at upper floor levels of higher order town centres, within accessible areas and within Employment Zones;</p> <p>(f) require all new business floorspace over 100m² to be flexible, capable of accommodating a range of unit sizes having regard to the nature of the scheme and viability;</p>			
Nottingdale Ltd	Nottingdale Ltd	London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CF 5	Location of Business Uses		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS495	<p>Policy CF5-Location of Business Units</p> <p>Based on the preceding justifications given in respect of paragraphs 31.3.31, 34 and 36, we object to the following parts of this policy:</p> <p>Offices</p> <p>The categorisation of different offices sizes is arbitrary and is not based on any sound evidence. The evidence base for Employment supply and demand only distinguishes between small scale offices of 100 -300sqm and other office floorspace. It does not identify a need for a limit on office floorspace based on the thresholds provided. Ie medium offices at 300sqm-1000sqm and large offices of 1,000sqm or more.</p> <p>The justification for limiting large offices in the Employment Zones is to protect these locations for small scale and medium sized offices and to avoid traffic congestion in areas away from Public Transport.</p> <p>There is nothing to say that say five "medium sized" offices of approx 1,000sqm each would generate any more or less people movements that one 5,000sqm office. Yet the policy seems to be worded in CF5 to allow one and prevent the other. In effect the impact will largely be the same and limiting offices to 1,000sqm will reduce economies of construction. In reality, larger offices are often sub divided based on inherent design flexibility to allow each floor to be separately let.</p> <p>The policy should therefore avoid an arbitrary floorspace restriction and instead seek flexible designs that allow for sub division based on market demand.</p> <p>The evidence in the Roger Tym and Partners report clearly highlights that buildings such as the Yellow Building, developed in the Freston Road Employment Zone, are let out to a number of tenants.</p> <p>Light Industrial</p> <p>The policy seeks to protect light industrial uses throughout the Borough and specifically in the Employment Zones.</p> <p>The Employment evidence base makes it clear that there is a decline in demand for industrial space and the greater demand is for small office units. This part of the policy is not therefore credible or based on the evidence available. New light industrial space of approx 4,300sqm delivered as part of the Nottingdale Village remains unlet after a year of marketing and points to evidence of this reducing demand.</p>		<p><i>Offices</i></p> <p>The Council considers that the thresholds used to divide office premises into a number of types are appropriate and reflect the Council's ambitions for offices within the Borough.</p> <p>The Employment Land study classes "small offices" as those with a floor area of between 100 and 300 sq m. Large offices are defined as 1,000 sq m to reflect the size of office development classed as "major development" in terms of the planning applications. Logically, very small offices will be those with a floor area below the lower threshold for a small office, with medium offices between those which are larger than "small", but which do not reach the 1,000 sq m, or "large" threshold.</p> <p>The purpose of the classification is to allow the Council to direct different types of offices to different parts of the Borough. For example the small and very small offices of particular significant to local people can be located throughout much of the borough, being as scale that is unlikely to cause problems in terms of amenity or to change the character of an area. The Council has chosen to welcome new large offices,(as potential major trip generators) within town centres and other accessible areas. This position is supported by the Employment Land Study and by the Mayor of London.</p> <p>Employment Zones are not seen as suitable locations for new large scale office development for a number of reasons, and not simply because, as potentially high trip generators, they should be located in town centres and other accessible areas (important though this is.) Employment Zones are considered to be the suitable location for smaller office, workshop and light industrial uses as these are the uses in particular demand by the Borough's residents.</p> <p>The Council accepts that a large number of small offices could have the potential to create traffic, but that this potential is less than for a single large unit made up of the same floorspace. Small business premises are more likely to serve local people than large. Local people are more likely to walk to work than visitors from outside the Borough.</p> <p>Whilst a policy which seeks flexible designs which allow subdivision may help meet the existing demand for office premises in a particular area it is less likely to provide the smaller premises sought by the Council. The market will provide the most profitable form of development. This does not necessarily equate to that favoured by a local authority to best meet the needs of</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Employment Zones</p> <p>We object to the resistance of large scale offices in the Employment Zones. This ignores the presence and established character of the built and permitted development specifically in the Freston Road Employment Zone. For the reasons given in the preceding paragraphs it is clear that the evidence does not support this position and that alternative wording would ensure delivery of smaller units as part of wider development delivery. For instance, requiring a small percentage of new developments to deliver small office units to meet the demand identified, whilst supporting and building on the regeneration success established in the Freston Road Employment Zone.</p>		<p>its residents.</p> <p><i>Light industrial</i></p> <p>The Council recognises that light industrial uses are small in scale in the Borough. The Employment Land Study also recognises that this is a sector likely to decline further. However, the long-term analysis within the Employment Land Study suggests that the land supply for industry/warehousing is in line with demand; both show constant employment and constant floorspace for the period to 2026. The short-term market analysis confirms that there is occupier demand, that provision of fit-for-purpose, relatively low-cost property is financially viable, and that the market is tight. All this suggests that, if demand is to be met and business is not to be forced out or priced out of the Borough, the Council should safeguard sites against competition from higher-value uses.</p> <p>This approach would also comply with that of the Mayor for London, which classified Kensington as a borough of "restrictive transfer" in terms of industrial uses.</p> <p><i>Employment Zones</i></p> <p>These issues have been considered elsewhere in the consultees comments.</p>	
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CF 5	Location of Business Uses				PSubCS510				
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CF 5	Location of Business Uses	Yes	Yes		PSubCS511	<p>Policy CF 5: Location of Business Uses</p> <p>KHT notes that Policy CF 5 seeks to protect very small and small offices (when either stand alone or as part of larger business premises) throughout the Borough, and medium sized offices within the Employment Zones, Higher Order Town Centres, other accessible areas and primarily commercial mews. KHT supports Policy CF 5 in that additional office floorspace may be appropriate outside of existing Employment Zones and Higher Order Town Centres, in accessible locations. This is consistent with the London Plan, which seeks the renovation and renewal of existing stock and positively encourages the provision of a variety of type, size and cost of office premises to meet the needs of all sectors.</p>		Support noted.	No change.
Ms Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust		Policy CF 7	Arts and Culture Uses	Yes	Yes		PSubCS153	<p>We support your Submission Core Strategy in respect of Policy CF7 (Arts and Culture Uses) as it contains all the elements required for a thoughtful and solid framework for the current and future cultural needs of the Borough. Good quality arts and cultural facilities are essential components in the development of sustainable communities and it is important to provide, protect and promote cultural facilities for their leading role in the quality of cultural life in Kensington and Chelsea and for their valuable contribution to the character and function of London as a whole.</p>		<p>Support for Council's position on arts and cultural facilities noted.</p> <p>Policy CF3 is titled "Diversity of uses within Town Centres" as sets out the criteria by which the Council will maintain an appropriate balance of town centre uses. The ambition of the policy is to secure the success and vitality of our town centres by protecting, enhancing and promoting a diverse range of shops, and by ensuring that the uses will be supported, but not dominated, by a</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CF3 is titled 'Diversity of uses within Town Centres' but only deals with shops. The wording of the policy should reflect the title. The policy protects shops but is entirely silent on any kind of diversity in town centres in spite of an excellent description of town centre uses in the Glossary on page 452. We therefore suggest the title of this policy be amended accordingly. Thank you for including a description of arts and cultural uses in the Glossary on page 440. The document is very long at over 450 pages and although it does not undermine the soundness of the CS(in our opinion) it obscures its key themes and entails repetition. 		range of complimentary town centre uses. This indicates the positive contribution that non shop town centre uses can have in the life of a centre. The Council considers that, whilst lengthy, the Core Strategy offers a clear vision for planning the Borough into 2028.	
Welcome Trust		Cluttons LLP	Policy CF 8	Hotels		Yes		PSubCS158	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We suggest that Policy CF8a is amended to refer to protecting hotels "in all wards except Earl's Court and Courtfield" since concentrations of hotels are shown in Courtfield ward as well as Earl's Court ward on the Fostering Vitality Map and problems in relation to them being in conflict with the residential nature of the surrounding area were referred to in para 31.3.15 of the draft Core Strategy policy of 24th July 2009. Our proposed amendment to the draft policy would make it more sound by being justified by the evidence. 		The Council recognises that there is a particular concentration of hotels in the Courtfield and Earl's Court Wards. This concentration was reflected in the Draft Core Strategy of July 2009. However, when consulted, the GLA were concerned that our policy approach was overly permissive, given their stated desire (within the London Plan, Policy 3D.7 Visitor accommodation and facilities) to increase London's stock of bedrooms by 40,000 net by 2026. The Council, therefore, amended the policy to allow the loss of hotels in Earl's Court ward only, the ward which historically has experienced the greatest conflict between hotels and the surrounding residential area. Following further discussions with the GLA, the GLA are satisfied that this is a suitable approach, given the positive stance that the Core Strategy takes towards the provision of new hotels in many parts of the centre. This is a fundamentally different approach to that taken in the UDP.	No change.
The London Planning Practice LLP	The London Planning Practice LLP		Policy CF 8	Hotels	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS285	<p>The hotel survey carried out by Acorn includes reference to the fact that although they attribute the number of hotels in the borough to be in the region of 95; if taken in the wider definition to include other types of hotel accommodation there would be 189 hotel establishments within the Borough.</p> <p>The Acorn report also includes the data collected as part of the 2004/2005 survey on hotels for the Borough which states that there were 191 hotel establishments containing 30,858 bedspaces in 2004.</p> <p>The 2004 to 2005 analysis shows that there was a decline in the number of hotel establishments over the period 1992 to 2004 by 23; however there was a substantial increase in the number of bedspaces within hotel establishments, by 3,170 or 11%.</p> <p>This shows that although there was a rise in the number of hotels being lost to other uses, there was a substantial increase in bedspaces by extension or internal refurbishment works which is more important to the visitor economy.</p> <p>There appears therefore to be capacity within existing hotel establishments to cater for additional visitors to the Borough.</p> <p>The introduction of these policies conflict with the long standing and future strategic objectives of the London Plan and PPS3 which seek to encourage the provision of additional housing to meet need.</p>		<p>The Council recognises that the Borough's hotel sector remains vibrant. This is reflected by the role that it remains in providing jobs within the Borough.</p> <p>The GLA have interpreted Policy 3D.7 (Visitor accommodation and facilities) of the London Plan, as a requirement that the Council takes a restrictive approach to the loss of hotels. A more relaxed approach in Earl's Court ward has only proved possible given the history of conflict between hotel and residential amenity in the area, and given that there is little indication that large numbers of hotel bedspaces are still being lost in the ward.</p> <p>The GLA are however extremely concerned that a more relaxed approach as suggested by the consultee, would not be in general conformity with the London Plan. This was made clear in the comments received by the GLA on the Proposed Submission Core Strategy (July/September 2009).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council is satisfied that it will meet its requirements with regard the provision of additional housing within the plan period with the proposed restrictive approach to loss of hotels in place.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>There is already an extreme shortage of land within the Borough preventing new residential development from being brought forward, where as there is a large proportion of hotels with capacity already in existence within the Borough that can address the need for hotel bedspaces and tourist accommodation within Central London.</p> <p>Whilst the London Plan encourages the provision of 40,000 net additional bedspaces up to 2026, the plan also places an emphasis on the creation of new housing, particularly affordable housing and an adaptable range of market housing due to the expected increase in the population within this part of Central London.</p> <p>It is therefore maintained that Policy CF8 is not justified or consistent with national or regional policy.</p>			
Mr T Nodder	K&C Environment Round Table		Policy CH 1	Housing Targets		No	Effective	PSubCS21	<p>Making provision for the numbers of additional dwellings proposed in Policy CH1 will require a positive parallel provision of services, schools, community resources, neighbourhood retail facilities, transport improvements and green spaces. This is acknowledged in para 35.3.3. However, Para 39.1.9 recognises that there is a risk that infrastructure may not be provided. It is noted that in the Infrastructure Chapter and tables many items depend on sources of funding from private finance, developer contributions and S106 contributions. We note that the "Green" items are mostly so dependent. We doubt whether in this respect the Core Strategy meets sufficiently the expectation of PPS12 quoted in 37.2.2. We support generally the comments from the Kensington Society and the Chelsea Society, sharing their concerns that the Borough could become over-developed in an unbalanced way. In particular, we are concerned that the Strategy will not effectively deliver the green improvements that are needed for the environmental health of the Borough.</p> <p>We also support strongly the comments made by the amenity societies regarding the importance of protecting and enhancing the Thameside.</p>		<p>While the representation does not appear to raise an issue of soundness <i>per se</i> it should be noted that Policy C1, and the assessed infrastructure requirements seek to ensure that new developments will assist in providing necessary infrastructure. In preparing an assessment of infrastructure requirements, best practice as provided by PAS has been used, with consultation and involvement of stakeholders. It is an on-going process, and so will evolve over time, while Policy C1 requires necessary infrastructure to be provided alongside development, and complies with Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>A Planning Obligations Supplementary planning Document has also been prepared to assist in formulating the required obligations to secure infrastructure, including necessary community and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Combined, and taking account of the best practice, it is considered that the approach to infrastructure delivery meets the test of PPS12. The Borough is also part of a Planning Officer's Society grouping sharing and developing best practice in infrastructure planning, and English Nature have been involved in the process, to the extent of advising on provision of green infrastructure, on an on-going basis. Through the approach adopted, it is considered that the tests of soundness, and the PPS12 requirement, are met.</p>	No change.
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social Council		Policy CH 1	Housing Targets		No	Justified	PSubCS45	<p>Policy CH 1 Housing targets</p> <p>B Only 200 out of 600 new homes per year will be affordable (33%). There is not the evidence base to justify this policy and it does not follow London Plan 2008 policy which requires 50% affordable housing. The evidence in 35.3.10 is not reflected in policy CH 1.</p> <p>Furthermore, the supporting text fails to provide evidence on overall housing need and does not report the findings of the SHMA. There is reference to the need within affordable housing (35.3.6), but not the share of need between the affordable and owner occupation tenures.</p> <p>The target for affordable housing should be a minimum in the same way as the target for the total number of units is a minimum.</p> <p>C We support this policy which follows the SHMA in deciding the split between social rented and intermediate housing.</p>		<p>Support for part C of the policy is noted.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective, and the tenure split is made in Policy CH2. The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. While the 50% target is considered appropriate as a target for qualifying sites, the 200 units</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											p.a. target, expressed numerically, is appropriate as a target overall, and this translates to a 50% minimum target on qualifying sites (see policy CH2i). The tenure split, also a concern of the objector, is dealt with in policy CH2.	
Brookfield Developments	Brookfield Developments (UK) Ltd	DP9	Policy CH 1	Housing Targets	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS72	<p>Policy CH1 (c)</p> <p>The term 'require' does not provide for sufficient flexibility in application of this policy in light of the amendments to policy CH2.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to tenure mix targets accord with the position being advocated as part of the Housing Strategy and acknowledge the need for increasing the opportunity to deliver mixed and balanced communities in accordance with PPS3 and in light of the particular concentrations of social rented housing exist in the Borough. The following changes are proposed:</p> <p>"c. The Council will generally seek the provision of (score through text</p> <p>Require) affordable housing tenures (score through text</p> <p>to be provided) such that they work towards a Borough wide target of 60!B% social rented housing and 40% (score through text</p> <p>.) Intermediate housing. "</p>		<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Direction of 10 September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended <p>The SHMA has been used as evidence supporting the drafting of policies within the Diversity of Housing Chapter, and accords with guidance set out in PPS3. It incorporates both a market assessment and a needs assessment. The SHMA looks at the housing market within and around the Royal Borough, while the</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>Londonwide SHMA treats London as a whole, as a housing market. A sub-regional housing market is also being prepared. The 'international-dimension' is incorporated within each, as housing market boundaries transcend the local. The studies on which the policy has been based fully comply with government guidance on the conduct of a SHMA (CLG, 2007).</p> <p>Policy CH1, to be consistent with the above, and with policy CH2, should therefore require the appropriate housing tenures. The suggested 60%:40% split is not supported by evidence in the objectors' representation, and this has also been addressed through the response provided to the representative made to policy CH2.</p>	
Sun Life Assurance Plc	Sun Life Assurance Plc	DP9	Policy CH 1	Housing Targets	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS77	<p>Policy CHI</p> <p>The term 'require' does not provide for sufficient flexibility in application of this</p> <p>policy in light of the suggested amendments to policy CH2.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to tenure mix targets accord with the position being</p> <p>advocated as part of the London Housing Strategy and acknowledge the need for</p> <p>increasing the opportunity to deliver mixed and balanced communities in accordance</p> <p>with PPS3 and in light of the particular concentrations of social rented tenures which</p> <p>exist in the Borough. The following changes are proposed:</p> <p>"c. The Council will generally seek the provision of Delete [require] affordable housing</p> <p>tenures Delete [to be provided] such that they work towards a Borough wide target of</p> <p>60% Delete [85%] social rented housing and 40% Delete [15%] Intermediate housing. "</p>		<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30% intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. 	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended <p>The SHMA has been used as evidence supporting the drafting of policies within the Diversity of Housing Chapter, and accords with guidance set out in PPS3. It incorporates both a market assessment and a needs assessment. The SHMA looks at the housing market within and around the Royal Borough, while the Londonwide SHMA treats London as a whole, as a housing market. A sub-regional housing market is also being prepared. The 'international-dimension' is incorporated within each, as housing market boundaries transcend the local. The studies on which the policy has been based fully comply with government guidance on the conduct of a SHMA (CLG, 2007).</p> <p>Policy CH1, to be consistent with the above, and with policy CH2, should therefore require the appropriate housing tenures. The suggested 60%:40% split is not supported by evidence.</p>	
828 Pte Ltd	828 Pte Ltd	DP9	Policy CH 1	Housing Targets				PSubCS83	<p>Housing Targets - Policy CHI</p> <p>We note that criterion "c" of Policy CHI advises that the Council will "require affordable</p> <p>housing tenures to be provided such that they work towards a Borough-wide target of 85% social</p> <p>rented housing and 15% Intermediate housing."</p> <p>Our clients consider that the wording of this criterion of the policy does not provide for sufficient</p> <p>flexibility in the application of the policy. The wording of criterion "c" of the policy should be</p> <p>amended to make reference that the Council will "generally seek the provision of' affordable</p> <p>housing.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed tenure mix should accord with the London Housing Strategy and</p> <p>recognise the overarching principle to provide mixed and balanced communities, as advocated in</p> <p>PPS3. As such, the proposed tenure mix should be re-worded to refer to "60% social rented</p> <p>housing and 40% Intermediate housing."</p>		<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 40% affordable housing is generally viable. ● 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target 	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended <p>The SHMA has been used as evidence supporting the drafting of policies within the Diversity of Housing Chapter, and accords with guidance set out in PPS3. It incorporates both a market assessment and a needs assessment. The SHMA looks at the housing market within and around the Royal Borough, while the Londonwide SHMA treats London as a whole, as a housing market. A sub-regional housing market is also being prepared. The 'international-dimension' is incorporated within each, as housing market boundaries transcend the local. The studies on which the policy has been based fully comply with government guidance on the conduct of a SHMA (CLG, 2007).</p> <p>Policy CH1, to be consistent with the above, and with policy CH2, should therefore require the appropriate housing tenures. The suggested 60%:40% split is not supported by evidence.</p>	
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		Policy CH 1	Housing Targets		No	Justified	PSubCS203	<p>Housing targets</p> <p>18. Within the Core Strategy, the Council has made reference to a target of 3,500 additional homes to be built in the Core Strategy period 2007/8 -2016/17, equating to an annual monitoring target of 350. This is in accordance with the housing target set out in paragraph 3A.1 of the adopted London Plan and is supported. The overall target is, <i>however</i>, set out in the review of the London Plan policy. Previous iterations (policy CH1 in the July pre-submission draft) included the target 3,500 which is not included in the current monitoring target of 350 is included within policy, the overall target is not. The exclusion of the overall target would undermine the ability of the Council to achieve its targets, <i>however</i>, for clarity it should be included in the draft replacement London Plan as and when the new London Plan figures are published. It allows flexibility regarding these numbers subject to their finalisation (final sentence of CH1a.). The Council disagrees that the overall target be contained within the policy will assist with clarity, particularly as the policy already contains the transitional arrangements to the new London Plan figures - based on the SHLAA (the 600 net additional referred to within CH1a.). This approach, allows and assists with general conformity matters, and does not appear to be a concern to the representor.</p> <p>19. The draft consultation replacement London Plan was published on 12 October 2009 and includes new targets for housing delivery for the borough. The proposed <i>revised</i> ten year figure for Kensington & Chelsea is 5,850 with a figure of 585 new homes.</p> <p>20. These figures are based on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)/Housing Capacity Study (HCS). The SHLAA/HCS is part of the <i>evidence</i> base for the <i>review</i> of the London Plan. These are minimum targets in general conformity following formal publication of the new London Plan in 2011</p> <p>21. The Core Strategy has taken account of the latest published annual monitoring targets in the draft consultation replacement London Plan by setting a target of 600 units per annum, which exceeds the targets currently being delivered and significantly exceeds the existing monitoring target in the adopted plan. The Core Strategy is clear that the <i>revised</i> targets will be delivered once tested through EIP, i.e after 2011 and the adoption of the new London Plan.</p> <p>22. London Plan policy 3A.2 states that "<i>DPD policies should (amongst other matters) seek to exceed the figures in Table 3A.1 of the draft consultation replacement plan</i>". This aspect of the policy is therefore in general conformity with the London Plan and draft replacement plan on overall provision of new homes.</p> <p>Affordable housing targets</p> <p>23. London Plan policy 3A.9 requires that DPD policies should set a target over the plan period in their area, based on an assessment of all housing in the area. Statement 3 (PPS3) further emphasises this requirement for a borough to set a target for affordable housing delivery.</p>	<p>The emerging London Plan, including its approach to affordable housing and housing numbers is, at the time of preparing the Core Strategy, in draft form only. It is not yet published and it has at least reached its final stage. The Council will continue to monitor the emerging London Plan and will update the Core Strategy policy accordingly. The Core Strategy approach based on the emerging London Plan figures (350 p.a. net), with a commitment to be updated as and when the new London Plan figures are published. It allows flexibility regarding these numbers subject to their finalisation (final sentence of CH1a.). The Council disagrees that the overall target be contained within the policy will assist with clarity, particularly as the policy already contains the transitional arrangements to the new London Plan figures - based on the SHLAA (the 600 net additional referred to within CH1a.). This approach, allows and assists with general conformity matters, and does not appear to be a concern to the representor.</p> <p>Consequently, the only change being sought with regard to CH1 regarding the housing numbers is the insertion of the overall target within policy. The Council do not accept that this will assist with clarity.</p> <p>The main concern appears to be the use of the 90 units p.a. target, as set out within the Mayor's Housing Strategy in the interim, until new London Plan policy is effective, despite being the agreed target through the draft consultation replacement London Plan. The figure is a target which, through applying the emerging affordable housing policy, is one which will be exceeded, while a 200 unit target from 350 units delivery is considered excessive.</p>	No change.	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>3.12 of the draft consultation replacement London Plan seeks that boroughs set an overall target for the amount of affordable housing needed over the plan period and separate targets for social rented and intermediate housing to reflect the strategic priority for affordable family housing. In setting those targets account should be taken of current and future housing requirements identified in the London Plan, need for family housing, strategic, sub-regional and local needs, mixed and balanced communities, capacity and viability.</p> <p>24. Policy CH1 in the Core Strategy is not clear regarding affordable housing targets. The reasoned justification (paragraph 35.3.2) states that 90 units a year is the agreed target in the draft Mayor's Housing Strategy between 2008-11. This then leads into a higher target that is formed on the back of emerging housing targets and capacity work set out in the draft consultation replacement London Plan (200 per annum target between 2011/12-2021/22 or 2000 over ten years).</p> <p>25. As such, the policy seeks the "maximum amount of affordable housing with a target of 200 units per annum from 2011/2012 until 2021/222". There is no reference in policy to the targets to be applied from the adoption of the Core Strategy up to 2011/2012 other than reference in the paragraph 35.3.2 to the targets agreed as part of the draft Mayor's Housing Strategy.</p> <p>26. Whilst a three-year target has been negotiated with the GLA as the short-term delivery target for the borough having regard to the Mayor's aspiration to deliver 50,000 homes by 2011 as part of his housing strategy across London; this three-year target is a funding based target and is not subject to the tests of policy 3A.9 of the London Plan or the tests set out in PPS3, PPS12 or subject to the examination process, which require a rigorous assessment against the realistic needs and supply within the borough.</p> <p>27. The appropriateness to adopt the three-year target as forming part of the Core Strategy target does not follow the more recent evidence being presented in setting the latter target of 200 units per annum, due to be implemented from 2011/2012. The 200 unit target should therefore apply from the adoption of the plan on the basis of the evidence.</p> <p>28. The Council's evidence suggests an overwhelming need for affordable housing in the borough. On the basis of the evidence the Council could justify a target closer to the current strategic target of 50%. Regards should, however, be had to both need and supply amongst other factors. The Council has presented the argument that a target closer to the current strategic target in the London Plan would not be deliverable. The Council delivered zero affordable housing units in 2008.</p> <p>29. Whilst this is the case, the Council proposes detailed affordable housing policies for site specific delivery (contained within policy CH2). These policies provide a robust basis to achieve substantial delivery of affordable housing in order to meet the emerging targets that have been put forward. The 200 per annum target should therefore be a minimum target on this basis, having regard to the particular circumstances of land and viability constraints within the borough.</p> <p>30. Whilst the GLA can accept the numeric target proposed in the latter part of policy CH1, it should be brought forward within the whole of the plan period, so as not to harm the implementation of the London Plan strategic affordable housing target set out in policy 3A.9 and emerging policy</p>			
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		Policy CH 1	Housing Targets	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS248	<p>Para 2.2.1. Para 35.3.1 Policy C 1 Policy CH 1, CH 2 Policy CH 3 Para vi Policy CT 1 Para b</p> <p>HOUSING, ADDED POPULATION, DENSITY AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES</p> <p>The Core Strategy, taking its lead from the GLA and the London Plan, envisages some 6,000 new dwellings over a decade. (Population is forecast to rise by 20,000.) This housing expansion will occupy much of the developable land in the Borough and significantly increase the overall density of the densest local authority in Britain.</p> <p>But many of the ancillary social, medical and commercial services on which residents rely are already over-subscribed, have little of no room in which to expand and are faced by prohibitive K&C land values if they want to expand.</p> <p>If the Inspector was to talk to residents about this he would find them speaking of surgeries with waiting lists, standing room only on buses, long queues at post offices, lack of on-street visitor parking space, tiny flats and inhuman cramming on the Underground. These are, of course, the views of middle-income residents, not the rich. (But as Figure 8.3 shows, the Borough has a high proportion of residents with incomes of £35,000 and below.)</p> <p>The Society does not suggest that delivering additional houses on what are currently non-housing sites would be ineffective in meeting housing demand. The issue is the relationship between that new housing (and additional population) and the capacity of a</p>		<p>While the representation does not appear to raise an issue of soundness <i>per se</i> it should be noted that Policy C1, and the assessed infrastructure requirements seek to ensure that new developments will assist in providing necessary infrastructure. In preparing an assessment of infrastructure requirements, best practice as provided by PAS has been used, with consultation and involvement of stakeholders. It is an on-going process, and so will evolve over time, while Policy C1 requires necessary infrastructure to be provided alongside development, and complies with Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>A Planning Obligations Supplementary planning Document has also been prepared to assist in formulating the required obligations to secure infrastructure, including necessary community facilities.</p> <p>The specific issue of transport capacity is also raised and queried. In the context of development at Earls Court these would be considered at the planning stage, with infrastructure requirements being assessed alongside any planned development.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>wide range of social and physical facilities. There is insufficient evidence on the impact of this increase in population on social and community services. The question never seems to be addressed. It is assumed that higher population density is justified without exploring its side-effects.</p> <p>Policy C1 does, of course, require additional social facilities to be financed via S.106 Agreements. But there is no assessment of the scope for expanding the supply of the Borough's already overstretched infrastructure of public transport and roads, surgeries and post offices, playing fields and parks.</p> <p>How, for instance, will the construction of new flats on the site of the Earl's Court Exhibition solve the problems of acute congestion (due both to District/Circle/Piccadilly line interchanging passengers and heavy local demand) at Earl's Court Underground Station?</p> <p>How, furthermore, does the Plan reconcile all the proposed new residents with Policy CT1 (b). 'Ensure that development will not result in any material increase in traffic</p> <p>congestion.....' ? Additional residents will lead to additional servicing vehicles ranging from refuse collection to plumbers, parcels delivery, computer technicians, lift engineers and building contractors. Additional residents will also generate additional business and family visitors. Even if residential development is 'permit free' it will still contribute to traffic.</p> <p>Increasing the Borough's population will put its social and community infrastructure under even greater pressure. This problem is not assessed. No evidence is advanced to justify the addition of 20,000 residents. The Society considers that the Plan is unsound.</p> <p>The plan needs either to scale down provision for increased population or show how the supply of social and community infrastructure should be expanded - or a mix of the two.</p>			
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		Policy CH 1	Housing Targets		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS263	<p>19. Policy CH1 (Housing Targets) seeks to achieve the London Plan target of 350 net additional dwellings a year until the London Plan is replaced (2011/12) and from then on the Council proposes to deliver a minimum of 600 net additional dwellings a year until 2021/22. The 600 unit target is derived from the recently completed London wide SHLAA which will feed into the replacement London Plan. GOL's previous advice to the Council was to roll forward the adopted London Plan housing target (350 per year) to 2028 and this approach was taken in the previous version of the Core Strategy. Whilst we accept the reference to the higher target of 600 (although this is yet to be tested at examination) we are concerned that the target as set out in CP1 (and elsewhere in the text) lacks clarity and critically, does not appear to cover the full plan period to 2028. Policy 3.3 of the Draft Replacement London Plan states that '... if a target beyond 2021 is required, roll forward and seek to exceed that in Table 3.1 until it is replaced by a revised London Plan target '.</p>		<p>The policy allows for the delivery of the existing target, as per the London Plan, while acknowledging the emerging changes, which will bring about a higher annual target. The Housing Trajectory has been updated to roll forward the known targets, and is monitored annually. The revised target also takes account of the most up-to-date information contained within the SHLAA, and it is not considered that reference to this renders the policy inconsistent with national policy.</p>	Amend Housing trajectory data to cover full plan period.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CH 1	Housing Targets		No	Effective	PSubCS429	<p>p215 Policy CH1 Housing Targets</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The specific changes to the policy propose deleting the term 'require' as it does not provide for sufficient flexibility in application of this policy in light of the suggested amendments to policy CH2 and having regard to the approach taken by the SHMA in establishing the role for intermediate housing products in RBKC.</p>		<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>The proposed amendments to tenure mix targets accord with the position being advocated as part of the London Housing Strategy and acknowledge the need for increasing the opportunity to deliver mixed and balanced communities in accordance with PPS3 and in light of the particular concentrations of social rented tenures which exist in the Borough. The proposed change will increase the effectiveness of the policy to achieve the Council's objectives.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CH1</p> <p>The Council will ensure that sufficient housing sites are allocated in order to ensure the housing targets are met.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>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;</p> <p>b) make provision for the maximum amount of affordable housing with a target of 200 units per annum from 2011/12 until 2021/22 from all sources;</p> <p>c) generally seek the provision of [delete require] affordable housing tenures [delete to be provided] such that they work towards a Borough wide target of 6085% social rented housing and 40 [delete 15] % Intermediate housing. It is acknowledged that in the following wards Golborne, St.Charles, Notting Barns, Colville, Norland, Earl's Court and Cremorne wards an increased provision of intermediate provision will be targeted in order to broaden tenure choice in these areas.</p>		<p>years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended <p>The SHMA has been used as evidence supporting the drafting of policies within the Diversity of Housing Chapter, and accords with guidance set out in PPS3. It incorporates both a market assessment and a needs assessment. The SHMA looks at the housing market within and around the Royal Borough, while the Londonwide SHMA treats London as a whole, as a housing market. A sub-regional housing market is also being prepared. The 'international-dimension' is incorporated within each, as housing market boundaries transcend the local. The studies on which the policy has been based fully comply with government guidance on the conduct of a SHMA (CLG, 2007).</p> <p>Policy CH1, to be consistent with the above, and with policy CH2, should therefore require the appropriate housing tenures. The suggested 60%:40% split is not supported by evidence.</p>	
Ken Housing	Kensington Housing	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CH 1	Housing Targets	Yes	Yes		PSubCS515	Policy CH 1: Housing Targets		Noted. the additional housing is an important supply of the Borough's overall housing target, and this is	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Trust								KHT notes that the Council will make provision for a minimum of 350 net additional dwellings a year until the London Plan is replaced. From this date, the Council is planning to make provision for a minimum of 600 net additional dwellings a year until c. 2021/22. KHT notes that the comprehensive redevelopment of Wornington Green should yield a net uplift of c. 460 of market units, which would make a positive contribution to RBKC's Borough-wide housing requirement.		reflected, partly, in its inclusion as a strategic site.	
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturge on behalf of Metro Shopping Fund LP	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS17	<p>The requirement for at least 50% affordable housing in the third part of this policy is based solely on the fact that the need for affordable homes exceeds the number that are ever likely to be provided. However, this fails to take into account evidence on viability, including consideration of the Council's own applications, which demonstrate that a requirement of 50% is more than can be borne.</p> <p>The Mayor has explicitly recognised that whilst the consolidated London Plan sought 50% of all new housing to be affordable, this was not actually achievable. Even during strong economic conditions with rising markets, developments overall were able to deliver only about a third of their total as affordable and as a result, the Mayor has abandoned the 50% requirement.</p> <p>The Mayor has since agreed a target for the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea of 90 affordable units per annum until 2011, which represents just over 25% of the total housing numbers for the Borough. In the longer term, this requirement increases to some 200 units a year, which represents a third of the total.</p> <p>Requiring 50% affordable housing will not only substantially reduce the amount of housing overall that is actually delivered within the Borough, contrary to national policies, but it will also result in less affordable housing as a result. A 50% requirement is also inflexible in that it is becoming out of date with the London Plan, the consultation draft of which has dropped the numerical target of 50%.</p> <p>In order to be consistent with the long term affordable housing levels that have been agreed with the Mayor, the 50% requirement should be amended to "up to a third", in order to make this element of the policy sound.</p>		<p>It is incorrect to state that "the requirement for at least 50% affordable housing in the third part of this policy is based solely on the fact that the need for affordable homes exceeds the number that are ever likely to be provided".</p> <p>The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (see criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended <p>The London Plan, as adopted still refers to the 50% target, and the Core Strategy, which will need to be in general conformity with this, should therefore reflect the target. At present, only limited weight can be afforded to the draft London Plan. It is not therefore considered that the policy, as drafted, is not sound.</p>	
Mr Robin Meltzer	K&C Liberal Democrats		Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Justified	PSubCS28	<p>HOUSING</p> <p>We are also objecting under the soundness test of 'justification' on the Council's very controversial plan for housing which would see the building of thousands of new market homes in the poorer wards in the Borough without due effort to create mixed communities in the wealthier wards. We think this fails the basic test of whether a policy is, as the guidance says "the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives".</p> <p>The Diversity of Housing map shows all wards north of Holland Park Avenue except for Pembridge as unsuitable for off-site affordable housing. (It would be better to reverse the proposition and show the wards with low social housing as being suitable for off-site Affordable Housing.) The map makes a nonsense of the fact that during the very period of the Core Strategy consultation process, the Council granted affordable housing off-site for their own planning application to sell off the playground of the Holland Park School. The affordable housing for this development is to be placed in Notting Barns in the poorer, north of the Borough. Also during the Core Strategy consultation period, the Commonwealth Institute and Odeon Cinema developments on Kensington High Street failed to trigger any affordable housing whatsoever, on or off-site.</p> <p>The Holland Park School planning approval has been seen by residents as particularly offensive, not simply because of the sale of educational land to developers but also because the land was once part of Holland Park itself, a park which has been eaten into steadily.</p> <p>The inspectorate may wish to examine the extent to which the awkward bifurcation of the new school building itself and the private housing planning plan for one third of the same site was a deliberate attempt to get around the Core Strategy policy, putting affordable housing in a ward which already has a high proportion</p>		<p>The policy requires on-site provision in the first instance for all proposals which exceed the 1200m2 threshold. in accordance with national guidance, off-site provision may be acceptable in exceptional circumstances. The policy approach to the sites within the 800m2 - 1200m2 range has not altered and is based on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements". The level of housing need has been evidenced through the Council's SHMA.</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not 	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>of social housing.</p> <p>Even the generalities of the affordable housing policy are in disarray. The Council has significantly watered down their commitment to on-site affordable housing. In the first draft of the Core Strategy, the wording was: "The provision of affordable housing on site is of such strategic importance, no alternatives to this approach are being offered." Presumably realising that recent major decisions have entirely ignored this, they now merely say: "On-site provision is not always possible, in which case provision should be within the area that does not reinforce the broad spatial pattern of housing tenure in the Borough". (p.216, 35.3.14). They proceed to give some very stretchable examples of when off site will be allowed - design, size of site etc.</p> <p>The aspiration to have residential accommodation return to spaces above shops in Notting Hill, Brompton Cross, Kings Road and Fulham Road should apply to all the southern places from Chapter 11 to Chapter 17.</p> <p>The Council is keen to state its wish to "reinforce the spatial pattern" in Knightsbridge, High St Ken South Ken, Fulham Road and Notting Hill Gate. This means that any affordable housing whatsoever will only be encouraged in High St Ken (p.89, 11.3.18), South Ken (p.95, 12.13.13) and Knightsbridge (p.104, 14.13.18) if it doesn't affect the "vitality" of the area. Indeed, there is no mention at all of any plans for affordable housing in Notting Hill Gate area (p. 116, 16.3.17), nor in Fulham Road area (p. 120, 17.3.9).</p> <p>This is all a clear contravention of the diversity/housing mix stated policy. As a result of the detail in this Strategy, the 'vitality' of the wealthier areas (with no evidence base shown to back up what this 'vitality' takes into account) can now be used by the Council as an excuse for not permitting affordable housing in those areas. Meanwhile, the policies of estate renewal, whereby developers build market homes to help pay for the upkeep of social housing, will see demographics in the currently poorer wards change dramatically. There is no mention of the current 'vitality' of those areas or the importance of social cohesion when a neighbourhood changes so dramatically. Nor is there any reference to the plan to suddenly accelerate the gentrification of the poorer wards without any corresponding efforts to use the planning system to diversify the wealthier communities.</p>		recommended	
53-56 Hans Place		London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS40	<p>Residential</p> <p>3.2 Policy Ch2 of the Core Strategy relates to the provision of new housing, dwelling mix and affordable housing.</p> <p>3.3 The Council has recently carried out a Housing Market Assessment for the Borough which demonstrates that there is a definitive need for larger dwellings for families in both the market and affordable housing sectors. The Council have emphasised that 80% of new dwellings over the next 20 years should be large dwellings of 3 and 4 bedrooms.</p> <p>3.4 This is to some degree conflicting with other policies in the Core Strategy such as part (f) of Policy CH2 which seeks to "resist development which results in the net loss of five or more residential units"</p> <p>3.5 This is very restrictive policy when applied to all future development within the Borough and would not assist in allowing the Council to meeting other objectives such as addressing</p>		<p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a 	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>housing need.</p> <p>3.6 The policy should be expressed as a ratio rather than numbers of units and other circumstances allowing a greater proportion of units to be lost should be considered particularly where they relate to the refurbishment of listed buildings or where other historic benefits are achieved.</p> <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>3.7 The Council have reviewed their policy for requiring affordable housing in new development and are focussing on the amount of floorspace within new development rather than on a unit basis as previously proposed within the UDP and also as per that within the London Plan.</p> <p>3.8 Policy CH2 sets out the affordable housing criteria policies on the following: i) require the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing 50% provision on gross residential floor space in excess of 800sqm, j) require the provision to be in the form of a commuted sum in lieu of affordable housing where less than 1,200sqm of gross external residential floor space is proposed. k) require affordable housing provision of affordable homes on site where more than 1,200sqm of gross external residential floor space is proposed unless exceptional circumstances exist."</p> <p>3.9 The London Plan is clear in its policies and sub text in promoting development. The provisions made under Policy 3A.10 and support circumstances and economic viability are crucial in informing a scheme aspiration for 50% affordable housing.</p> <p>3.10 The affordable housing thresholds however which are set out in the London Plan are low floorspace thresholds within new development providing residential development. Council have addressed the need to consider the viability of sites in the London Plan as part of this policy. The consideration of viability of individual site periods as a way of encouraging development to come forward rather than as a condition of planning consent.</p> <p>3.11 The main issue with this policy lies in the considerably low floorspace threshold. Council has introduced a starting threshold of 800sqm whereby the affordable housing with a presumption of 50% provision. This is in line with the Core Strategy for the Royal Borough with a particular emphasis on affordable housing. The figure has been based on the London Plan's threshold of ten units per 800sqm which can reasonably be achieved within 800sqm.</p> <p>3.12 This threshold figure of 800sqm however is too low as it is not in line with the London Plan dwelling mix policy is adhered to. This threshold would not allow for the provision of corridors, circulation space and cores all necessary to facilitate a diverse housing mix.</p> <p>3.13 It is suggested that if a floorspace threshold is considered appropriate, it should be notional capacity to reflect reasonable sized units and the Council's policy should be introduced on thresholds above 15,000sqft.</p> <p>3.14 There is also no indication of how the commuted payment to the Council should be calculated. This forms an important element of this policy and should be included for seeking such payments.</p> <p>3.15 This part of policy CH2 is therefore not consistent with regional policy.</p>		<p>lower target</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended. <p>There is no conflict between the SHMA, which indicates the need for a variety of unit sizes, and criterion (f), which resists the loss of units, which themselves contribute to the existing housing stock. The SHMA recognises the important role that smaller units play in providing for housing need, and the policy balances between these competing needs.</p>	
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social Council		Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Justified	PSubCS46	<p>Policy CH 2 Housing Diversity</p> <p>a) The policy on bed size (housing mix) is unsound as it contains no targets or proportions and fails to provide the strong steer towards family housing (3 beds +) as required by the SHMA. Without this, there is no policy hook for the output indicator on housing mix in 38.8.8.</p> <p>5 bed units should be included as a category if diverse need is to be met.</p> <p>The proportions in paragraphs 35.3.14 and 35.3.15 should be included as policy. In more general terms we propose 3 bed 35%,</p>		<p>The housing mix supports the SHMA targets, while recognising that not every development can rigidly adhere to these proportions of delivery. It is entirely consistent with the SHMA, and with government guidance set out in PPS3.</p> <p>In accordance with government guidance, on-site provision is preferred, and is the default position. A contribution off-site, or as a financial contribution is only allowed in exceptional circumstances. However, due to the circumstances of the borough, developments between 800 and 1200 square metres will contribute financially in lieu of on-site affordable housing. This contribution is set at a 'financially-neutral' level, and will</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>4 bed 20% and 5 bed 10%.</p> <p>j) We object to the policy of a sum being paid in lieu of affordable housing. This makes the core strategy unsound, preventing the achievement of a 50% affordable housing target.</p> <p>l) We oppose the policy of never providing off site affordable housing in specific wards, which is contrary to housing need and choice and acts as a further bar on maximizing the delivery of affordable housing.</p>		<p>allow the delivery of further affordable housing that would otherwise not have been secured on a unit-based threshold. Off-site affordable housing is restricted to certain wards and this is based on the presumption of delivering mixed and well balanced communities. Therefore, where off-site delivery is acceptable, the Council has identified areas where it ought to be provided, and where it ought not.</p> <p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended <p>The SHMA has been used as evidence supporting the</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>drafting of policies within the Diversity of Housing Chapter, and accords with guidance set out in PPS3. It incorporates both a market assessment and a needs assessment. The SHMA looks at the housing market within and around the Royal Borough, while the Londonwide SHMA treats London as a whole, as a housing market. A sub-regional housing market is also being prepared. The 'international-dimension' is incorporated within each, as housing market boundaries transcend the local. The studies on which the policy has been based fully comply with government guidance on the conduct of a SHMA (CLG, 2007).</p> <p>Policy CH1, to be consistent with the above, and with policy CH2, should therefore require the appropriate housing tenures.</p>	
53-56 Hans Place		London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS54	<p>4.3 Policy CH2 Delete the following parts :</p> <p>(f) resist development which results in the net loss of five or more residential units ;</p> <p>(g) require development that results in the amalgamation of residential units to be subject to a 50% requirement to ensure the resultant units are not further amalgamated in the future;</p> <p>4.4 Policy CH2 " i) require the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing provision being at least 50 % provision on gross residential floor area j) require the provision to be in the form of a commuted sum in lieu of affordable housing where up to 15 ,000sqft of gross external residential space is proposed.</p>		<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50%</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold 	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended <p>The need for protection of existing residential stock is evidenced through monitoring trends which highlight the significant decay of housing stock within the Borough.</p>	
Brookfield Developments	Brookfield Developments (UK) Ltd	DP9	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity			Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS73	<p>Policy CH2 (i+j)</p> <p>Revisions to the mechanisms by which affordable housing IS calculated are</p> <p>considered necessary to provide consistency with PPS3 and the London Plan.</p> <p>Provision as a proportion of habitable rooms or units provides sufficient flexibility for</p> <p>the appropriate amount of affordable housing to be advanced on differing</p> <p>development schemes and on this basis a departure from the London Plan position (to</p> <p>a floorspace calculation) is not justified.</p> <p>Revisions to tenure balance of new provision are considered appropriate in light of the</p> <p>strategic direction from the GLA and the need to improve tenure balance across the</p> <p>Borough's affordable offer to the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Together the amendments ensure compliance with PPS3 and the London plan and</p> <p>provide added assurance that policy promotes rather than frustrates delivery of</p> <p>housing in accordance with targets and other policy objectives.</p> <p><i>The Council's (score through text</i></p> <p><i>w ill ensure new; housing development is provided so as to further refine</i></p> <p><i>the grain the mix ~housing across the Borough) key housing priority is the delivery</i></p> <p><i>of new homes both market and affordable which meet needs and contribute towards</i></p> <p><i>providing a broad mix of housing for a wide variety of households in the area.</i></p> <p><i>To deliver this the Council will:</i></p>	<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of</p>	No change.	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>i. on schemes which have the capacity to provide 10 homes or more, require</p> <p>the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing with the presumption being at least 50% provision (score through text on-gross residential floor space in excess of 8m2). of either habitable room numbers or unit numbers as</p> <p>affordable housing provision taking into account contributions towards</p> <p>the Borough target from other sources of supply, the need to promote</p> <p>rather than restrain residential development. the viability of the proposals</p> <p>and site specific circumstances including the availability of public subsidy.</p> <p>Where an applicant identifies that a 50% affordable contribution cannot</p> <p>be viably supported by a development the council will require a viability</p> <p>assessment, using the GLA toolkit or an agreed alternative, to be submitted as part of the planning application documentation;</p> <p>j. require the affordable and market housing to have (score through text equivalent) -acceptable</p> <p>levels of-amenity in relation to factors including views;- daylight, noise and</p> <p>proximity to open space, play space, community facilities, and shops;</p>		<p>85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended 	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Sun Life Assurance Plc	Sun Life Assurance Plc	DP9	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS80	<p>Policy CH2</p> <p>Paragraph 29 of Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2006). states that Local</p> <p>Planning Authorities (LPAs) should set overall targets for affordable housing which</p> <p>should reflect an assessment <i>...of the likely economic viability of land for housing...</i>, '</p> <p>The London Plan provides for flexibility on the quantum of affordable housing</p> <p>through the provisions of Policy 3A.IO which states the following:</p> <p>"Boroughs should seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when</p> <p>negotiating on individual private residential and mixed use schemes, having regard to</p> <p>their affordable housing targets adopted in line with Policy 3A.9, the need to</p> <p>encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual</p> <p>circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of</p> <p>individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme</p> <p>requirements'</p> <p>Paragraph 3.52 of the supporting text to the policy notes that in estimating provision</p> <p>from private residential or mixed-use developments, Boroughs should take account of</p> <p>economic viability and that the</p> <p><i>'...development control toolkit developed by the Three On this basis the paragraph states that Boroughs should '...take account of the individual Dragons and Nottingham Trent University is one mechanism that will help'.</i></p> <p><i>Fscheme requirements urth ermore, the London Plan is clear is stating that determining the affordable housing requirements for a specific site should be approached in the context of Policy 3A.9 (referenced above).</i></p> <p>Paragraph 3.57 states that in exceptional cases, that the required affordable houses</p> <p>may be provided off site, for example, where there are demonstrable benefits to be</p> <p>gained by providing the units in a different location. Further, the emerging London Plan and 'New Plan for London' indicate that the</p>		<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>mechanistic 50% affordable housing target in the adopted London Plan has proved unachievable and unresponsive to local circumstances.</p> <p>It adds that the Mayor is to removing it, instead using a more collaborative approach. The draft</p> <p>London Plan abandons the 50% target. The Core Strategy does not provide a robust</p> <p>justification for keeping the 50% target.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should therefore reflect the national and emerging London</p> <p>planning policy framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing provision on site should be based upon scheme viability and other considerations in line with the London Plan rather than seek to impose the strategic "target" of 50% on all schemes regardless of individual site circumstances. The proportions of social rented and intermediate should be considered on a site by site basis and should as advocated by Policy 3A.9 of the London Plan should be based on a robust viability assessment. The Core Strategy, in line with the London Plan policy, should recognize the exceptional circumstances when off site or no affordable provision would be acceptable. <p>The following wording is requested:</p> <p>i. on schemes which have the capacity to provide 10 homes or more, require the</p> <p>maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing with the presumption being at</p> <p>least 50% provision Delete: [on gross residential floor space in excess of 800m] of either</p> <p>habitable room numbers or unit numbers as affordable housing provision the viability</p> <p>of the proposals and site specific circumstances including the availability of public</p> <p>subsidy. Where an applicant identifies that a 50% affordable contribution cannot be</p> <p>viably supported by a development the council will require a Viability assessment,</p> <p>using the GLA toolkit or an agreed alternative, to be submitted as part of the planning</p> <p>application documentation.</p> <p>j. require as appropriate provision to be in the form of a</p>		<p>to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40% affordable housing is generally viable. 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended 	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>commuted sum in lieu of</p> <p>affordable housing <i>Delete rest of paragraph</i></p> <p>k: <i>Amend para to read:</i> require provision of affordable homes is proposed, unless exceptional</p> <p>circumstances are agreed to exist;</p> <p><i>Delete para for sub point [P. require a viability assessment]</i></p>			
828 Pte Ltd	828 Pte Ltd	DP9	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity				PSubCS84	<p>Housing Diversity - Policy</p> <p>em</p> <p>This policy sets out the Council's direction for the provision of affordable housing in the</p> <p>Borough. The policy should recognise that the key priority is the delivery of both private and</p> <p>affordable new homes which contribute to mixed and balanced communities, as set out in PPS3.</p> <p>The policy should reflect the mechanisms by which affordable housing is calculated in order to</p> <p>provide consistency with PPS3 and the London Plan. Provision as a proportion of habitable</p> <p>rooms or units provides sufficient flexibility for the appropriate amount of affordable housing to</p> <p>be advanced on differing development schemes and on this basis a departure from the London</p> <p>Plan position (to a floorspace calculation) is not justified.</p> <p>As such, criterion</p> <p>"i".</p> <p>of the policy should be deleted and re-worded to state that the Council will</p>		<p>Policy CH 2 Housing Diversity</p> <p>a) The policy on bed size (housing mix) is unsound as it contains no targets or proportions and fails to provide the strong steer towards family housing (3 beds +) as required by the SHMA. Without this, there is no policy hook for the output indicator on housing mix in 38.8.8.</p> <p>5 bed units should be included as a category if diverse need is to be met.</p> <p>The proportions in paragraphs 35.3.14 and 35.3.15 should be included as policy. In more general terms we propose 3 bed 35%, 4 bed 20% and 5 bed 10%.</p> <p>j) We object to the policy of a sum being paid in lieu of affordable housing. This makes the core strategy unsound, preventing the achievement of a 50% affordable housing target.</p> <p>l) We oppose the policy of never providing off site affordable housing in specific wards, which is contrary to housing need and choice and acts as a further bar on maximizing the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>The housing mix supports the SHMA targets, while recognising that not every development can rigidly adhere to these proportions of delivery. It is entirely consistent with the SHMA, and with government guidance set out in PPS3.</p> <p>In accordance with government guidance, on-site provision is preferred, and is the default position. A contribution off-site, or as a financial contribution is only allowed in exceptional circumstances. However, due to the circumstances of the borough, developments between 800 and 1200 square metres will contribute financially in lieu of on-site affordable housing. This contribution is set at a 'financially-neutral' level, and will allow the delivery of further affordable housing that would otherwise not have been secured on a unit-based threshold. Off-site affordable housing is restricted to certain wards and this is based on the presumption of delivering mixed and well balanced communities. Therefore, where off-site delivery is acceptable, the Council has identified areas where it ought to be provided, and where it ought not.</p> <p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended <p>The SHMA has been used as evidence supporting the drafting of policies within the Diversity of Housing Chapter, and accords with guidance set out in PPS3. It incorporates both a market assessment and a needs assessment. The SHMA looks at the housing market within and around the Royal Borough, while the Londonwide SHMA treats London as a whole, as a housing market. A sub-regional housing market is also being prepared. The 'international-dimension' is incorporated within each, as housing market boundaries transcend the local. The studies on which the policy has been based fully comply with government guidance on the conduct of a SHMA (CLG, 2007).</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											Policy CH1, to be consistent with the above, and with policy CH2, should therefore require the appropriate housing tenures. The suggested 60%:40% split is not supported by evidence.	
Nottingdale Ltd	Nottingdale Ltd	London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity	No	No	Effective	PSubCS87	<p>We object to the affordable housing policy approach being suggested in CH2.</p> <p>In relation to Affordable Housing the 50% strategic (London Plan) target relates to the delivery from those secured through planning obligations on private market housing development. This needs to be reflected in the wording of the policy. As the Core Strategy will need to be in accordance with the London Plan, it is noted that the draft changes to the London Plan are material and these seek to remove the % based on floorspace provision.</p> <p>The policy recommends that a floorspace capacity level is applied. This is set at 800sqm, whereby the number of dwellings would be expected to provide 50% affordable housing for developments over 800sqm. We object to this for the following reasons:</p> <p>1 Policy 3A.11 and para 3.60 of the London Plan (2008) states clearly that in assessing capacity the appropriate to the site location set out in the LP density matrix (Table 3A.2) should apply. As such, the calculation proposed does not follow the strategic policy in the London Plan as it applies a blunt uniform requirement regardless of location in the Borough. Many parts of the Borough provide for large family housing and this should inform the density assessment.</p> <p>2 Notwithstanding the above objection in principle, a threshold of 800sqm based on an assumed 900sqm to be an unrealistic and artificially low floor area. It should be at a level which reflects a reasonable average size that the private residential market in K&C would require. ie units larger than the minimum in the UDP. Research should be taken from recent residential developments in the Borough and from the existing housing stock to establish a reasonable size of unit that the residential market would require. Additionally, the Housing SPD looks to raise the minimum unit sizes for residential development. This should also be considered when judging whether it is sound to apply the minimum unit sizes suggested.</p> <p>3 The basis for calculating the 800sqm threshold is also fundamentally flawed. It assumes a very coarse a housing mix that is contrary to the findings of the Council's own Housing Assessment that identifies a 1:1 ratio of affordable to market housing.</p> <p>1 The text to the capacity assessment also falls short of explaining why a capacity size (say 810sqm) would require a commuted payment and why a 9 unit scheme of minimum sized units equating to 800sqm cannot be achieved with the addition of another minimum sized unit.</p> <p>2 The floorspace minimums do not take account of other site specific constraints to work within the confines of an existing property and cannot be applied with any accuracy. This is especially true of listed buildings.</p> <p>In its current form the suggested policy basis is onerous and likely to hinder the delivery of market and affordable housing across the Borough. It should be made clear that all affordable housing expectations must be met through the process of financial viability.</p> <p>We object to part 'm' of this policy. Whilst it is encouraging that the policy aims to ensure that housing can be achieved, we object to the need for offsite affordable housing to be provided in application. There are adequate safeguards in the ability to provide affordable housing on the 'main site' does not and cannot proceed in the absence of a site that is acceptable to the Council.</p> <p>Expecting a second site to be acquired and designed for the planning application (in the form of a planning permission) for the delivery of the market housing would be pre-emptive. It also seeks to pre-empt what an acceptable planning application is made.</p> <p>Again, the clear strategic policy is to encourage rather than constrain development. The suggestion is considered to be counterproductive to that aim by placing additional burdens on those capable of delivering new housing in K&C.</p> <p>We object to part 'q' of this policy. A requirement for 85% of any affordable housing to be provided to the London Plan. The recent proposals published in April 2009 by the Council state that there will be a greater focus on stimulating development in London which this policy position directly contradicts.</p> <p>Appendix 2 -Further Evidence</p> <p>We object to the assertion that affordable housing provision should</p>	<p>affordable housing policies for the determination of affordable housing policies. The Secretary of State's Directive of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan's affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan. Regardless of the fact that the Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate housing. Policy 3A.4 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10. This should be considered material when</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with its published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p>	No change.	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>the sizes of habitable rooms for affordable housing are standardised by the Housing Corporation. The requirement for market housing and indeed there should not be a penalty of additional cost for building affordable housing as a result of different approaches to housing design. The Mayor has clearly indicated that sizes of London are often too small and larger units should be provided (see draft housing SPD). It is easier to quantify affordable housing as habitable rooms than floor area and it allows for a direct comparison not possible if floor area is used. This is because the standards for affordable housing are strict and a certain area of affordable is unlikely to fit exactly or easily with these standards. There is a justification given for judging the need for any development to provide affordable housing on a particular site to accommodate 10 or more houses. This appears to be based upon the fact that 'very large' (250-300 sq ft) units are often proposed in the Borough and these can limit or circumvent the amount of affordable housing delivered. Large flats/ houses are often proposed as they meet the requirements of people wishing to live in the Borough and provide, for the most part, a provision of family sized dwellings which the Council is keen to encourage. The Core Strategy states that the latest housing market assessment shows the main shortfall in terms of market housing as being three and four bedroom homes. It goes on to state that approximately 80% of market housing in the Borough should be three and four bedroom homes. It is clear that generous sized units that provide for families will therefore be needed to meet local housing need.</p>		<p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the requirement for affordable housing compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposals to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenural split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the local level, may be satisfactorily incorporated, if they do not exceed the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended 	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											Chapter 40 of the Core Strategy explains to users of the Plan how the thresholds have been derived. The Council considers that these, together with the evidence outlined above, provide a sound basis for the policy.	
Owners of 31 Holland Park		London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS90	<p>ii) Residential</p> <p>3.2 Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy relates to the provision of new housing, dwelling mix and affordable housing.</p> <p>3.3 The Council has recently carried out a Housing Market Assessment for the Borough which demonstrates that there is a definitive need for larger dwellings for families in both the market and affordable housing sectors. The Council have emphasised that 80% of new dwellings over the next 20 years should be large dwellings of 3 and 4 bedrooms.</p> <p>3.4 This is to some degree conflicting with other policies in the Core Strategy such as part (f) of Policy CH2 which seeks to "resist development which results in the net loss of five or more residential units"</p> <p>3.5 This is a very restrictive policy when applied to all future development within the Borough and would not assist in allowing the Council to meeting other objectives such as addressing housing need.</p> <p>3.6 The policy should be expressed as a ratio rather than numbers of units and other circumstances allowing a greater proportion of units to be lost should be considered particularly where they relate to the refurbishment of listed buildings or where other historic benefits are achieved.</p>		Resisting proposals which would result in the loss of five or more residential units being amalgamated into a smaller number of residential homes is consistent with the SHMA. This seeks provision of larger units, and policy has been developed to allow for this. The net loss of up to 5 small units to allow for larger units is acceptable under the terms of the policy, and is considered sufficient to encourage the size of dwellings needed as evidenced, while protecting the borough from significant stock erosion.	No Change.
Telereal		Savills Plc	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity	No	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS120	<p>As acknowledged by the Authority's Submission Core Strategy, the Borough has acute housing affordable housing policies for the determination of affordable housing applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan of 2008.</p> <p>In order to justify draft Policy CH2 (i) which "requires the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing to be provided on a site, the presumption being at least 50% provision on gross residential floor space in excess of 800m²", the Submission Core Strategy states that "in calculating the floor area equivalent to the affordable housing threshold, the UDP floorspace standards have been applied to the Council's preferred mix for nine market homes i.e. the number of homes that can be built without triggering affordable housing. This calculation has produced a threshold of 800m² (8,600ft²)".</p> <p>The Affordable Housing Viability Study Draft Report (September 2009) explains that this 800m² threshold corresponds to an average dwelling size of 860 sq ft. (approximately 80m²). It goes on to state that "the specific results of the viability analysis, the 800 sq m threshold could be said to be reasonable". The viability analysis set out in the study looks at only four sites.</p> <p>The LPA's evidence identified above is not considered to represent a robust justification.</p> <p>In terms of GLA guidance on affordable policy thresholds, Policy 3A.11 of the consolidated London Plan (February 2008), states that 'Boroughs should normally require affordable housing provision on a site which has the capacity to provide 10 or more homes'. The recently released Draft Replacement London Plan (October 2009) takes the same stance. This adopted policy is the starting point for drafting local planning policy. Local Authorities should to negotiate with developers on schemes which trigger the GLA's adopted 10-unit threshold to secure affordable housing on-site or as a result of off-site provision or financial contributions, subject to viability considerations. Any further restrictions to small or medium sized schemes providing some form of affordable housing provision, will simply result in stalled housing delivery and schemes not coming forward to meet housing need or a mix of housing type and tenure.</p> <p>The evidence base does not demonstrate whether schemes above the threshold of 800 m² of additional residential floorspace and below the GLA's adopted "10-unit threshold", could deliver affordable housing without viability being affected. The LPA has not provided robust evidence to determine the level of increased supply which additionally may be subject to specific site</p>	<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of affordable housing applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan of 2008.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site</p>	No change.	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>which could be achieved by implementing such a threshold (taking account of viability factors). It has also been demonstrated how it will impact on the delivery of smaller schemes and windfall sites within the District. The Core Strategy is reliant upon to provide the necessary supply of housing land. This is contrary to the government guidance set out in PPS3 which states that " <i>local planning authorities will need to undertake an informed assessment of the economic viability of any thresholds and proportions of affordable housing, including their likely impact upon overall levels of housing delivered and creating mixed communities.</i>"</p> <p>For the above reasons, it is considered that draft Core Strategy Policy CH2 (i) is not compliant with national and regional planning policy, not justified; and is therefore unsound.</p>	<p>It is sound because it is in line with national and regional planning policy, and is justified.</p>	<p>It is sound because it is in line with national and regional planning policy, and is justified.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended <p>The Council disagrees that insufficient sites have been assessed in order to gauge overall viability. The approach in the policy adopts a phased, or dynamic viability approach, which will always take account of individual site viability. Affordable Housing Viability analyses are, by their nature, strategic, while the policy contains sufficient flexibility to take account of viability on a site-by-site basis.</p>	
Mr Simon Avery	Bell Cornwell		Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS142	<p>For clarity, to express my comments in terms of the specific "Soundness" tests wording:</p> <p>1) justified - the application of those standards to all listed buildings is neither credible, nor is there a robust evidence-base to demonstrate that all listed buildings are capable of compliance with those requirements without falling foul of National Policy, as expressed in PPG15 (see below)</p> <p>2) effective - the potential conflict with PPG15 renders Policy CH2 b) being vulnerable to not being deliverable. Omission of the "site character" proviso also makes the policy inflexible</p> <p>3) consistent with national policy - PPG15 paragraph 3.4 requires alterations and extensions to listed buildings to be either needed or desirable from a heritage perspective, rather than from the perspective of other regulations. To require all residential proposals which include alterations/extensions to listed buildings to comply with those other standards is very likely in most cases to be inconsistent with PPG15 paragraph 3.4 requirements.</p> <p>I trust that clarifies my comments in an appropriate form for Core Strategy purposes.</p>		<p>Proposals will, necessarily, be assessed against the policy criteria, and all other material considerations, of which certain will relate to the adequacy of provision of the accommodation. As a result, the assessment is against all the relevant policies. Proposals will need to demonstrate that they comply, as far as reasonable, with the relevant standards. A minor amendment to criterion (b) is recommended, which clarifies this point, while further policies within the Renewing the Legacy chapter will be relevant to determination of proposals which affect a listed building, or are of historic interest.</p>	Change criterion b) to include a reference to where it is not possible to meet the standards.
John Lewis Partnership	John Lewis Partnership	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Justified	PSubCS146	<p>Policy CH2 (Housing Diversity)</p> <p>We note that policy CH2(b) requires new residential dwellings, including conversions, amalgamations and changes of use, to be designed to meet all the following standards:</p> <p>(i) lifetime homes</p> <p>(ii) floorspace and floor to ceiling heights</p>		<p>Proposals will, necessarily, be assessed against the policy criteria, and all other material considerations, of which certain will relate to the adequacy of provision of the accommodation. As a result, the assessment is against all the relevant policies. Proposals will need to demonstrate that they comply, as far as reasonable, with the relevant standards. A minor amendment to criterion (b) is recommended, which clarifies this point, while further policies within the Renewing the Legacy chapter will be relevant to determination of proposals which affect a listed building, or are of historic interest.</p>	Changes to criterion (b) in recognition of instances where it is not possible to meet the required standards.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>(iii) wheelchair accessibility for a minimum of 10% of dwellings</p> <p>We are particularly concerned about the imposition of floorspace and floor to ceiling height standards (CH2.b.ii). There is no reference to any evidence base in support of this policy. Whilst it is clearly very important that suitable standards of residential amenity are achieved, there is no indication in the Core Strategy as to what the proposed floorspace and floor to ceiling height standards will be and how these will be applied where there are existing site constraints (e.g. in residential conversion schemes). There is also no indication that the implications of this policy approach on overall housing delivery and affordability within RBKC has been addressed.</p> <p>As there does not appear to be a robust and credible evidence base in place, we consider policy CH2(b)(ii) to be unsound on the basis that it is not justified.</p>			
Welcome Trust		Cluttons LLP	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		Yes		PSubCS160	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We support Policy CH2c "to encourage extra care housing provision particularly in the south of the Borough" because there is clear, justified evidence of the need and the policy is sound. We support Policy CH2d to allow the self containment of HMOs where self contained studio flats are to be created. However the way in which this policy is currently drafted is unclear as to how it would be implemented in practice. For example, would the Council's floorspace standards be imposed on the new studio units and does the policy allow for any reduction in the number of units in a building if the overall living accommodation is improved by providing selfcontained studios ? Will there be any different approach towards these uses within historic buildings where alterations are more restricted but a current HMO use may not result in the optimum use of the building? We would welcome the chance for this policy to be discussed at the Examination in Public and wish to reserve the right to comment further on this policy. We also believe the policy should allow for the loss of HMO accommodation where other planning goals are met such as in the restoration of a listed building. 		<p>Support for CH2(c) is noted.</p> <p>Support for CH2(d) is also noted, qualified by the questions raised. Clearly the policy is not designed to prevent the self containment of HMOs and allow for their change to studio flats.</p> <p>The policy applies to HMOs, and supports their self containment where suitable studio flats can be created. Such proposals will, necessarily, be assessed against the policy criteria, and all other material considerations, of which certain will relate to the adequacy of provision of the accommodation. As a result, the assessment is against the all the relevant policies. Proposals will need to demonstrate that they comply, as far as reasonable, with the relevant standards. A minor amendment to criterion (b) has been recommended, which clarifies this point, while further policies within the Renewing the Legacy chapter will be relevant to determination of proposals which affect a listed building, or are of historic interest.</p>	No change.
Welcome Trust		Cluttons LLP	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Effective	PSubCS161	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We object to the use of s106 agreements to restrict future residential amalgamations under Policy CH2g on the basis that this is unnecessary (there is no justification for this in the text) it increases impact on the administrative and legal resources of RBKC and restricts flexibility by landowners and indeed RBKC over the use of property over time, thus making the policy ineffective. We therefore submit that this policy is unsound. 		<p>Disagree that the legitimate use of planning obligations, in line with the relevant circular (Circular 05/2005 "Planning Obligations") renders the policy as unsound.</p> <p>Government guidance contained within the Circular sets out how planning obligations should be used, and the policy conforms to these requirements. It sets out the 5 Secretary of State tests, all of which must be adhered to: A planning obligation must be:</p> <p>(i) relevant to planning;</p> <p>(ii) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;</p> <p>(iii) directly related to the proposed development;</p> <p>(iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and</p>	No Change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											(v) reasonable in all other respects. Planning obligations are therefore private agreements negotiated, usually in the context of planning applications, between local planning authorities and persons with an interest in a piece of land (or "developers"), and intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. The justification therefore stems from the evidenced loss of residential units following amalgamation, as monitored. The use of planning obligations to prevent subsequent losses allows flexibility in the effectiveness of the policy - i.e. it may allow some amalgamation to meet housing needs and demands, but prevents further future amalgamation.	
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Effective	PSubCS241	<p>Need to manage the mix of housing required to respond to the housing needs of the Borough's residents and provide a better choice of housing .</p> <p>The Society considers that the Core Strategy, based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, fails to propose an appropriate mix of housing in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proportion of new housing that should be affordable; the proportion of market housing that should be in large units, most of which are sold to an international market as "second homes". See also London Plan 3A.5; and housing choice for older households needing to downsize or to find sheltered housing or nursing homes. <p>Chapter 35: Diversity of Housing seeks to provide a diversity of housing thereby catering for a variety of housing needs of Borough residents in mixed and balanced communities - the support for this comes from PPS3 and the London Plan.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is intended to define the housing needs of Borough residents whether for affordable housing or market housing. This showed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a huge need for affordable housing - considerably larger than the amount of housing that is likely to added over the next 10 years, but the proposed target is from 2011/12 will be 200pa or a third of the total housing target - given that large schemes will make up a large proportion of the total additional housing this is modest compared to the policy in the Core Strategy CH2 (I) which requires the maximum reasonable affordable housing with the presumption of at least 50% provision from schemes over 800 sqm; a need for more market housing and suggested that 80% should be large units (3 and 4 bedroom units) (para 35.3.10), although the Council indicates that rather than being tied to such exact ratios, the SHMA underlines "the need for as high a proportion of large units to be provided as possible"(35.3.11) on the basis that there is a demand for larger dwellings with 3 or more bedrooms (35.3.16) <p>There is a fundamental problem in undertaking a SHMA in Kensington and Chelsea - instead of focusing on the needs of Borough residents for what are assumed will be primary residences, any market housing that is built will be offered on an international market. A large proportion will be sold abroad, especially larger units, to people for whom it will not be their</p>		<p>The SHMA has been used as evidence supporting the drafting of policies within the Diversity of Housing Chapter, and accords with guidance set out in PPS3. It incorporates both a market assessment and a needs assessment. The SHMA looks at the housing market within and around the Royal Borough, while the Londonwide SHMA treats London as a whole, as a housing market. A sub-regional housing market is also being prepared. The 'international-dimension' is incorporated within each, as housing market boundaries transcend the local. The studies on which the policy has been based fully comply with government guidance on the conduct of a SHMA (CLG, 2007).</p> <p>The timing of the various SHMAs -during the economic downturn which began in 2007 with the 'credit crunch', and ensuing recession - means that they have taken full account of the circumstances in their preparation, as with of all evidence underpinning housing policies. By their nature they need to be strategic, and forward looking, and as up-to-date as practicable. It may therefore be necessary to review them, either fully or in part, in due course subject to how their in-built assumptions perform against reality. However, it is not right to disregard them entirely, with their methodologies conforming to the relevant guidance, and with the ability to see beyond the prevailing market characteristics at that time.</p> <p>The demand of borough residents, and their intentions, e.g. for down-sizing has also been incorporated into the RBKC SHMA, the preparation of which conforms wholly with recommended practice guidance.</p> <p>The representation refers to the high proportion of sales during 2009 for the buy-to-let market, as would be expected during the economic downturn, and in particular, due to the unavailability of credit, with a proportionately larger number of cash-buyers.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>primary (or even second) residence. This issue was raised with both the consultants and the Council with a request for evidence to establish what proportion of housing in new schemes completed in the last 5 years was bought and occupied as a primary residence and for what proportion of the year the property was occupied.</p> <p>Recent research by MoliorLondon (November 2009) showed that of the 5,500 new houses and news flats sold in London between January and September 2009 around two-thirds were bought as buy-to-let property investments and nearly 30% were sold in places like Hong Kong and Singapore. In Kensington and Chelsea these proportions may well be higher, especially for larger units. This would suggest that if a high proportion of new market housing were large units, very few would be bought by Borough residents. This raises a fundamental question - how many Borough residents get housed by these schemes? If a high proportion of new larger units do not meet the housing needs of Borough residents there is a fundamental flaw in the usefulness of undertaking a SHMA. It is a poor guide to the mix of housing to build.</p> <p>A second flaw is the evidence base - a snapshot survey of moving intentions of current owner occupiers and their moving intentions. To base the housing mix decisions for the next 20 years on a January 2009 snapshot - the depth of a recession is not a robust basis for such an analysis.</p> <p>Finally, there appears to be little information on latent demand by long-term Borough resident who may wish to downsize to a more modern, smaller, more manageable housing or move to sheltered housing. Unless such housing is available as part of the choice, older single people or couples will not be able or willing to downsize and free up larger units in the housing stock. This would suggest that there is an untapped demand for such housing, which means that more of the new market housing should be meeting these very real needs of Borough residents rather producing new stock that leaks out of the stock available to Borough residents.</p> <p>The Society recognises that the Council is obliged to undertake a SHMA, but is convinced that its outputs are largely irrelevant in the special circumstances of this Borough and are entirely misleading in terms of devising policies which would deliver the right mix of housing that would best meet the requirements of Borough residents for a primary residence .</p> <p>The Council would do better to identify the key issues and design policies that would produce a mix that would meet those concerns. The SHMA leads to policies which would waste what few opportunities we have to meet the needs of our residents and lead to greater not less polarisation of our communities, not only between rich and poor, but primary residences and housing which is only used for part of the year.</p> <p>Test of soundness:</p> <p>The Society believes that there is therefore a risk that this area of the plan will fail the effectiveness test of soundness, because what is intended may not be achieved. For this reason, we make the following proposal to rectify the soundness issue</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>The Society considers that:</p>			

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a higher target for affordable housing should be adopted; the focus of the analysis should be on what will meet the needs of Borough residents - especially in the market sector; and the need for manageable, modern units for downsizing couples or single people should be encouraged to enable the release of larger units. <p>The Core Strategy housing mix should be revised to increase the proportion of small units - a 50:50 mix between small and large and a bias to meeting the needs of older households would be a more appropriate mix.</p> <p>The Council should undertake an analysis of major schemes completed in the last 5 years to determine how they are used - whether primary residences and if not how much of the year they are occupied.</p>			
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS249	<p>Para 2.2.1. Para 35.3.1 Policy C 1 Policy CH 1, CH 2 Policy CH 3 Para vi Policy CT 1 Para b</p> <p>HOUSING, ADDED POPULATION, DENSITY AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES</p> <p>The Core Strategy, taking its lead from the GLA and the London Plan, envisages some 6,000 new dwellings over a decade. (Population is forecast to rise by 20,000.) This housing expansion will occupy much of the developable land in the Borough and significantly increase the overall density of the densest local authority in Britain.</p> <p>But many of the ancillary social, medical and commercial services on which residents rely are already over-subscribed, have little of no room in which to expand and are faced by prohibitive K&C land values if they want to expand.</p> <p>If the Inspector was to talk to residents about this he would find them speaking of surgeries with waiting lists, standing room only on buses, long queues at post offices, lack of on-street visitor parking space, tiny flats and inhuman cramming on the Underground. These are, of course, the views of middle-income residents, not the rich. (But as Figure 8.3 shows, the Borough has a high proportion of residents with incomes of £35,000 and below.)</p> <p>The Society does not suggest that delivering additional houses on what are currently non-housing sites would be ineffective in meeting housing demand. The issue is the relationship between that new housing (and additional population) and the capacity of a wide range of social and physical facilities. There is insufficient evidence on the impact of this increase in population on social and community services. The question never seems to be addressed. It is assumed that higher population density is justified without exploring its side-effects.</p> <p>Policy C1 does, of course, require additional social facilities to be financed via S.106 Agreements. But there is no assessment of the</p>		<p>While the representation does not appear to raise an issue of soundness <i>per se</i> it should be noted that Policy C1, and the assessed infrastructure requirements seek to ensure that new developments will assist in providing necessary infrastructure. In preparing an assessment of infrastructure requirements, best practice as provided by PAS has been used, with consultation and involvement of stakeholders. It is an on-going process, and so will evolve over time, while Policy C1 requires necessary infrastructure to be provided alongside development, and complies with Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>A Planning Obligations Supplementary planning Document has also been prepared to assist in formulating the required obligations to secure infrastructure, including necessary community facilities.</p> <p>The specific issue of transport capacity is also raised and queried. In the context of development at Earls Court these would be considered at the planning stage, with infrastructure requirements being assessed alongside any planned development.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>scope for expanding the supply of the Borough's already overstretched infrastructure of public transport and roads, surgeries and post offices, playing fields and parks.</p> <p>How, for instance, will the construction of new flats on the site of the Earl's Court Exhibition solve the problems of acute congestion (due both to District/Circle/Piccadilly line interchanging passengers and heavy local demand) at Earl's Court Underground Station?</p> <p>How, furthermore, does the Plan reconcile all the proposed new residents with Policy CT1 (b). 'Ensure that development will not result in any material increase in traffic congestion.....' ? Additional residents will lead to additional servicing vehicles ranging from refuse collection to plumbers, parcels delivery, computer technicians, lift engineers and building contractors. Additional residents will also generate additional business and family visitors. Even if residential development is 'permit free' it will still contribute to traffic.</p> <p>Increasing the Borough's population will put its social and community infrastructure under even greater pressure. This problem is not assessed. No evidence is advanced to justify the addition of 20,000 residents. The Society considers that the Plan is unsound.</p> <p>The plan needs either to scale down provision for increased population or show how the supply of social and community infrastructure should be expanded - or a mix of the two.</p>			
Martins Properties (Chelsea) Ltd	Martins Properties (Chelsea) Limited	Gerald Eve	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS258	<p>Policy CH2 Housing Diversity</p> <p>Policy CH2 identifies the criteria against which proposals will be considered in order to ensure that housing diversity is achieved.</p> <p>Criterion i, j and k relate to thresholds for affordable housing. The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea has moved away from a unit threshold for affordable housing to a floorarea threshold basis.</p> <p>MP fundamentally object to this basis of assessment for Affordable Housing thresholds. Paragraph 2.2.30 of the Strategy identifies that demand for private sector housing in the borough is insatiable and given the relatively little development land available can never be met.</p> <p>Paragraph 35.3.10 of the Strategy identifies that the main shortfall in terms of market housing is for three and four bedroom homes. Paragraph 35.3.17 identifies there is considerable demand in some southern areas of the Borough for very large luxury residential units (typically around 250 to 300 m2 or even larger). The paragraph states often schemes of this nature involve fewer than 10 units, and therefore fall below the London Plan trigger of affordable housing. The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea therefore propose a floorspace threshold rather than a unit threshold, as the most appropriate trigger for affordable housing within the Borough .</p> <p>National Guidance set out in PPS3 (paragraph 29) identifies the criteria for affordable housing. It states that local planning authorities should set out an overall Plan wide target for the amount of affordable housing to be provided. In relation to the range of circumstances in which affordable housing will be required, PPS3 states that the national indicative minimum site size threshold is 15 dwellings. However, local planning authorities can set a lower minimum threshold, where viable and practicable,</p>		<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience,</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>including in rural areas. This could include setting different proportion of affordable housing to be sought for a series of site size thresholds over the Plan area. Local planning authorities will "need to undertake an informed assessment of the economic viability of any thresholds and proportions of affordable housing proposed, including their likely impact upon overall levels of housing delivery and creating mixed communities " (PPS3 paragraph 29).</p> <p>MP object fundamentally to the policy on the basis that the Criterion i sets out a requirement for the provision of at least 50% affordable housing on all schemes in excess of 800m2. The policy as it is worded is therefore a requirement rather than a target at a Borough wide level. Also the policy does not provide the evidence base of an informed assessment of the economic viability of any threshold or proportion of affordable housing proposed as required by PPS3. MP considers that at the level proposed of 800 and 1200 m2 the policy will sterilise the viability of many smaller schemes which would otherwise provide valuable new housing to meet an identified need.</p> <p>There is clearly a significant amount of tension between the need to provide housing and the need to deliver affordable housing. For example, if greater weight is given to policies which set high standards for the proportion of affordable housing that must be achieved when development comes forward, this can have the effect of disincentivising developers to bring forward new housing development thus stemming the delivery of new housing. Therefore, although the proportion of affordable housing that might be achieved on individual developments may be high, the total volume in a particular borough may not be significant because of reduced total number of housing developments coming forward, particularly in the current financial climate.</p> <p>Developers make informed decisions on whether to bring forward development based on viability. If the prescribed arbitrary threshold is proposed (which does not have regard to viability) then the consequences are developers will either bring forward alternative uses which are viable or not proceed with the development. The London Plan policy 3A.11 states that Boroughs should normally require affordable housing provision on a site which has a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, applying the density guidance set out in policy 3A.3 of the London Plan and table 3A.2. The policy states that Boroughs are encouraged to seek a lower threshold through the DPD process where this can be justified in accordance with Government Guidance. As set out above, we do not consider that this threshold has been justified in accordance with Government Guidance.</p> <p>The floorspace threshold would also have a negative impact on the Borough's objectives of bringing forward family housing and is likely to result in the reduction in the size of residential units coming forward. Developers are likely to reduce the size of units so the overall floor area does not exceed the affordable housing threshold.</p> <p>This would run counter to the objectives within the London Plan and LDF which seek to improve residential amenity.</p> <p>Notwithstanding these fundamental objections we consider that the floor area threshold is too small and would constrain unit sizes. Paragraph 41.2.7 sets out a floor area threshold based on 57m² for two bedroom units and 98m² for three to four bedrooms units. As identified within paragraph 35.3.17 there is considerable demand for large luxury residential units typically</p>		<p>together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with its published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>around 250 to 300 metres square.</p> <p>Therefore to base a floor area threshold for three to four bedroom units on 98 metre square net internal is not appropriate as it does not reflect the size of units being developed and would trigger a requirement for affordable housing if 3 family homes were proposed.</p> <p>MP consider that criteria i and p should be amended to reflect Policy 3A.10 of the London Plan whereby the authority will seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing having regard to affordable housing targets, the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements.</p>		<p>respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40% affordable housing is generally viable. 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended 	
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Justified	PSubCS266	<p>21. The affordable housing target seeks to achieve 90 units per year until 2011 and 200 units annually when the London Plan is adopted until 2021/22. The 200 unit figure represents 33% of the overall housing target. Again the target does not appear to cover the full plan period to 2028 and clarification on this is required. Policy CH2 (i) then requires 'the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing with the presumption being at least 50% provision on gross residential floorspace in excess of 800m²'. Chapter 40 provides explanatory text to justify the approach to affordable housing but the Council will need robust evidence including a viability assessment to support the affordable housing targets, floorspace thresholds and assumptions regarding delivery on strategic sites.</p>		<p>The Council has conducted the viability assessment and drafted a policy which allows viability to be assessed dynamically, having assessed the overall viability strategically. This strategic assessment demonstrates that a 40% target is viable in most cases. Based on need, from the SHMA, the target for qualifying sites is assessed as 50%, with the overriding caveat that this will always be subject to a viability assessment of the site where 50% is not proposed. Through this approach of a 50% target on qualifying sites, the numerical 200 p.a. target will be exceeded.</p>	No change.
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity				PSubCS268	<p>24. We note that the Council will identify sites for temporary or permanent use for Gypsies and Travellers in the forthcoming DPD. Confirmation on the timetable for this DPD is required.</p>		<p>DPD timetables and programming of other DPDs is more rightly located within the LDS, and should not be a matter for the Core Strategy.</p>	No change.
Circadian Ltd	Circadian Ltd	DP9	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS279	<p>The policy should reflect the mechanisms by which affordable housing is calculated in order to provide consistency with PPS3 and the London Plan. Provision as a proportion of habitable rooms or units provides sufficient flexibility for the appropriate amount of affordable housing to be advanced on differing development schemes and on this basis a departure from the London Plan position (to a floorspace calculation) is not justified.</p> <p>As such, criterion "i". of the policy should be deleted and reworded to state that the Council will target the provision of up to 50% of either habitable room numbers or unit numbers as affordable housing provision taking into account contributions towards the Borough target from other sources of supply, the need to promote rather than restrain residential development, the viability of the proposals and site specific circumstances including the availability of public subsidy.</p> <p>Criterion "i" refers to the potential for the provision of off-site affordable housing, except within the Cremorne Ward, amongst others. This is based on 2001 census information that identifies areas where off-site affordable housing is not appropriate as they already contain a high proportion of Social rented housing. Our clients query the robustness of the Council's assessment in this assertion and request further clarification and evidence to back up this statement.</p> <p>Criterion "q" advises that in the Cremorne ward, affordable</p>		<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>housing should include a "minimum of 15% intermediate housing." As previously stated, this figure should be amended to a target "40%" and refer to the Borough wide target, evidence of need, scheme viability and site specific circumstances.</p> <p>For the above reasons, the policy as currently drafted is not considered to be in accordance with London Plan policy and is therefore not 'Sound' and a departure from the approach in the London Plan has not been 'Justified'.</p>		<p>numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended 	
The London Planning Practice LLP	The London Planning Practice LLP		Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS286	<p>The Council has recently carried out a Housing Market Assessment for the Borough which demonstrates that there is a definitive need for larger dwellings for families in both the market and affordable housing sectors. The Council have emphasised that 80% of new dwellings over the next 20 years should be large dwellings of 3 and 4 bedrooms.</p> <p>This is to some degree conflicting with other policies in the Core Strategy such as part (f) of Policy CH2 which seeks to " <i>resist development which results in the net loss of five or more residential units</i> "</p> <p>This is a very restrictive policy when applied to all future development within the Borough and would not assist in allowing the Council to meeting other objectives such as addressing housing need.</p> <p>The Council have reviewed their policy for requiring affordable housing in new development and are focussing on the amount of floorspace within new development rather than on a unit basis as previously proposed within the UDP and also as per that within the London Plan.</p> <p>The London Plan is clear in its policies and sub text in promoting, not restraining residential and mixed-use development. The provisions made under Policy 3A.10 and supporting paragraphs 3.52-3.53 make it clear that site circumstances and economic viability are crucial in informing a schemes ability to meet the London wide policy aspiration for 50% affordable housing.</p> <p>3.31 The affordable housing thresholds however which are set out in Policy CH2 are not applied flexibly due to the very low floorspace thresholds within new development providing residential floorspace. However, it is accepted that the Council have addressed the need to consider the viability of sites in their assessments for requiring affordable housing as part of this policy. The consideration of viability of individual sites will be essential over the early parts of the plan period as a way of encouraging</p>		<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>development to come forward rather than restrain it with greater controls.</p> <p>The main issue with this policy lies in the considerably low floorspace thresholds which are being applied. The Council has introduced a starting threshold of 800sqm whereby they will require the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing with a presumption of 50% provision. This figure has been based on the London Plan's threshold of ten units and the Council consider that ten units can reasonably be achieved within 800sqm.</p> <p>This threshold figure of 800sqm however is too low as it is unlikely to generate 10 units especially if the Council's dwelling mix policy is adhered to. This threshold would not allow for the creation of all internal elements such as corridors, circulation space and cores all necessary to facilitate a development.</p> <p>It is suggested that if a floorspace threshold is considered appropriate, it should be at least 12,500sqft, to allow for notional capacity to reflect reasonable sized units and the Council's dwelling mix policy. Any commuted payment should be introduced on thresholds above 15,000 sqft.</p> <p>There is also no indication of how the commuted payment towards affordable housing will be calculated by the Council. This forms an important element of this policy and should be considered in relation to the actual mechanism for seeking such payments.</p> <p>This part of policy CH2 is therefore not consistent with regional policy nor is it justified.</p>		<p>environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended <p>The SHMA has been used as evidence supporting the drafting of policies within the Diversity of Housing Chapter, and accords with guidance set out in PPS3. It incorporates both a market assessment and a needs assessment. The SHMA looks at the housing market within and around the Royal Borough, while the Londonwide SHMA treats London as a whole, as a housing market. A sub-regional housing market is also being prepared. The 'international-dimension' is incorporated within each, as housing market boundaries transcend the local. The studies on which the policy has been based fully comply with government guidance on the conduct of a SHMA (CLG, 2007).</p> <p>The need for protection of existing residential stock is evidenced through monitoring trends which highlight</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											the significant decay of housing stock within the Borough.	
Cadogan Estates Ltd	Cadogan Estates Ltd	Gerald Eve	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS291	<p>Policy CH2</p> <p>The Cadogan Estate is one of the largest single land holdings in London comprising some 38 hectares of one of the Capital's most fashionable districts, stretching from Knightsbridge in the north to Cheyne Walk in the south, and from Cadogan Place in the east to Beaufort Street in the west. Substantial residential conversion programmes that took place in the early to mid 20th Century have resulted in the high proportion of the portfolio attributable to flat conversions that can be seen today.</p> <p>Today, the Estate currently comprises 1,800 flats, 370 houses, 200 shops and stores, 5 schools and approximately 40,000 sq m of office accommodation.</p> <p>In addition to the ongoing management, the Estate is also highly experienced in major redevelopment projects. Specifically, CEL brought forward the development of the Duke of York's headquarters, a Grade II listed building on the King's Road. CEL undertook conversions and developed the site to create a vibrant new destination including a mix of retail, commercial and residential property totalling in the order of 500,000 sq ft together with the occupation of the new Saatchi Gallery.</p> <p>Against this background and with regard to Policy CH2 i, j and m, CEL fundamentally objects to the inclusion of a floorspace threshold which, at the level proposed of 800 sq m and above, will sterilise the viability of many small refurbishment and conversion schemes which would otherwise provide valuable new housing to the market.</p> <p>Importantly, paragraph (i) now makes reference to a presumption that there will be a requirement to achieve at least 50% provision of affordable housing on gross residential floorspace in excess of 800 sq m.</p> <p>There is clearly a balance to be made between the need to provide housing and the need to deliver affordable housing. If greater weight is given to policies which set high standards for the proportion of affordable housing that must be achieved when development comes forward, this will have the affect of disincentivising developers to bring forward new housing developments thus stemming the production of new housing. Consequently, although the proportion of affordable housing that might be achieved on individual developments may be relatively high, the total volume in a particular Borough may not be significant because of reduced total numbers of housing developments coming forward generally, particularly in the current financial climate.</p> <p>CEL have significant concerns with a policy presumption that is based on a requirement for at least 50% provision of affordable housing on gross residential floorspace.</p> <p>Firstly, reference to a figure of at least 50% is arbitrary and without basis. The Royal Borough have not provided any evidence that a requirement for at least 50% of residential schemes to be affordable represents the most effective way of delivering affordable housing numbers. CEL consider the overall effect will be to disincentivise the delivery of housing and thus affordable housing schemes.</p> <p>Secondly, if a threshold is to be used, it should only be referred to</p>		<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30% intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with its published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>in the context of a maximum threshold. Developers and landowners require as much certainty as possible on the maximum costs</p> <p>they may be incurring when pursuing a particular type of development proposal. It would be wholly inappropriate, and indeed contradictory to the requirements of Policy CH2(p), to make reference to an open ended requirement for affordable housing where there is no clear justification of how the quantum of affordable housing is defined.</p> <p>It is on this basis, that CEL suggests that, should it be considered necessary to include reference to a target, this should be constructed as a maximum threshold and it should be made explicit that this is a borough wide target and not a requirement for each site. Such an approach would then be consistent with the requirements of Policy CH2(p) as proposed.</p> <p>Finally, it is considered that Policy CH2(m) does not represent an affective or justified approach to the delivery of off site affordable housing solutions . A requirement to make an application for any offsite affordable housing concurrently with the main planning application is presumptuous and, importantly, impractical.</p> <p>Due to the nature and prestige of the Royal Borough, opportunities for purchasing development land are extremely scarce. As a result, until the applicant has certainty on the main application, both in terms of the quantum of development that will be achieved and an agreed position on viability, developers and landowners will simply not commit to the costs associated with securing a site and indeed promoting a separate planning application. The negotiations that might occur during the determination of the main application site have a significant effect on the quantum of off site housing that may be required and consequently the size of the site that may be required. Indeed, schemes where off site solutions are required are likely to be smaller and therefore more sensitive to these changes. It would therefore be wholly ineffective to bring forward a policy that places onerous requirements without clear justification.</p> <p>On schemes where an off site solution is appropriate, it is considered sufficient to secure this through appropriately worded obligations and triggers within a legal agreement. This approach minimises unnecessary costs to the developer/landowner but provides sufficient control to the LPA for the delivery of the affordable housing component.</p>		<p>London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended 	
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS303	<p>Policy CH2 refers to floorspace standards (criterion bii). Is there a particular need for larger family sized affordable housing? The community strategy refers to 'negotiating larger internal space standards on new affordable housing schemes delivered through planning agreements'.</p> <p>Criterion h. requires housing schemes to include outdoor amenity space. This could attempt to link to areas of open space and play</p>		<p>Whilst the Council acknowledges the health impacts identified by HUDU, the Health Impact Assessment which accompanies the Core Strategy clearly identifies the causes and likely impact of various arisings. It is considered that this is the correct location to explicitly refer to health impacts. The health benefits and cost are implicit throughout the document and their direct inclusion within the main body of text adds no strategic</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									space deficiencies, particularly in the south of the borough (see Para 33.3.24).		value. The range of unit sizes is sought through criterion a, and evidence within the SHMA will be used to ensure the delivery of a range of unit sizes to meet local need. Criterion h of CH2 requires outdoor amenity space. this should be reas in conjunction with policy CR5.	
DP9	DP9		Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS334	<p>Policy CH2: Housing Diversity</p> <p><i>Unsound: Not consistent with National Policy</i></p> <p>Revisions to the mechanisms by which affordable housing is calculated are considered necessary to provide consistency with PPS3: Housing (2006) and the London Plan (as amended 2008).</p> <p>Paragraph 29 of PPS3 states that Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should set overall targets for affordable housing which should reflect an assessment '...of the likely economic viability of land for housing..., taking account of risks to delivery and drawing on informed assessment of the likely finance levels available...'. .</p> <p>Policy 3A.9 of the London Plan seeks a target of 50% of all new housing provisions throughout London to be affordable. The Plan provides for flexibility on the quantum of affordable housing through the provisions of Policy 3A.10 which states the following:</p> <p><i>"Boroughs should seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed use schemes, having regard to their affordable housing targets adopted in line with Policy 3A.9, the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements"</i></p> <p>Paragraph 3.52 of the supporting text to the policy notes that in estimating provision from private residential or mixed-use developments, Boroughs should take account of economic viability and that the '<i>...development control toolkit developed by the Three Dragons and Nottingham Trent University is one mechanism that will help</i>'. On this basis the paragraph states that:</p> <p>Boroughs should '<i>...take account of the individual circumstances in which the site lies, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements</i>'. Furthermore, the London Plan is clear is stating that determining the affordable housing requirements for a specific site should be approached in the context of Policy 3A.9 (referenced above).</p> <p>Paragraph 3.57 states that in exceptional cases, that the required affordable houses may be provided off site, for example, where there are demonstrable benefits to be gained by providing the units in a different location.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should therefore reflect the national and London planning policy framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing provision on site should be based upon scheme viability and other considerations in line with the London Plan rather than seek to impose the strategic "target" of 50% on all schemes regardless of individual site circumstances. The proportions of social rented and intermediate should be considered on a site by site basis and should 		<p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>as advocated by Policy 3A.9 of the London Plan should be based on a robust viability assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Core Strategy, in line with the London Plan policy, should recognize the exceptional circumstances when off site or no affordable provision would be acceptable. <p>The following wording is requested:</p> <p><i>The Council's [delete: will ensure new housing development is provided so as to further refine the grain of the mix of housing across the Borough] key housing priority is the delivery of new homes both market and affordable which meet needs and contribute towards providing a broad mix of housing for a wide variety of households in the area.</i></p> <p>To deliver this the Council will, in relation to:</p> <p><i>a. require new residential developments to include a mix of types, tenures and sizes of homes [delete: to reflect the] which contribute to meeting the varying needs of the Borough...;</i></p> <p><i>i. on schemes which have the capacity to provide 10 homes or more, require the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing with the presumption being up to [delete: at least] 50% provision [delete: on gross residential floor space in excess of 800m²] of either habitable room numbers or unit numbers as affordable housing provision taking into account contributions towards the Borough target from other sources of supply, the need to promote rather than restrain residential development, the viability of the proposals and site specific circumstances including the availability of public subsidy. Where an applicant identifies that a 50% affordable contribution cannot be viably supported by a development the council will require a viability assessment, using the GLA toolkit or an agreed alternative, to be submitted as part of the planning application documentation;</i></p> <p><i>n. require that where provided within a scheme affordable housing and market housing are delivered so as to achieve an integrated tenure blind design which does not prejudice the creation of mixed and balanced communities [delete: are integrated in any development and have the same external appearance:]</i></p> <p><i>o.require the affordable and market housing to have [delete equivalent] acceptable levels of amenity in relation to factors including [delete: views], daylight, noise and proximity to open space, playspace, community facilities, and shops;</i></p> <p>Delete policy sub points p and q</p>		<p>authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However, the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40% affordable housing is generally viable. 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended 	
Earl's Court and	Capital & Counties	DP9	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity		No	Effective	PSubCS432	p219 Policy CH2 Housing Diversity		The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Olympia Group	obo Earl's Court								<p>Reasons</p> <p>The proposed changes provide additional clarity of wording in respect of the Council's key housing priority, the re-provision of older person accommodation, allow provision of studio accommodation in leasehold accommodation and ensure affordability of intermediate accommodation accords with PPS3 and the CS Glossary. They also provide guidance as to how particular standards will be implemented by the Council.</p> <p>Revisions to the mechanisms by which affordable housing is calculated are considered necessary to provide consistency with PPS3 and the London Plan. Provision as a proportion of habitable rooms or units provides sufficient flexibility for the appropriate amount of affordable housing to be advanced on differing development schemes and on this basis a departure from the London Plan position (to a floorspace calculation) is not justified</p> <p>Revisions to tenure balance of new provision are considered appropriate in light of the strategic direction from the GLA and the need to improve tenure balance across the Borough's affordable offer to the end of the plan period. Furthermore the SHMA takes a particular approach to determining the potential role for intermediate provision which only 'tests' households' ability to afford intermediate priced accommodation at the 'usefully affordable level'. This may understate the ability of this tenure to resolve need particularly where it is provided at a range of price points between social rented levels and market provision. .</p> <p>The requirement within the policy to meet unquantified standards in respect of floorspace and floor to ceiling heights should be deleted or guidance added as to the scope of these requirements.</p> <p>It is not apparent that the proposed policy requirement has had regard to findings of the Housing Viability study. This concluded that provision of 50% affordable housing would not be a viable proposition in the current market and a 40% target would be the 'highest' that could be reasonably advanced. (para 7.15). Amendment is therefore recommended to reflect an overall 40% target, though in any event the particular viability issues facing large sites in terms of up front infrastructure costs should be acknowledged. This will also align with the direction of PPS3 paragraph 29.</p> <p>Small revisions are necessary to part (m) in order to allow for alternative approaches to the delivery of off site affordable housing subject to agreement with the Council.</p> <p>Together the amendments ensure compliance with PPS3 and the London plan and provide added assurance that policy promotes rather than frustrates delivery of housing in accordance with targets and other policy objectives. They will increase the effectiveness of the policy.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CH2</p> <p>The Council's [delete will ensure new housing development is provided so as to further refine the grain of the mix of housing across the Borough] key housing priority is the delivery of new homes both market and affordable which meet needs and contribute towards providing a broad mix of housing for a wide</p>		<p>planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>Reference to the adopted London Plan's 50% target/objective is made in Policy CH2. The London Plan further advises borough's affordable housing policies should also refer to the London Plan's 'indicative 70 : 30 tenurial split of social rental and intermediate housing. This, however, is purely indicative. The Council, accordingly, has proposed a tenure split in line with it's published SHMA (broadly indicating proportions of 85:15). This is in accordance with the London Plan policy and government guidance (PPS3) which allows authorities to determine their tenure split based on local evidence.</p> <p>The Council notes that the GLA has accepted the position as a satisfactory compliance with the Adopted London Plan. The Council also notes that representations have been made by some other parties to the proposed intent to amend the London Plan, in respect of the 50% target and tenurial split. However,</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>variety of households in the area.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>Housing mix and type</p> <p>a. require new residential developments to include a mix of types, tenures and sizes of homes to reflect the which contribute to meeting the varying and evidenced needs of the Borough, taking in to account the characteristics of the site, development viability and current evidence in relation to housing need;</p> <p>b. require new residential developments, including conversions, amalgamations and changes of use, to be designed to meet where possible all the following standards:</p> <p>(i) lifetime homes;</p> <p>(ii) delete f loorspace and floor to ceiling heights;</p> <p>(iii) wheelchair accessibility for a minimum of 10% of dwellings</p> <p>c. encourage extra care housing, particularly in the south of the Borough.</p> <p>d. protect houses in multiple occupation except where a proposal concerns conversion into self-contained studio flats, and require any such proposal to be subject to a S106 agreement to ensure the flats remain long term as studios in perpetuity;</p> <p>e. resist the loss of residential hostels except where the site will be utilized as a different form of affordable housing;</p> <p>f. resist development which results in the net loss of five or more residential units;</p> <p>g. require development that results in the amalgamation of residential units to be subject to a s106 agreement to ensure the resultant units are not further amalgamated in the future;</p> <p>h. require housing schemes to include outdoor amenity space;</p> <p>Affordable housing</p> <p>i. on schemes which have the capacity to provide 10 homes or more, 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] the Council will target the provision of up to 40% 50% of either habitable room numbers or unit numbers as affordable housing provision taking into account contributions towards the Borough</p>		<p>the Council considers that these, if accepted at the London-level can be satisfactorily incorporated, if they are adopted following the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council intends to provide more detailed criteria on the implementation of the Core Strategy's affordable housing strategy in the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council signalled this intent in its October 2009 proposed submission version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended 	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>target from other sources of supply, the need to promote rather than restrain residential development, the viability of the proposals, particularly large sites with significant infrastructure costs, and site specific circumstances including the availability of public subsidy. Where an applicant identifies that a 40% 50% affordable contribution cannot be viably supported by a development the council will require a viability assessment, using the GLA toolkit or an agreed alternative, to be submitted as part of the planning application documentation;</p> <p>j. require as appropriate provision to be in the form of a commuted sum in lieu of affordable housing within the scheme where schemes propose less than 12 homes [delete 1,200m2 of gross external residential floor space is proposed;]</p> <p>k. require provision of affordable housing [delete provision of affordable homes on site] within the scheme where 12 homes or more [delete than 1,200m2 of gross external residential floor space is] are proposed, unless exceptional circumstances are agreed to exist;</p> <p>l. require that any [delete off-site] off-scheme affordable housing is not generally provided [delete to be provided in] within the any wards [delete except the] following ward areas as illustrated on the Housing diversity map in this chapter: Golborne, St.Charles, Notting Barns, Colville, Norland, Earl's Court and Cremorne wards;</p> <p>m. require, where appropriate, an application to be made for any 'off-site' affordable housing concurrently with the main planning application and that the two applications are linked through a Section 106 agreement or unilateral undertaking;</p> <p>n. require that where provided within a scheme affordable and market housing [delete and market housing] are delivered so as to achieve an integrated tenure blind design which does not prejudice the creation of mixed and balanced communities [delete have the same external appearance;]</p> <p>o. require the affordable and market housing to have [delete equivalent] acceptable levels of amenity in relation to factors including views, daylight, noise and proximity to open space, playspace, community facilities, and shops;</p> <p>p. [delete require a viability assessment, using the GLA toolkit or an agreed alternative, to be submitted where schemes fail to provide 50% affordable housing on floorspace in excess of 800m2;]</p>			

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>q. require that affordable housing includes a minimum of 15% intermediate housing] in Golborne, St.Charles, Notting Barns, Norland, Colville, Earl's Court and Cremorne wards affordable housing should include a minimum of 40% intermediate housing. In all other wards a minimum of 85% social rented housing should be provided] Elsewhere in the Borough consideration should be given to the Borough wide targets, need, scheme viability and site specific circumstances;</p> <p>r. require that the provision of intermediate housing is provided at the "usefully affordable"] which is affordable to households whose income prevents them from accessing suitable accommodation on the open market locally.</p>			
Treasury Invest Ltd	Treasury Invest Ltd	DP9	Policy CH 2	Housing Diversity	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS496	<p>Policy CH 2: Housing Diversity</p> <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>National planning guidance for affordable housing is detailed in Planning Policy</p> <p>Statement 3: Housing (2006) (PPS3). Paragraph 29 states that</p> <p><i>"Local Planning This is reflected at a Regional level in Policy 3A.II of the London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2004) which states that</i> <i>"boroughs should normally require... "</i></p> <p>This Policy is intended to be read in the context of policy 3A.I0 of the London Plan which states that:</p> <p>affordable housing provision on a site which has the capacity to provide 10 or more <i>homes</i> Authorities will need to undertake an informed assessment of the economic viability of any thresholds and proportions of affordable housing proposed, including their likely impact upon overall levels of housing delivery and creating mixed communities."</p> <p>Proposed Policy CH 2 of the Submission Core Strategy parts (i),G) and (k) set thresholds for affordable housing provision of 800m 2 and 1200m2 of gross external residential floorspace.</p> <p>It is considered that these thresholds will have an impact upon levels of overall housing delivery as they will discourage smaller development sites from coming forward. These thresholds are not flexible and do not take in to account the need to encourage development, and the individual circumstances and costs involved with the redevelopment of sites. As a consequence, it is considered that this policy will jeopardise the creation of mixed communities and directly conflict with national planning policy.</p> <p>More specifically, part G) of Policy CH 2 requires the provision of affordable housing to be in the form of a commuted sum in lieu of affordable housing where less than 1,200m 2</p> <p>of gross external residential floorspace is proposed. PPS3 is clear that financial contributions in lieu of on-site provision should only be considered where it can be robustly justified. Paragraph 29 of PPS3 identifies the approach that Local Planning Authorities</p>		<p>The Core Strategy's approach to securing affordable housing provision is predicated on the employment of the relevant London Plan policies, including Policy 3A.10 which emphasises "the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements".</p> <p>The Council, in order to ensure that the issue of affordable housing provision viability within the Borough has been properly considered, as advised by PPS 3, commissioned an independent study of the Plan's emerging affordable housing policy, particularly in respect of threshold size and indicative targets, to the Borough. This 'Affordable Housing Viability Study' undertaken by Fordham Research reported that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% affordable housing is generally viable. • 50% affordable housing is deliverable in some circumstances; no justification for adopting a lower target • Affordable housing threshold of 10 units would be financially viable in most circumstances; limited evidence for a lower threshold • Within the Royal Borough, a 10 unit threshold equates, and is comparable with the 800 sq M threshold within the policy. • Variable area thresholds and targets are not recommended. <p>The Council has been employing the London Plan affordable housing policies for the determination of planning applications since the Secretary of State's Directive, of September 2007, 'not to save' the Unitary Development Plan affordable housing policies, on the grounds that their criteria had been superseded by the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council's operational experience of the London Plan's affordable housing policies during the last two years show that they have applied the key policy criteria to determine whether a housing development could provide affordable housing in accordance with the Royal Borough's needs. The London Plan Policy 3A.3 sets a London wide strategic target that 50% of all new</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>should take towards seeking developer contributions to facilitate the provision of affordable housing:</p> <p><i>"in seeking developer contributions, the presumption is The suggested affordable housing thresholds within Policy CH 2 are too low and will discourage smaller development sites from coming forward. These sites are so small that on-site provision of affordable housing is not a reasonable option and that a payment in lieu is the only alternative; this does not follow the guidance contained within PPS3 which prioritises on-site provision of affordable housing to create mixed and sustainable communities.</i></p> <p>that affordable housing will be provided on the application site so that it contributes towards creating a mix of housing. " should be applied flexibly, taking in to account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements. "</p> <p>"Boroughs should seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed use schemes, having regard to their affordable housing targets adopted in line with Policy 3A.9, the need to encourage, rather than restrain development and the individual circumstances of the site. Targets For the reasons described above in relation to Policy CH 2 parts (i), G) and (k), the Proposed Submission Core Strategy is unsound as it does not comply with national planning policy.</p>		<p>housing provision should be affordable, on the indicative basis of 70% social housing and 30 % intermediate provision. Policy 3A.11 applies these requirements to sites with a capacity to provide 10 or more homes, subject to the 'viability test' prescribed by Policy 3A.10.</p> <p>The Council considers that the key elements of any affordable housing policies should be the identification of an appropriate 'threshold' and a site specific 'viability test' to ensure that a housing proposal provides the 'maximum reasonable' amount of affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that any overall 'target/objective', derived from either a percentage or numerical basis, is a secondary factor as this is subordinate to the fundamental site specific viability test. Similarly in respect of any 'indicative' tenurial split, which additionally may be subject to specific site environmental or built form constraints, which may preclude significant social rental housing for households with children.</p> <p>These considerations and operational experience, together with the imperative of ensuring general conformity with the London Plan, have resulted in the Council's decision to develop Policy CH2 of the Core Strategy as proposed for submission as drafted.</p> <p>Government advice is that DPDs should not reiterate national or regional policies and should instead simply refer to them; therefore the additional expanded criteria regarding the Council's interpretation of the London Plan policies, and other government guidance, have been included within the Policy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy emphasises that the implementation of Policy CH2 will be dependent upon a 'viability test' as to what would represent the 'maximum reasonable' affordable housing provision on a particular site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3A.,10 (criterion p). This viability test will normally employ the Affordable Housing Toolkit (GLA) methodology or suitable alternatives, however, the Council does not consider it appropriate to specify such detail in the Core Strategy. These provisions build in the flexibility to the policy, and the thresholds are relevant to the circumstances found within the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.</p>	
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social Council		Policy CH 3	Protection of Residential Uses		No	Justified	PSubCS47	<p>Policy CH 3 Protection of residential uses</p> <p>To make this policy sound there needs to be protection for social rented housing in the same way as market residential use is protected.</p> <p>We believe that social rented housing and existing residents needs should be prioritised over creating retail opportunities. For example, residents from Portobello Ct are particularly concerned by plans to rebuild their estate to allow retail units to expand eastwards of Portobello Rd.</p>		The policy applies to all residential uses, and covers all tenures.	No change.
Sun Life Assurance Plc	Sun Life Assurance Plc	DP9	Policy CH 3	Protection of Residential Uses	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS94	<p>Policy CH3</p> <p>This policy is unduly restrictive, the draft Core Strategy should return to the policy presumption of residential development on all sites and should recognise the exceptional circumstances where small retail units and community uses across the borough can be developed for housing.</p>		The evidence supports the policy approach as explained in Policy CH3 and its reasoned justification. The Core strategy policies are internally consistent in their approach to dealing with presumptions in favour of uses, for example community uses (see also Keeping Life Local) and offices (see also Fostering Vitality section). The evidence to support these approaches, and through monitoring, demonstrates that the policy is not unduly	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Residential development has historically been the priority land use in the Royal Borough. Indeed policy H2 of the UDP confirms that vacant sites should be brought forward for residential development wherever possible.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should refer to other important London Plan and national policy considerations which set out the agenda for a sustainable approach including the promotion of "more efficient use of land though higher density, mixed use development and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings"</p> <p>The priority for the borough should remain in favour of residential use. Indeed, this priority is requested under London Plan policies.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should reflect that residential use is the priority land use in the Borough.</p> <p>The following amendments to the draft policy are requested:</p> <p>c. will permit new residential units everywhere except unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated:</p> <p>Delete sub points (i) and (ii)</p> <p>And amend sub point (vi) by deleting the first sentence to read</p> <p>or where replacing offices with a higher order town centre; a large or a medium office in a</p> <p><i>highly accessible area (PTAL</i></p> <p><i>4 or above); or a very small or small</i></p>		restrictive. Further, this demonstrates there need not be a presumption in favour of residential development where there may be competition with uses such as arts and culture uses, and offices in certain areas, dependent on their PTAL rating.	
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		Policy CH 3	Protection of Residential Uses	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS250	<p>Para 2.2.1. Para 35.3.1 Policy C 1 Policy CH 1, CH 2 Policy CH 3 Para vi Policy CT 1 Para b</p> <p>HOUSING, ADDED POPULATION, DENSITY AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES</p> <p>The Core Strategy, taking its lead from the GLA and the London Plan, envisages some 6,000 new dwellings over a decade. (Population is forecast to rise by 20,000.) This housing expansion will occupy much of the developable land in the Borough and significantly increase the overall density of the densest local authority in Britain.</p> <p>But many of the ancillary social, medical and commercial services on which residents rely are already over-subscribed, have little of no room in which to expand and are faced by prohibitive K&C land values if they want to expand.</p> <p>If the Inspector was to talk to residents about this he would find them speaking of surgeries with waiting lists, standing room only on buses, long queues at post offices, lack of on-street visitor parking space, tiny flats and inhuman cramming on the</p>		<p>While the representation does not appear to raise an issue of soundness <i>per se</i> it should be noted that Policy C1, and the assessed infrastructure requirements seek to ensure that new developments will assist in providing necessary infrastructure. In preparing an assessment of infrastructure requirements, best practice as provided by PAS has been used, with consultation and involvement of stakeholders. It is an on-going process, and so will evolve over time, while Policy C1 requires necessary infrastructure to be provided alongside development, and complies with Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>A Planning Obligations Supplementary planning Document has also been prepared to assist in formulating the required obligations to secure infrastructure, including necessary community facilities.</p> <p>The specific issue of transport capacity is also raised and queried. In the context of development at Earls Court these would be considered at the planning stage, with infrastructure requirements being assessed alongside any planned development.</p>	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Underground. These are, of course, the views of middle-income residents, not the rich. (But as Figure 8.3 shows, the Borough has a high proportion of residents with incomes of £35,000 and below.)</p> <p>The Society does not suggest that delivering additional houses on what are currently non-housing sites would be ineffective in meeting housing demand. The issue is the relationship between that new housing (and additional population) and the capacity of a wide range of social and physical facilities. There is insufficient evidence on the impact of this increase in population on social and community services. The question never seems to be addressed. It is assumed that higher population density is justified without exploring its side-effects.</p> <p>Policy C1 does, of course, require additional social facilities to be financed via S.106 Agreements. But there is no assessment of the scope for expanding the supply of the Borough's already overstretched infrastructure of public transport and roads, surgeries and post offices, playing fields and parks.</p> <p>How, for instance, will the construction of new flats on the site of the Earl's Court Exhibition solve the problems of acute congestion (due both to District/Circle/Piccadilly line interchanging passengers and heavy local demand) at Earl's Court Underground Station?</p> <p>How, furthermore, does the Plan reconcile all the proposed new residents with Policy CT1 (b). 'Ensure that development will not result in any material increase in traffic</p> <p>congestion.....' ? Additional residents will lead to additional servicing vehicles ranging from refuse collection to plumbers, parcels delivery, computer technicians, lift engineers and building contractors. Additional residents will also generate additional business and family visitors. Even if residential development is 'permit free' it will still contribute to traffic.</p> <p>Increasing the Borough's population will put its social and community infrastructure under even greater pressure. This problem is not assessed. No evidence is advanced to justify the addition of 20,000 residents. The Society considers that the Plan is unsound.</p> <p>The plan needs either to scale down provision for increased population or show how the supply of social and community infrastructure should be expanded - or a mix of the two.</p>			
DP9	DP9		Policy CH3	Protection of Residential Uses	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS335	<p>Policy CH3: Protection of Residential Uses</p> <p><i>Unsound: Not consistent with National Policy</i></p> <p>It is considered that this policy is unduly restrictive and that the draft Core Strategy should return to the policy presumption of residential development on all sites and recognise the exceptional circumstances where small or medium business use across the borough can be developed for housing.</p> <p>Residential development has historically been the priority land use in the Royal Borough. Indeed policy H2 of the UDP confirms that vacant sites should be brought forward for residential development wherever possible.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should refer to other important London Plan and national policy considerations which set out the agenda for a sustainable approach including the promotion of "more efficient</p>		The evidence supports the policy approach as explained in Policy CH3 and its reasoned justification. The Core strategy policies are internally consistent in their approach to dealing with presumptions in favour of uses, for example community uses (see also Keeping Life Local) and offices (see also Fostering Vitality section). The evidence to support these approaches, and through monitoring, demonstrates that the policy is not unduly restrictive. Further, this demonstrates there need not be a presumption in favour of residential development where there may be competition with uses such as arts and culture uses, and offices in certain areas, dependent on their PTAL rating.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>use of land though higher density, mixed use development and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings.</p> <p>The support for a mix of uses should be focussed on existing centres and should, where appropriate include residential use. The wider priority for the borough should remain in favour of residential use. Indeed, this priority for the borough should remain in favour of residential use. Indeed, this priority is requested under London Plan policies.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should reflect that residential use is the priority land use in the Borough. The following amendments to the draft policy are requested:</p> <p><i>Residential use is the priority land use in the Borough, and the Council will ensure a net increase in residential accommodation in residential accommodation...</i></p> <p>c) ... permit new residential use and floorspace everywhere except unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated:</p> <p>i. at ground floor level of all town centres,</p> <p>ii. where replacing existing retail uses across the borough,</p> <p>iii. where replacing an existing light industrial use across the Borough,</p> <p>iv. within the Kensal, Latimer Road and Lots Road Employment Zones,</p> <p><u>[delete: v. where replacing an arts and cultural use]</u></p> <p>vi. where replacing a social and community use, which predominantly serves, or provide significant benefits to, borough residents (unless as part pf an enabling development); or</p> <p>vii. where replacing offices within a higher order town centre; <u>[delete: 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.]</u></p>			
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social Council		Policy CH 4	Estate Renewal		No	Justified	PSubCS48	<p>Policy CH 4 Estate Renewal</p> <p>The policy should refer to a compelling case that demonstrates long term benefits to existing residents, as well as to other stakeholders.</p> <p>b) The guarantee should be that existing tenants have the right to return to rebuilt homes on the estate (if they wish) and this guarantee should extend to leaseholders who had bought their homes. The term "in the area" is too vague.</p> <p>d) We are concerned about financial guarantees, given that redevelopment to a large extent is based on raising private sector funds. What if the money dries up or a developer goes bankrupt? There should have been an evaluation of the impact of the credit crunch on the proposed development sites.</p> <p>e) This policy is unsound, as it suggests the disintegration of existing communities. There must be protection for existing</p>		The Council does not agree that the issues raised are sufficient to undermine the soundness of the policy nor the Plan. .	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>estates and their autonomy as a balance to finance led mega projects.</p> <p>To make the plan sound we are seeking the inclusion (in the monitoring chapter) of output indicators for the housing issues we have identified above.</p>			
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CH 4	Estate Renewal	Yes	Yes		PSubCS516	<p>Policy CH 4: Estate Renewal</p> <p>KHT strongly supports the principle of estate renewal and welcomes the inclusion of Policy CH 4 within the Core Strategy. KHT supports the principle of part (a) of Policy CH 4 which states that the Council will require the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, with the minimum being no not loss of existing social rented provision. KHT suggests that part (a) of Policy CH 4 should clarify that the calculation on whether there is a loss of affordable housing provision should be based on habitable rooms rather than</p> <p>units, where the redevelopment of an estate is providing a housing mix more appropriate to the needs of both existing and prospective future residents, to be consistent with the Mayor's adopted Housing SPG. In addition, KHT supports part (d) of Policy CH 4 which notes that the Council will 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>KHT notes that part (c) of Policy CH 4 requires the mix of house sizes for the reprovided social-rented accommodation to be determined by the housing needs of the tenants of the estate and by the housing needs of the Borough, at the time an application is submitted. KHT considers that the mix of house sizes should be based on the housing needs of existing estate tenants only; the housing needs of the Borough in general should only apply if the net uplift in units proposed as part of the comprehensive redevelopments is sufficient in terms of quantum to sustain provision of net new affordable units. KHT therefore suggests that the reference to 'the housing needs of the Borough' should be removed from part (c) of Policy CH 4.</p>		The supporting comments are noted. In criterion (a) the reference is sufficiently flexible to ensure that there is no net loss, be this in terms of units, habitable rooms or floorspace. In criterion (c) the needs of the borough is correctly referenced. Estate renewal may be of more than local significance, and so there needs to be a balance between creating only replicated housing, and a wider view taken on the overall needs. This will, of course, be a consideration through any planning process.	No change.
Mr Robin Meltzer	K&C Liberal Democrats		Policy CK 1	Social and Community Uses		No	Justified	PSubCS29	<p>PROVISION FOR THE ELDERLY</p> <p>We are also objecting under the soundness test of 'justification' to the Council's proposals for the elderly.</p> <p>The strategy Council defines "social and community uses" to include elderly homes, care homes and schools. (p.165., 30.3.4).</p> <p>The effect of policy CK1 (p.165) is that developers are free to develop land that falls into this category if they include some new community usage on the development. This is presumably the principle behind the developments planned for the Edenham residential home and the Holland Park School playground site. This means that the amount of land in "social and community use" will diminish over time. There is no justification for this because the great need for land which falls under this category is already established.</p> <p>Further, the Edenham home has not been replaced elsewhere in the Borough, and the Council have made no proposals to do so, despite the findings of the review of housing for elderly people (Ref: Evidence Base section on Housing Institute of Public Care May 2008 - Older People's Housing needs).</p>		The consultees comment is incorrect.	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social Council		Policy CK 1	Social and Community Uses		No	Justified	PSubCS41	<p>Policy CK1 Social and Community Uses</p> <p>For the policy to be sound there needs to be an additional clause which addresses the need of the voluntary and community sector for accessible and affordable premises which meet their operational requirements, including access for disabled people.</p> <p>The definition of social and community uses (30.3.4) needs to include open space and cultural facilities as required by London Plan Policy 3A.18 and 3.100.</p> <p>b) We support the commitment to a new secondary school in North Kensington. It should be referred to as a community school or community college, reflecting that it is for those of all faiths and none and that it will provide adult education, with pre-employment training for local residents. These important details should be included in 30.2.3.</p> <p>c ii) We regard the change from one social and community use to another to be unsound as currently worded. There needs to be protection for voluntary and community premises which could be lost to schools, hospitals, places of worship etc if this policy stands.</p> <p>c iii) Also unsound is the policy of development being permitted where an existing social and community use can be removed so long as it is re-provided elsewhere in the borough. This should only be permitted where it can be demonstrated it is supported by the local neighbourhood, an important protection for keeping life local and retaining the vitality of local communities.</p>		<p>a) Access for disabled people is a vital component of all new public buildings in line with the DDA. As such, additional wording in unnecessary,</p> <p>The importance of Arts and Cultural uses is noted and has not diminished since the last iteration of the Core Strategy., However, due to the arts and cultural uses being predominantly town centre uses and often high trip generating, their position within the Fostering Vitality Chapter was considered more appropriate. To this end, they have been designated under a specific policy (Policy CF7).</p> <p>b) Support is noted for the new community academy in North Kensington. The Council is committed to delivering a school for the local community which will be multi-faith and cater for the educational and sporting needs of the community. Further detailing will be undertaken as part of the North Kensington Sports Centre SPD.</p> <p>c i) The consultee has misunderstood the intention of the sequential test for social and community uses. The Council's position is in fact, directly aligned to that of the consultee. The whole notion of CK1 is to protect social and community uses within the same, similar or related use and ensure that the land bank does not diminish.</p> <p>Therefore, land or a building which ceases use as a community or voluntary sector office, should firstly be considered for reuse by the community or voluntary sector. Not, as is suggested by the consultee, as a hospital or school.</p> <p>c ii) The consultee seems to have misunderstood the concept of the sequential test. The relocation of a social and community use to elsewhere in the borough as stated in CK1 (c. iii) would only be acceptable if it has been demonstrated that CK1 (c. i) and (c. ii) cannot be achieved.</p>	No change
Sun Life Assurance Plc	Sun Life Assurance Plc	DP9	Policy CK 1	Social and Community Uses	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS68	<p>Policy CKI</p> <p>Policy CKI states that</p> <p>"the Council will ensure that social and community uses are protected or enhanced throughout the Borough". Part c sets out the sequential approach to change of use, however, it is considered that it is too restrictive in its current form and could hinder redevelopment.</p> <p>It is suggested that the sequential approach should also take into consideration the</p> <p>following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision should be made for the change of use of land and/or buildings where the current or last use was in social or community use to other uses, such as residential where the existing use will be relocated to another premises; and • It should also be stated that when assessing the change of use from social/community to another use, factors such as demand for such a facility in that location should be taken into consideration when assessing the 		<p>The first factor suggested is covered under the sequential test CK1 (c. iii) where residential uses would be considered the enabling development which would stimulate the re-provision of social and community uses elsewhere in the borough.</p> <p>Demand for social and community uses differs from use to use therefore a series of parameters for all social and community uses would be necessary. This is not seen as appropriate. However the use of assessing demand is not precluded by the policy as worded and its use will be assessed on a case-by-case basis</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									proposals.			
Martins Properties (Chelsea) Ltd	Martins Properties (Chelsea) Limited	Gerald Eve	Policy CK 1	Social and Community Uses	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS257	<p>Social and community uses are identified as including care homes/care facilities; and elderly people's homes; community/meeting halls; doctors, dentist, hospitals and other health facilities; bespoke premises for the voluntary sector; hostels; laundrettes; libraries; metropolitan police and other emergency service facilities; petrol filling stations; places of worship; schools and other educational establishments; sports facilities and youth facilities.</p> <p>Martins Properties (Chelsea) Limited ("MP") object to the policy on the basis it does not provide any flexibility for the relocation of uses through, for example use swaps nor does it provide any criteria in relation to the loss of a social and community use entirely.</p> <p>Additionally, any policy should make it clear that it relates to the specific social and community use which exists on the land or building being developed rather than seeking to protect the use for any other social and community use.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.2.30 of the Strategy identifies that demand for private sector housing in the Borough is insatiable, and given the relatively little development land available, can never be met.</p> <p>At a strategic level the London Plan identifies that there is an acute shortage of housing (paragraph 3.7). Policy 3A.1 therefore sets minimum targets at a borough level and states that the Mayor will and Boroughs should promote policies that seek to achieve and exceed this target. As land is a scarce resource, policies within the London Plan also seek to make the most efficient use of land and to maximise intensity of use (Policy 3A.3).</p> <p>Given that there is a need at a strategic and local level for housing there must be a recognition within policy that the most efficient use of land is sought and that if land is protected there should be criteria against which proposals for alternative uses can be assessed which would enable the land to be put to more efficient use. Particularly, where these uses meet other objectives within the Plan.</p> <p>Policy CK1 should therefore provide criteria against which proposals can be assessed where this will allow the reuse of the site and bring it into beneficial use. Such an approach was adopted within the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea</p> <p>Supplementary Planning Guidance on Elderly Persons Accommodation dated April 2004. Within the SPG paragraph 7.5 identifies that the Council expects the following issues to be addressed by applicants in justifying development proposals which involve the loss of elderly persons accommodation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local need and capacity; • Commercial viability; and • Suitability for conversion or extension. <p>MP</p>		<p>The Council acknowledges the demand for housing in the borough is high, however, to sustain a local life and community cohesion, this housing needs to be accompanied by a sufficient supply of social and community uses. The Council has a duty to its residents to maintain its existing land bank of social and community uses and add to it where appropriate. Therefore, the re-provision or relocation of a social and community use in favour of an enabling use (such as residential) will only be considered against if it can be demonstrated against the sequential test within CK1 (c).</p> <p>The Council is unwilling to adopt a criteria based approach by which all applications for a change of use from a social and community use will be assessed. This is not to say that criteria will not be acceptable, however with such a rich variety of uses classified as social and community, issues of demand and viability will be assessed on a case by case basis.</p> <p>In doing this, it is considered that the Council will be able to meet its annual housing targets whilst also maintaining a robust social infrastructure provision.</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		Policy CK 1	Social and Community Uses	No	No	Effective	PSubCS316	<p>We suggest that Policy CK1 should refer to the proactive approach taken in the core strategy to identifying future health and social infrastructure requirements as demonstrated in the infrastructure schedule. The reactive and protective stance of Policy CK1 may hinder the PCT's ability to relocate or upgrade GP premises, particularly GP practices operating from unsuitable accommodation, for instance single-handed GP practices located in former housing which does not meet DDA requirements.</p> <p>Aside from referring to a new academy for the communities of North Kensington in criterion a, Policy CK1 doesn't refer to strategic social infrastructure requirements. Consideration could be given to reference to other corporate and partner actions in section 30.4, including the PCT's 'polysystem' model of care and the intention to develop a polysystem for the south of the borough commencing with the commissioning of an Urgent Care Centre at Chelsea and Westminster Foundation Trust and a polyclinic at a site in Earls Court. Also, Policy CK1 could refer to an aim of the community strategy (Aim4 viii.) to examine how sport provision in the south of the borough can be improved.</p>		<p>As written, Keeping Life Local will not hinder the relocation of PCT resources where it can be demonstrated that the relocation of a premises is to the greater benefit of the Borough. This is demonstrated using the sequential approach in CK1.</p> <p>The Council supports the PCT's polysystem approach however, as this forms part of the Primary Care Strategy, the Core Strategy already supports this within Corporate and Partner Action 6 of the Keeping Life Local.</p> <p>The provision of sport facilities throughout the borough is essential to stimulating communities and providing better local health rates. Keeping Life Local acknowledges this by designating sports facilities as social and community uses. As such the Core Strategy will support any new opportunities providing they meet the criteria in CK1(b). However, a new Corporate and Partner Action will be added to ensure Planning and Borough Development works alongside the Council's Sport Development team.</p>	Add corporate and partner action
Metropolitan Police	Metropolitan Police	C G M S	Policy CK 1	Social and Community Uses		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS350	<p>in order to ensure Policies CF5 and CK1 of the emerging RBKC Core Strategy comply with the national guidance and the strategic development plan, thereby ensuring 'soundness', the relevant policy framework is set out. I then refer to the operational background in respect of particular policing uses and finally propose minor alterations to Policies CF5 and CK1.</p> <p>Relevant Planning Policy</p> <p>PPSI states at paragraph 27 (iii) (Delivering Sustainable Development), 'in preparing development plans, planning authorities should seek to: promote communities which are healthy, safe and crime free ...',</p> <p>London Plan Policy 3A.17 (Addressing the needs of London's diverse population) of the states:</p> <p>'Policies in DPDs should identify the needs of the diverse groups in their area. They should address the spatial needs of these groups, and ensure that they are capable of being met wherever possible, both through general policies for development and specific policies relating to the provision of social infrastructure including healthcare and social care (Policy 3 A.18), safety and security (Policy 4B . 6), policing facilities (my emphasis), the public realm (Policy 4B.3)'</p> <p>Policy 3A.18 (Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure and community facilities) states:</p> <p>' Policies in DPDs should assess the need for social infrastructure and community facilities in the area (my emphasis), and ensure that they are capable of being met wherever possible . These needs include primary healthcare facilities , children 's play and recreation facilities, services for young people , older people and disabled people, as well as libraries , sports and leisure facilities, open space , schools , nurseries and other childcare provision, training facilities, fire and policing facilities (my emphasis), community halls , meeting rooms, places of worship, public toilets , facilities for cyclists , convenience shops , banks in g facilities and post offices (also see Chapter 3 D). A</p>		<p>With regard to CK1, the Council understands MPA's position, however, as written it is considered to provide the support and flexibility for police facilities whilst also remaining water-tight in protecting other (potentially more vulnerable) uses. Whilst the wording proposed by MPA may be suitable for the needs of the police, the Council is concerned that it would not provide the necessary protection for the full range of social and community facilities defined in Keeping Life Local. This could significantly weaken our position should applications come forward for the loss of a social and community use without the re-provision of certain facilities.</p> <p>The third bullet-point of CK1c iii. protects against the net loss of facilities in line with LP policy 3A.18 and allows for the off-site re-provision of facilities where it is demonstrated that there is a greater benefit to the borough. The Core Strategy is explicit in its support for the MPA Estate Strategy (Corporate and Partnership Actions of Keeping Life Local on page 168). As any application relating to the loss of police facilities would presumably be in line with the Estate Strategy, it would almost certainly be supported by the Council. Therefore, an application for a change of use of a policing facility to a non-social and community use would be supported providing the MPA could demonstrate that the proposal, as part of the wider Estate Strategy, results in significant improvement to policing across the borough through off-site re-provision.</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p><i>dequate provision for these facilities is particularly important in major areas of new development and regeneration.</i></p> <p>London Plan Policy 3.B4 states:</p> <p><i>With strategic partners, the Mayor will promote, manage and where necessary protect the varied industrial offer of the Strategic Industrial Locations (SILs - Policy 2 A.10), set out in Annex 2 as London's strategic reservoir of industrial capacity. Boroughs should identify SILs in DPDs, and develop local policies and criteria to manage Locally Significant and other, smaller industrial sites outside the SILs, having regard to (inter alia):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>the potential for surplus industrial land (as defined in assessments) to help meet strategic and local requirements for a mix of other uses such as housing and social infrastructure and where appropriate, contribute to town centre renewal.</i> <p>Furthermore, emerging London Plan Policy 2.17 defines inter alia 'other industrial related activities' as being acceptable within Preferred Industrial Locations..</p> <p>Having outlined relevant government guidance and strategic development plan policies, the requested minor alterations are made within the context of the MPA's operational need</p>			
Metropolitan Police	Metropolitan Police	CGMS	Policy CK 1	Social and Community Uses		Yes		PSubCS352	<p>Policy CK 1 is broadly welcomed, however minor alterations are recommended to ensure the policy reflects the Strategic Development Plan. The MPA's estate strategy highlights the possibility of disposal of some order facilities which are no longer suitable for effective policing use. Redevelopment of these sites will allow the MPA to improve the provision of police facilities in the borough. Policy 3A.18 of the London Plan prevents against the net loss (my emphasis) of social infrastructure and community facilities. It is therefore recommended that Policy CK1 is altered in order to facilitate the loss of outdated and life-expired policing facilities, ensuring improved policing across the borough and further ensuring that the emerging policy reflects the Strategic Development Plan in this regard.</p> <p><i>Recommended Alteration</i></p> <p>In order to ensure the emerging policy reflects the Strategic Development Plan it is recommended that the following point is added to policy CK 1, part c:</p> <p><i>iv, Permit change of use where the last use was as a social or community use where:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>alternative community facilities of a similar nature are provided locally in the area within which that facility serves;</i> <i>it would enable the implementation of a strategy for the provision of a community service in the Borough;</i> or <i>the site is either demonstrably unsuitable for continued use as a community facility or is vacant and no community use is forthcoming despite active site marketing on realistic terms.</i> 		<p>The Council understands MPA's position, however, as written it is considered to provide the support and flexibility for police facilities whilst also remaining water-tight in protecting other (potentially more vulnerable) uses. Whilst the wording proposed by MPA may be suitable for the needs of the police, the Council is concerned that it would not provide the necessary protection for the full range of social and community facilities defined in Keeping Life Local. This could significantly weaken our position should applications come forward for the loss of a social and community use <i>without</i> the reprovision of certain facilities.</p> <p>The third bullet-point of CK1c iii. protects against the net loss of facilities in line with LP policy 3A.18 and allows for the off-site reprovision of facilities where it is demonstrated that there is a greater benefit to the borough. The Core Strategy is explicit in its support for the MPA Estate Strategy (Corporate and Partnership Actions of Keeping Life Local on page 168). As any application relating to the loss of police facilities would presumably be in line with the Estate Strategy, it would almost certainly be supported by the Council. Therefore, an application for a change of use of a policing facility to a non-social and community use would be supported providing the MPA could demonstrate that the proposal, as part of the wider Estate Strategy, results in significant improvement to policing across the borough through off-site reprovision.</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Other Representations</p> <p>It is recommended that reference to 'Safer Neighbourhood Team Bases' is replaced with '<i>Neighbourhood Policing Facilities</i>' in line with current MPA terminology.</p> <p>The MPA request that the above alteration is taken into account in the final Core Strategy.</p>			
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social Council		Policy CK 2	Local Shopping Facilities		No	Justified	PSubCS42	<p>Policy CK2 Local Shopping Facilities</p> <p>The protection given by this policy is weak. Local shopping facilities are about much more than convenience shopping, it is about access to services that are essential to keep life local. Services such as a post office, a pharmacist, a bank, a laundrette, a café and a greengrocer's. To make this policy sound a Local Needs Index should be included. In preparing this plan RBKC has used a Local Needs Index which identifies 11 key services.</p> <p>The policy should also be strengthened by recognising that local shopping facilities are important to local economic activity.</p>		<p>Local economic activity is acknowledged as being a key determinant of the success of the Borough's centres, however, these are included within the Fostering Vitality chapter.</p> <p>The Local Needs Index, whilst establishing 11 key services is not necessarily accurate for the profiles of the Council's local centres. For example, the presence of a Bookmaker within the Thackeray Street Neighbourhood Centre would do little to stimulate local life.</p> <p>The other uses identified by the consultee are covered within CK1 as social and community uses, in CK2 as convenience retail or are uses which are not considered to immediately contribute to local life and are better positioned within areas of higher accessibility.</p>	No change
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CK 2	Local Shopping Facilities	Yes	Yes		PSubCS507	<p>Policy CK 2: Proposed Local Shopping Facilities and the 'Keeping Life Local: Social and Community Uses, Local Shopping Facilities and Walkable Neighbourhoods' diagram (page 164).</p> <p>KHT supports the recognition within the Core Strategy that national walkable neighbourhood indicators (i.e. 800 metre walk) are not appropriate within RBKC due to the relatively large numbers of shopping centres within the Borough. KHT considers that a 400 metre area is more appropriate in terms of assessing local shopping deficiency based on advice from CB Richard Ellis (Retail Planning). KHT notes that part of Wornington Green is not identified within a 5-minute walk (400 metres) of a neighbourhood or higher order shopping centre on the 'Keeping Life Local: Social and Community Uses, Local Shopping Facilities and Walkable Neighbourhoods' diagram on page 164. KHT therefore recognises that part of Wornington Green is within an identified area of deficiency.</p> <p>KHT supports the reference within Policy CK 2 that the Council will ensure opportunities exist for convenience shopping in these locations, and considers that this is consistent with the positive encouragement in the London Plan for the provision of retail as part of mixed use developments in accessible locations for local provision. KHT considers that Policy CK 2 should also provide for the provision of comparison retail floorspace inside and outside areas of</p> <p>deficiency, as part of delivering mixed-use, balanced and sustainable development as advocated in PPS1 and PPS6, where the provision would meet local needs. KHT suggests that in terms of comparison retail floorspace, the approach should reflect Policy CK 2 (with the amendments sought by KHT).</p>		<p>The Council notes that the soundness of the document is not being questioned.</p> <p>Support for concept of walkable neighbourhoods, and provision of convenience shopping throughout the Borough noted. The Council considers that Policy CF1 offers sufficient flexibility to allow new shopping (both convenience and comparison) in the Wornington area. This has been illustrated by the recent granting of the planning permission in the areas, which included a retail element.</p>	No change.
Ms Mary Gardiner	Kensington and Chelsea Social		Policy CK 3	Walkable Neighbourhoods and Neighbourhood		No	Justified	PSubCS43	<p>Policy CK3 Walkable neighbourhoods and neighbourhood facilities</p> <p>We support walkable neighbourhoods, but regard the protection</p>		<p>Support is noted. The parameters for walkable neighbourhoods are included within the text and as set out in the monitoring indicators in Section 2D. By simply adding the distances into the Policy, the Council is</p>	No change

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
	Council			od Facilities					<p>that is given by this policy as weak.</p> <p>The policy should give the proximity to local services as set out in the text - a maximum 400 metres (5 minutes) and a maximum 800 metres (10 minutes) walking distance. We would like this to be expressed in a maximum distance as the distance people can walk in a set time varies considerably.</p> <p>This policy should also refer to the local needs index, and identify services such as a GP, library, primary school and green space.</p>		merely repeating itself which is not seen as appropriate.	
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		Policy CL 1	Context and Character		No	Effective	PSubCS231	<p>Identification of views and vistas (4B.16):</p> <p>Strategically important views are designated in the London Plan (Table 4B.1) and managed through the London View Management Framework. This is currently being refined, although this is largely about how views should be managed rather than adding further views and vistas. The policy, however, says that "boroughs should base the designation and management of local views in their DPDs on Policies 4B.16 to 4B.18".</p> <p>The Core Strategy has not tackled this issue - it has not even identified the views and vistas covered by the UDP; see for example UDP policies covering views:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • along and across the Thames (CD1; CD2; CD6); • of the Royal Hospital (CD8); • of the South Kensington Museums Area (CD10 and CD11); • from Kensington Gardens (CD13 and CD14); • of and from Holland park (CD15); as well as • the strategic view from King Henry's Mound (Richmond Park) to St Paul's (CD17); and • those contained in conservation area proposals statements (CAPS). <p>The Core Strategy has only passing references to views and vistas, including Policy CL1 (d) and (e); CL2 (j) and CR5. This omission is particularly concerning given the Areas of Metropolitan Importance (the Thames and the Museums), the Royal Parks, Holland Park, the fine townscape as well as important local views that need protection.</p> <p>Test of soundness:</p> <p>The Society believes that there is therefore a risk that this area of the plan will fail the effectiveness test of soundness, because what is intended may not be achieved. For this reason, we make the following proposal to rectify the soundness issue</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>The Society proposes that those views and vistas that have already been identified should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • shown on the diagram for Renewing the Legacy (page 202); • where appropriate, shown on diagrams in the "Place" chapters - already shown on diagrams for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Earl's Court (p82) ○ Kensington High Street (p88) ○ Knightsbridge (p102 - but vista not shown) 		<p>The strategic high level policy for the protection of views and vistas can be found at Policy CL1 (e) which resists development which interrupts, disrupts or detracts from strategic and local vistas, views and gaps. This provides the high level policy for the more detailed policies which have been saved and retained in the adopted Unitary Development Plan, namely Policy CD8 which protects important views and vistas around the Royal Hospital; Policy CD10 which protects views around the South Kensington Museums Area; Policy CD13 which restricts building height around Kensington Gardens and Hyde Park; Policy CD14 which ensures that buildings do not impose themselves on Kensington Palace; CD15 which resists proposals encroaching or affecting the setting of Holland Park and CD17 protecting the long distance view from King Henry's mound to St. Pauls.</p> <p>The Conservation Area Proposals Statements (CAPS) have not been superseded at this stage by Supplementary Planning Documents and therefore remain in force as material considerations and detailed lower level policy.</p> <p>The specific reference to protecting views and vistas in the Submission Core Strategy is Policy CL1 (e). However, Policy CL2 (j) which relates to 'High Buildings' also requires a district landmark to articulate positively a point of townscape legibility of significance for the wider Borough and neighbouring boroughs, such as deliberately framed views and specific vistas.</p> <p>With reference to specific views along and across the River Thames the overarching high level policy in the Submission Core Strategy CL1 (e). However, the Policy Replacement Schedule at Chapter 41 in the Submission Core Strategy shows that Policies CD1 and CD2 are being superseded by the Core Strategy. This is in fact, an error and these two policies should be shown as being retained.</p> <p>With regard to the specific recommendations of the Kensington Society a reference to the Mayor's strategic view from King Henry's mound to St. Paul's is recommended to be made at reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.10. However, it is not considered appropriate to include further views on the 'Renewing the Legacy' map as this would not be a comprehensive reflection of all views and a 'Views' SPD will deal with these in detail.</p>	Recommend a reference to the strategiv view from King Henry's mound to St. Paul's at reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.10.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ King's Road and Sloane Square (p108) ○ Notting Hill Gate (p114) <p>Almost all of them should show views and vistas of Borough importance.</p> <p>In addition, in order to support the Core Strategy, the SPD on Tall Buildings and CAPS, the Borough should undertake research, as has been done in Westminster to define "Metropolitan Views", to produce an SPD on views and vistas. This will help ensure that new buildings, especially large or tall buildings make a positive contribution to our townscape and enhance rather than harm our views and vistas.</p>			
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		Policy CL 1	Context and Character	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS253	<p>Proposals Map opposite Page 158</p> <p>Policy CL 1</p> <p>CE 2</p> <p>CE2 (c)</p> <p>CE4 (c)</p> <p>THE RIVER THAMES</p> <p>The Embankment and the spaces fronting it (eg the Royal Hospital) are a Chelsea amenity of the greatest importance and the area based on the river itself - the Thames Policy Area - is designated as a 'site of metropolitan importance'. The Society is concerned that little specific is said about it in the Core Strategy. It is important to be able to protect this valued place from intrusive development, to protect views and vistas to and from it along and across the Thames, and to protect it from any consequences of the construction and completion of Thames Water's new sewage tunnel and connectors.</p> <p>Policy CL1 (e) is insufficient. Ideally the Thames Policy Area out to be identified as a 'place'. Views to and from the Royal Hospital and views along and across the Thames, especially from the bridges should be identified and protected. Proposals should be made to work with TfL on creating additional pedestrian crossings and to provide for cyclists in ways that give people on foot safe use of Bazalgette's famous belvedere walkway The Embankment is a unique and wonderful place. The need to rescue the Embankment from domination by traffic should be stated. Over 20 years much could be achieved.</p> <p>The Core Strategy is ineffective in identifying a Thames Policy area, in addressing its needs, in setting out policies for its protection or in identifying the potential for river-related uses. This makes it unsound.</p> <p>The Plan should show a Thames protection area on the Proposals Map. It should draw together into a single policy or an SPD all the policies that relate to the Thames and its frontages and set out measures for conservation and development.</p> <p>The Society also suggests, that in the absence of a 'place' for the Thames, further policy is added in section 4.4, with text along the</p>		<p>The River Thames is dealt with in some detail in the Submission Core Strategy, albeit in different chapters. To deal with it as a 'Place would not appropriate as they have been designated with specific aims in mind. Paragraph 4.4.1 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy states that 'Places' selected for the Core Strategy ' are those where significant change is planned, and the district, major and international town centres which are the focus for activity. With regard to specific Thames views there are two policies in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (CD1 and CD2) which are recommended to be retained. These will be eventually incorporated into a Views SPD which has been included in the latest Local Development Scheme (LDS). A reference to the Thames Policy Area is also recommended to be included at reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.9.</p> <p>With regard to other aspects of the River Thames Policy CL1(d) requires riverside development to enhance the waterside character and setting, including opening up views and securing access to the waterway;</p> <p>Policy CL1(e) provides the high level strategic policy for specific views. It resists development which interrupts, disrupts or detracts from strategic and local vistas, views and gaps;</p>	<p>It is recommended that UDP policies CD1 and CD2 are now retained as part of the Schedule of Changes and a reference to the Thames Policy Area is made at reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.9.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>following lines</p> <p>In addition to the 14 places identified, the Thames is of particular importance to the borough. Policies ensuring the long term protection of the Thames are contained in chapters 30 - 36, but to ensure the protection of the Thames, a further specific policy is introduced here:</p> <p>CP3 The Council will protect, promote and enhance the environment of the Thames area as defined on the proposals map</p>			
Circadian Ltd	Circadian Ltd	DP9	Policy CL 1	Context and Character		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS277	<p>Policy CLI - Context and Character</p> <p>The proposed drafting of the policy is too restrictive and goes beyond the assessment in PPG 15 which states that the desirability of preserving or enhancing a conservation area is a material consideration where development proposals would be seen in views in to or out of the area. The visibility of a new building could have a neutral or positive impact on the setting of a conservation area or listed building or in other sensitive views. As such, the policy should be reworded to ensure consistency with national guidance and allows flexibility for appropriately designed buildings taking in to account townscape impacts, in accordance with PPS12. Criterion "e" refers to the notion that the Council will "resist" development which interrupts, disrupts or detracts from a number of views. This should be reworded to reflect that the Council will "assess the impact of development" within the views and settings identified.</p> <p>The Core Strategy is therefore considered not to be 'Sound' as the policies do not follow the wording in national planning guidance in PPO15 or PPS12.</p>		With reference to Policy CL1 this is based on the principle in PPS10 of resisting 'design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area and the way it functions.' On this basis we are constantly seeking to improve the environment and new development must improve on the existing situation (see reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.3). The wording of the strategic high level policy of CL1 reflects this notion by stating that 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 buildings and the area and the way it functions. This is in line with guidance in PPS1 . It is thus in accordance with national policy. It is not clear why the policy does not follow guidance in PPS12 or PPG15, but as all policy guidance notes (unless superseded) are in accordance with each other. 'Taking opportunities to improve' is not the same as having a neutral impact.	No changes are recommended.
DP9	DP9		Policy CL 1	Context and Character	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS336	<p>Policy CL1: Context and Character</p> <p><i>Unsound: Not Effective</i></p> <p>The Core Strategy at Policy CL1 should make specific reference to the London Plan 2008 'density matrix' (Table 3A.2) in order to determine the appropriate density of new development. Allowances are already made within London Plan Policy 3A.3 to ensure new development is compatible with the local context and the design principles of Policy 4B.1, and does not need to be outlined within the supporting text to the policy at 34.3.7</p>		The Royal Borough's approach to density is clearly laid out in Policy CL1(c) which requires the density of development to be optimised relative to context, whilst taking into account the appropriate density range. Reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.7 makes it clear that the London Plan density matrix needs to be read in relation to the context of the development. It is not considered appropriate to make a specific reference to the density matrix within the policy itself as this is addressed by London Plan Policy 3A.3.	No changes recommended.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CL 1	Context and Character		No	Effective	PSubCS420	<p>Policy CL1</p> <p>The Council will require all development to respect the existing context, character, and appearance, taking opportunities available to improve the quality and character of buildings and the area and the way it functions, including being inclusive and accessible for all.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>(a) require development through its architecture and urban form to contribute positively to the context of the townscape, addressing matters such as scale, height, bulk, mass, proportion, plot width, building lines, street form, rhythm, roofscape, materials, vista, view, gaps and historic fabric;</p> <p>(b) require the analysis of context to be drawn from an area that is proportionate and relevant to the size of the development and</p>		<p>The proposed changes to Policy CL1 are unfortunately not highlighted. However, there appears to be a change to the wording of Policy CL1 (b) in so far as reference is made to taking account of the current development on the site. In response, whilst this may be a material consideration the current development may not fit comfortably into its context and therefore to assign it substantial weight by inclusion within the policy itself is not considered to weaken the policy as worded.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed wording for Policy CL1 (c) which includes reference to the appropriate density range for the site as a whole, and its potential to deliver sustainable development and to achieve wider planning benefits, the proposed additional wording is not accepted. Reference to the site as a whole is not helpful in relation to very large sites, such as Earl's Court, where the surrounding urban form is variable and different densities may be appropriate on different parts of the</p>	No changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>will take in to account the form of development currently on the site;</p> <p>(c) require the density of development to be optimised relative to context, whilst taking into account the appropriate density range for the site as a whole and its potential to deliver sustainable development and to achieve wider planning benefits;</p> <p>(d) require riverside and canalside development to enhance the waterside character and setting, including opening up views and securing access to the waterway;</p> <p>(e) assess the impact of resist development which interrupts, disrupts or detracts from strategic and local vistas, views and gaps and resist development which is harmful in important views having regard to its visibility in the round;</p> <p>(f) require a comprehensive approach to site layout and design including adjacent sites where these are suitable for redevelopment taking in to account phasing requirements.</p>		<p>site depending on the context (which may affect the reading of the density table. The reference to achieving sustainable development would be expected in any case without inclusion within the policy and density should not be dependent on the wider planning benefits.</p> <p>With reference to the proposed change to the wording of Policy CL (e) the revised wording is not actually a policy, but instead requires the impact to be assessed. This would be undertaken in any case. With regard to assessing visibility 'in the round' this effectively weakens the current wording as it will allow other factors to be taken into account which may not be connected with vistas, views and gaps. As part of the determination of any planning application all factors in the round would have to be considered and assigned appropriate weight. However, it does not to be stated as part of the policy.</p> <p>With reference to the proposed change to Policy CL (f) which takes into account proposed phasing requirements it is not immediately understood why phasing requirements needs to be added, except that it 'waters down' the policy. A comprehensive approach will be required in the first instance. Phasing requirements are a secondary consideration taking account of the practical requirements of construction</p>	
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CL 1	Context and Character	Yes	Yes		PSubCS513	<p>Policy CL 1: Context and Character</p> <p>KHT supports the principle of Policy CL 1, and notes that part 'f' of Policy CL 1 requires a comprehensive approach to site layout and design including adjacent sites where these are suitable for redevelopment.</p> <p>PPS3 requires Local Planning Authorities to identify deliverable sites to deliver housing. PPS3 note that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available, suitable and achievable. KHT suggests that this is reflected within part 'f' of Policy CL 1, and suggests that part 'f' of Policy CL 1 is amended to 'require a comprehensive approach to site layout and design including adjacent sites where these are deliverable and suitable for redevelopment.'</p>		<p>The support in principle is noted. The small amendment, intended to ensure that the requirement takes account of deliverability, is not considered to be required. Not only is it implicit in the Core Strategy, and PPS3, and should not be re-stated where it does not add to the policy. Therefore, if an adjacent site were not deliverable, it would, of course, be unreasonable to require it to be part of the comprehensive planning, however, account would need to be taken of the adjacent site, surroundings and context. The proposed amendment will not, therefore enhance the policy, and its exclusion will not run counter to the tests of soundness.</p>	No change.
53-56 Hans Place		London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CL 2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS51	<p>Extensions and Alterations</p> <p>3.20 Policy CL2 relates to the extension and alteration of existing buildings and includes reference to additional storeys and subterranean development in the Borough at part (g) of this policy.</p> <p>3.21 Part (f) sets out that the Council will "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 . "</p> <p>3.22 This policy and its supporting text at paragraphs 34.3.22 -34.3.28 of the Core Strategy are extended in establishing a scale of development that would be considered acceptable by the Council across the whole. This is a blanket approach policy and would not allow for each site to be considered on its own merits.</p> <p>3.23 The Royal Borough is located within Central London and some locations, especially where they are in close proximity to transport nodes, town centre uses, could accommodate tall buildings. This will aid the housing, aid regeneration or the refurbishment of derelict / underused buildings.</p> <p>3.24 By restricting alterations and extensions to existing detached buildings to a height below that which would constrain development to creating a flat and uninspiring skyline.</p> <p>3.25 As such the Council's policies should be promoting development and design solutions that optimize the potential of sites whilst addressing the need to create high quality and inclusive design that responds to local circumstances and reinforces a sense of place.</p> <p>Within some parts of the Borough higher buildings could be appropriate to define important routes, crossings, nodes and retail hierarchies.</p>	<p>alterations (Policy CL2 f) rather than the high buildings. The supporting text referred to is not in fact in relation to high buildings. With the policy itself the approach can be interpreted in relation to each case and the idea that it is not entirely understood. The Borough has a wide diverse townscape of high quality which we wish to enhance and additional storeys and roof level alterations should not individually or cumulatively dominate the original building. On this basis it would appear reasonable that they are sympathetic to the original architectural style and character of the building and do not exceed the prevailing building height. It is accepted however, that whilst they should generally be a subservient feature of the original building there is no need for them to be below the prevailing height for a detached building, but instead should not rise above the prevailing building height. On this basis a change to the</p>	<p>No change to wording of Development Management policies with the exception of Policy CL2 (f) where the revised Policy would read:</p> <p>f) 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 no higher than the prevailing building height.</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>3.27 Part (g) requires that it can be demonstrated that subterranean development does not involve excavation underneath a listed building .</p> <p>3.28 This part of the policy is unsupported by technical evidence or analysis from a reputable historical and the Council's arbitrary approach to resisting subterranean development under listed buildings.</p> <p>3.29 Paragraph 3.12 of PPG15 states that "inj udging the effect of any a lteration or extension it is essential to assess the e lements that make up the spec ial interest of t he building in question . "</p> <p>3.30 Paragraph 3.15 also follows on to state that " Achievi n g a proper ba lance betwee n the spec ial interest of the listed bu ilding and proposals for a lterations or extens ions i s de manding a nd shou ld a lways be based on specialist expertise; but i t is rare ly i mpossible, if r easonable flex ibility and imagination are shown by a ll parties concerned, to ensure that the harm to the special interest of the building should be assessed based on specialist expertise. It is not demonstrated that the structural integrity of buildings are not affected by most subterranean development is carried out in a sensitive and structurally sound manner.</p> <p>3.32 If the policy remains the Council should at least demonstrate that harm is caused by such development in order to justify this part of Policy CL2.</p> <p>3.33 This policy is therefore wholly inappropriate, and not in accordance with the advice in PPS12 and PPS15.</p>	<p>With regard to the 'prescriptive' nature of the text at paragraphs 34.3.22- 34.3.28 which is in relation to tall buildings, it is important that the Council's approach to tall buildings is fully explained and justified in the supporting reasoned justification to the policy. The Council has demonstrated in the text their locally distinctive approach to tall buildings in the Borough and the reason why tall buildings are very much the exception. It is important that this is understood in relation to the policy together with the factors that have been taken into account to determine the height of buildings in the Borough. This may be regarded as prescriptive, but the reasoned justification must be clear.</p> <p>The policy itself is clear and unambiguous. It is based upon a robust evidence base which demonstrates that high buildings will continue to be the exception in the Royal Borough given the context of medium height high density development. The areas of high public transport accessibility and town centres within the Borough are not characterised by high buildings and therefore the context is the principal consideration. On this basis it would not be appropriate, given the local context and the exceptional townscape to permit tall buildings on the basis of transport accessibilty, for regeneration reasons or the fact that the site happened to be within a town centre. The problem of derelict and underused buildings is not one fortunately from which the Borough suffers to any degree.</p> <p>In terms of the policies contained within the 'Renewing the Legacy' chapter the Council considers that they promote development and design solutions that optimize the potential of sites whilst addressing the need to create high quality and inclusive design that responds to local context and reinforce a sense of place.</p> <p>With regard to high or tall buildings defining important routes, crossings, nodes and retail hierarchies it is not accepted that a landmark building necessarily needs to be a tall building. If there is a need to mark certain areas this can be undertaken in a variety of ways without resorting to a tall building.</p> <p>Policy CL2 (g) resists excavation underneath a listed building. Harm is caused to the special architectural character and historic interest of a listed building if a basement is introduced beneath the building because of its detrimental effect on the hierarchy of the historic floor levels and on the scale of the original building as well as the unwelcome removal of historic fabric, including the original foundations. The creation of a basement inevitably involves lightwells being excavated</p>	<p>Policy CL2 (f) is recommended. The submission that it would result in a flat and uninspiring skyline is not accepted. The distinctive townscape of the Royal Borough varies from the contrasting grandeur of terraced houses and crescents to the relative modesty of mews. However, there is a consistency with regard to the height of the architectural set pieces in general following a uniform height. To permit varying heights in this way would respect the context, architectural style or character of the building would result in harm to the existing high quality townscape of the Borough rather than a more inspiring skyline.</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											which further harm the special architectural character and historic interest of a listed building if these were not part of its original character. This stance has been supported by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal, notably at 3 Halsey Street and 15 Mallord Street. However, it has also been supported on appeal in relation to other London Boroughs, notably 44 Priory Avenue, Bedford Park in the London Borough of Hounslow. Further technical evidence is not required on this point as objection is raised in principle to excavation. It is never appropriate.	
53-56 Hans Place		London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CL 2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS59	<p>Policy CL2 part (f) <i>"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 have a height reflective of local context. "</i></p> <p>part (g) <i>"require it is demonstrated that subterranean extensions meet the following criteria: excavation underneath or adjacent to a listed building will be resisted where it has a clear and detrimental impact upon the character and setting of a listed building.</i></p>		<p>In relation to the proposed re-wording of criteria (f) and (g) of Policy CL2 the proposed thrust of the rewording of Policy CL2 (f) is partially accepted, but with a different form of words. The words 'reflective of local context' are considered to be too imprecise and open to interpretation. Instead the Council would be satisfied with reference to additional storeys and roof level additions being no higher than the prevailing height.</p> <p>With reference to the changes proposed to Policy CL2 (g) these are not accepted. Harm is caused to the special architectural character and historic interest of a listed building if a basement is introduced beneath the building because of its detrimental effect on the hierarchy of the historic floor levels and on the scale of the original building as well as the unwelcome removal of historic fabric, including the original foundations. The creation of a basement inevitably involves lightwells being excavated which further harm the special architectural character and historic interest of a listed building if these were not part of its original character. This stance has been supported by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal, notably at 3 Halsey Street and 15 Mallord Street. However, it has also been supported on appeal in relation to other London Boroughs, notably 44 Priory Avenue, Bedford Park in the London Borough of Hounslow. Further appraisal of the affect on the special architectural character and historic interest of a listed building (or its setting) as an objection is raised in principle to excavation. It is never appropriate.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Policy CL2 (f) is amended as follows:</p> <p>f) 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 no higher than the prevailing building height.</p> <p>No amendment to policy CL2 (g).</p>
Brookfield Developments	Brookfield Developments (UK) Ltd	DP9	Policy CL 2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS70	<p>Policy CL2 (h) Our client submits that the proposed wording regarding high buildings the following rewording: <i>"h.-ensure that proposals for new tall buildings (score through tex height (score through tex within the context, except where the proposal is of slender profile and proportion; and ii. not within) identified linear views; and) iii -are the highest (score through tex exceptional) design quality; "</i></p>		<p>The proposed amendments to Policy CL2 (h) are not accepted. The reference to, 'prevailing building height within the context' is important because without reference to the context an isolated tall or high building may be regarded as a suitable guide for the prevailing height. The proposed changes effectively weaken the policy. With the proposed rewording tall isolated buildings such as 'Trellick Tower' which does not reflect the prevailing height of buildings within its context may be given as justification for further tall buildings. The reference to 'context' is important and ties in with the London Plan's density matrix and policy on tall buildings.</p> <p>The prevailing character of the borough is one of medium height high density buildings, often in the form of formal terraces and mansion blocks which are of exceptional architectural quality. The construction of tall buildings would largely be out of character with the existing townscape but in those very limited</p>	No changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											circumstances where they may be acceptable their impact will be over a wide area including sensitive areas such as conservation areas and the setting of listed buildings. On this basis they must be of an exceptional design, otherwise they will not reflect the prevailing architectural character of the Borough.	
Owners of 31 Holland Park		London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CL 2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS92	<p>v) <i>Extensions and Alterations</i></p> <p>3.11 Policy CL2 relates to the extension and alteration of existing buildings and</p> <p>includes reference to the creation of additional storeys and subterranean</p> <p>development in the Borough at part (g) of this policy.</p> <p>3.12 Part (f) sets out that the Council will <i>"require additional storeys and roofa group ofa detached building to be below the</i></p> <p>3.13 This policy and its supporting text at paragraphs 34.3.22 - 34.3.28 of the</p> <p>Core Strategy are extremely prescriptive in establishing a scale of</p> <p>development that would be considered acceptable by the Council across the</p> <p>Borough as a whole. This is a blanket approach policy and would not allow</p> <p>for each site to be considered on its own merits.</p> <p>3.14 The Royal Borough is located within Central London and some locations,</p> <p>especially where they are in close proximity to transport nodes, town centre</p> <p>uses, could accommodate tall buildings. This will aid the creation of more</p> <p>housing , aid regeneration or the refurbishment of derelict / underused</p> <p>buildings.</p> <p>3.15 By restricting alterations and extensions to existing detached buildings to a</p> <p>height below that prevailing, will constrain development to creating a flat and</p> <p>uninspiring skyline.</p> <p>3.16 As such the Council's policies should be promoting development and design</p> <p>solutions that optimize the potential of sites whilst addressing the need to</p> <p>create high quality and inclusive design that responds to local</p>		<p>The policy refers to additional storeys and roof level alterations (Policy CL2 f) rather than the high buildings. The supporting text referred to is not in fact in relation to this policy, but that relating to high buildings. With regard to the policy itself the approach can be interpreted in relation to each case and the idea that it is a 'blanket' approach is not entirely understood. However, in view of the fact that the Royal Borough has a distinctive townscape of high quality which we wish to enhance, additional storeys and roof level alterations should not individually or cumulatively dominate the original building. On this basis it would appear reasonable that they are sympathetic to the original architectural style and character of the building and do not rise above the prevailing building height. It is accepted, however, that whilst they should generally be a subservient feature of the original building there is no need for them to be below the prevailing height for a detached building, but instead should not rise above the prevailing building height. On this basis a change to the wording of Policy CL2 (f) is recommended. The submission that it would result in a flat and uninspiring skyline is not accepted. The distinctive townscape of the Royal Borough varies from the contrasting grandeur of terraces, squares and crescents to the relative modesty of mews. However, there is a consistency with regard to height with the architectural set pieces in general following a uniform height. To permit varying heights which do not respect the context, architectural style or character of the building would result in harm to the existing high quality townscape of the Borough rather than a flat and uninspiring skyline.</p> <p>With regard to the 'prescriptive' nature of the text at paragraphs 34.3.22- 34.3.28 which is in relation to tall buildings, it is important that the Council's approach to tall buildings is fully explained and justified in the supporting reasoned justification to the policy. The Council has demonstrated in the text their locally distinctive approach to tall buildings in the Borough and the reason why tall buildings are very much the exception. It is important that this is understood in relation to the policy together with the factors that have been taken into account to determine the height of buildings in the Borough. This may be regarded as prescriptive, but the reasoned justification must be clear.</p> <p>The policy itself is clear and unambiguous. It is based upon a robust evidence base which demonstrates that high buildings will continue to be the exception in the Royal Borough given the context of medium height high density development. The areas of high public transport accessibility and town centres within the Borough are not characterised by high buildings and therefore the context is the principal consideration. On this basis it would not be appropriate, given the local context and the exceptional townscape to permit tall buildings on the basis of transport accessibility, for regeneration reasons or the fact that the site happened to be within a town centre. The problem of derelict and underused</p>	<p>No change to wording of Development Management policies with the exception of Policy CL2 (f) where the revised Policy would read:</p> <p>f) 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 no higher than the prevailing building height.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>context and</p> <p>reinforces a sense of place.</p> <p>3.17 Within some parts of the Borough higher buildings could be appropriate to</p> <p>define important routes, crossings, nodes and retail hierarchies.</p> <p>3.18 Part (g) requires that <i>it can be demonstrated that subterranean listed building.</i></p> <p>development does not involve excavation underneath</p> <p>3.19 This part of the policy is unsupported by technical evidence or analysis from a</p> <p>reputable historical buildings expert and the Council's arbitrary approach to</p> <p>resisting subterranean development under listed buildings is unjustified.</p> <p>3.20 Paragraph 3.12 of PPG15 states that <i>"in judging the effect of any alteration or assessed the elements that make up the</i></p> <p>extension it is essential to have</p> <p>special interest of the building in question."</p> <p>3.21 Paragraph 3.15 also follows on to state that <i>"Achieving a proper balance listed building and proposals for alterations</i></p> <p>between the special interest of</p> <p>or extensions is demanding and should always be based on specialist</p> <p>expertise; but it is rarely impossible, if reasonable flexibility and imagination</p> <p>are shown by all parties involved",</p> <p>3.22 It is therefore argued that as an alternative, if subterranean development is</p> <p>proposed beneath a listed building, the harm to the special interest of the</p> <p>building should be assessed based on specialist expertise, It can already be</p> <p>demonstrated that the structural integrity of buildings are not affected by most</p>		<p>buildings is not one fortunately from which the Borough suffers to any degree.</p> <p>In terms of the policies contained within the 'Renewing the Legacy' chapter the Council considers that they promote development and design solutions that optimize the potential of sites whilst addressing the need to create high quality and inclusive design that responds to local context and reinforce a sense of place.</p> <p>With regard to high or tall buildings defining important routes, crossings, nodes and retail hierarchies it is not accepted that a landmark building necessarily needs to be a tall building. If there is a need to mark certain areas this can be undertaken in a variety of ways without resorting to a tall building.</p> <p>Policy CL2 (g) resists excavation underneath a listed building. Harm is caused to the special architectural character and historic interest of a listed building if a basement is introduced beneath the building because of its detrimental effect on the hierarchy of the historic floor levels and on the scale of the original building as well as the unwelcome removal of historic fabric, including the original foundations. The creation of a basement inevitably involves lightwells being excavated which further harm the special architectural character and historic interest of a listed building if these were not part of its original character. This stance has been supported by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal, notably at 3 Halsey Street and 15 Mallord Street. However, it has also been supported on appeal in relation to other London Boroughs, notably 44 Priory Avenue, Bedford Park in the London Borough of Hounslow. Further technical evidence is not required on this point as objection is raised in principle to excavation. It is never appropriate</p> <p>The policy refers to additional storeys and roof level alterations (Policy CL2 f) rather than the high buildings. The supporting text referred to is not in fact in relation to this policy, but that relating to high buildings. With regard to the policy itself the approach can be interpreted in relation to each case and the idea that it is a 'blanket' approach is not entirely understood. However, in view of the fact that the Royal Borough has a distinctive townscape of high quality which we wish to enhance, additional storeys and roof level alterations should not individually or cumulatively dominate the original building. On this basis it would appear reasonable that they are sympathetic to the original architectural style and character of the building and do not rise above the prevailing building height. It is accepted, however, that whilst they should generally be a subservient feature of the original building there is no need for them to be below the prevailing height for a detached building, but instead should not rise above the prevailing building height. On this basis a change to the wording of Policy CL2 (f) is recommended. The submission that it would result in a flat and uninspiring skyline is not accepted. The distinctive townscape of the Royal Borough varies from the contrasting grandeur of terraces, squares and crescents to the relative modesty of mews. However, there is a consistency with regard to height with the architectural set pieces in general following a uniform height. To permit varying heights which do not respect the context, architectural style or</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>subterranean development providing it is carried out in a sensitive and structurally sound manner.</p> <p>3.23 If the policy remains the Council should at least demonstrate that harm is caused by such development in order to justify this part of Policy CL2.</p> <p>3.24 This policy is therefore wholly inappropriate, and not in accordance with the advice in PPS12 and PPG15.</p> <p>Policy CL2</p> <p>part {f}</p> <p><i>"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 have a height demonstrated that subterranean extensions meet the following or adjacent to a listed building will be resisted a clear and detrimental impact upon the character and setting of reflective of local context."</i></p> <p>part (g)</p> <p>"require it</p> <p>criteria:</p> <p>excavation underneath</p> <p>where it has</p> <p><i>a listed building.</i></p> <p>level alterations to be sympathetic to the architectural style and character of the building and to either assist in unifying buildings or where there is prevailing building height."</p>		<p>character of the building would result in harm to the existing high quality townscape of the Borough rather than a flat and uninspiring skyline.</p> <p>With regard to the 'prescriptive' nature of the text at paragraphs 34.3.22- 34.3.28 which is in relation to tall buildings, it is important that the Council's approach to tall buildings is fully explained and justified in the supporting reasoned justification to the policy. The Council have demonstrated in the text their locally distinctive approach to tall buildings in the Borough and the reason why tall buildings are very much the exception. It is important that this is understood in relation to the policy together with the factors that have been taken into account to determine the height of buildings in the Borough. This may be regarded as prescriptive, but the reasoned justification must be clear.</p> <p>The policy itself is clear and unambiguous. It is based upon a robust evidence base which demonstrates that high buildings will continue to be the exception in the Royal Borough given the context of medium height high density development. The areas of high public transport accessibility and town centres within the Borough are not characterised by high buildings and therefore the context is the principal consideration. On this basis it would not be appropriate, given the local context and the exceptional townscape to permit tall buildings on the basis of transport accessibility, for regeneration reasons or the fact that the site happened to be within a town centre. The problem of derelict and underused buildings is not one fortunately from which the Borough suffers to any degree.</p> <p>In terms of the policies contained within the 'Renewing the Legacy' chapter the Council considers that they promote development and design solutions that optimize the potential of sites whilst addressing the need to create high quality and inclusive design that responds to local context and reinforce a sense of place.</p> <p>With regard to high or tall buildings defining important routes, crossings, nodes and retail hierarchies it is not accepted that a landmark building necessarily needs to be a tall building. If there is a need to mark certain areas this can be undertaken in a variety of ways without resorting to a tall building.</p> <p>Policy CL2 (g) resists excavation underneath a listed building. Harm is caused to the special architectural character and historic interest of a listed building if a basement is introduced beneath the building because of its detrimental effect on the hierarchy of the historic floor levels and on the scale of the original building as well as the unwelcome removal of historic fabric, including the original foundations. The creation of a basement inevitably involves lightwells being excavated which further harm the special architectural character and historic interest of a listed building if these were not part of its original character. This stance has been supported by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal, notably at 3 Halsey Street and 15 Mallord Street. However, it has also been supported on appeal in relation to other London Boroughs, notably 44 Priory Avenue, Bedford Park in the London Borough of Hounslow. Further technical evidence is not required on</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											this point as objection is raised in principle to excavation. It is never appropriate.	
Ms Sarah Dixey	Wandsworth Borough Council		Policy CL2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings		No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS123	<p>Core strategy paragraph 34.3.28 and policy CL2k fail the test of soundness under the " coherence, consistency and effectiveness test" as it does not have adequate regard to those DPDs of its neighbours, namely the Wandsworth Core Strategy Submission version in the follow respect;</p> <p>Reference in policy CL2k to buildings outside the borough boundary should be deleted. Wandsworth has prepared an evidence base on tall buildings that has informed the borough's Core Strategy policy and proposed detailed Development Management criteria policy for the assessment of tall buildings.</p> <p>Core strategy paragraph 34.3.28 and policy CL2k fail the test of soundness under the " conformity" test as it is not consistent with other relevant plans, namely the Wandsworth Core Strategy Submission Version in the following respect:.</p> <p>Reference in policy CL2k to buildings outside the borough boundary should be deleted. Wandsworth has prepared an evidence base on tall buildings that has informed the borough's Core Strategy policy and proposed detailed Development Management criteria policy for the assessment of tall buildings.</p>		Policy CL2 (k) is effective, consistent with national policy and has adequate regard to the Wandsworth Submission Core Strategy . It is founded upon a robust evidence base and does not preclude the construction of tall or high buildings which exceed the prevailing building height in the London Borough of Wandsworth. It actually requires a proper assessment of the impact of tall buildings to be undertaken in terms of a zone of visual influence. This is not incompatible with Policy IS3 relating to Tall Buildings in the Wandsworth Submission Core Strategy which requires that tall buildings are assessed in terms of their benefits to regeneration, townscape, public realm and their effect on the historic environment. The wording of Policy IS3 does not appear to preclude an assessment of the effect on townscape and the historic environment of adjoining boroughs. Furthermore, Wandsworth Policy IS3 requires that detailed criteria for the assessment of tall buildings on individual sites will be contained in a separate Development Management Policy Document and a Site Specific Allocations Document. The London Borough of Wandsworth should ensure that such documents contain criteria which ensures that the impact of Tall Buildings on adjoining boroughs is properly assessed and taken into account. A clarification is recommended that Policy CL2 k reads 'a neighbouring borough's townscape as viewed from the Royal Borough.'	Recommended change to Policy CL2k to read.....' require an assessment of the zone of visual influence of a proposed district landmark within or visible from the Borough, to demonstrate that the building has a wholly positive visual impact on the quality and character of the Borough's or neighbouring borough's townscape when viewed from the Royal Borough.'
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		Policy CL2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS206	<p>Tall buildings</p> <p>35. The Council is in the process of producing supplementary planning guidance on tall buildings. The SPG provides the draft strategy to the policy approach within the Core Strategy regarding tall buildings. GLA officers believe that the approach has translated into a reasoned and justified response as articulated within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>36. Notwithstanding the <i>above</i>, the Council has not identified suitable locations for tall buildings, despite the fact that they have been identified in the draft consultation London Plan (emerging policy 2.13 , Map 2.4 Earls Court and West Kensington (8) and Kensal Canalside (15)) may be suitable for tall buildings and further detailed testing.</p> <p>37. Policy 48.9 seeks that the Mayor will work with boroughs and the strategic partnership to help identify suitable locations for tall buildings that should be included in DPD's.</p> <p>38. The Council has adopted a cautious approach to tall buildings based on the design rationale that the borough is unique in terms of its townscape and building stock. The approach within the draft SPG follows a <i>sieve</i> analysis where sensitive areas are identified and discounted. These include Conservation Areas, their buffer zones and listed buildings. The approach requires further detailed work and testing, although the broad conclusions translate <i>effectively</i> across into the Core Strategy reasonably well. Whilst this is the case, the SPG does not identify suitable locations, but also does not dismiss the opportunities of tall buildings on a district scale where these perform landmark functions. The SPG also allows for positive tests, which are subject to the positive tests set out in the Core Strategy a</p> <p>39. The work undertaken by the Council to date is draft at the time be published imminently. The work can help to inform the Council' locations identified <i>above</i> may be examples of possible locations suitable for tall buildings (subject to the positive tests set out in the Core Strategy a</p>		The GLA acknowledge that the approach to tall buildings in the SPG is both justified and effective. However, the GLA comment that no specific locations have been identified in the Borough which could weaken those locations, such as conservation areas, although they have been identified in the draft consultation London Plan (emerging policy 2.13 and Earls Court/West Kensington Opportunity Areas and the Draft Consultation London Plan) may be suitable for tall buildings and further detailed testing. Notwithstanding the fact that the Royal Borough has not identified suitable locations relating Opportunity Areas and is cautious of the conclusion that tall buildings can be justified on regeneration grounds, the Borough's Urban Design evidence demonstrates that the Earl's Court and Kensal Opportunity Areas do not automatically lend themselves to suitable locations for tall or high buildings given their context. Each is understood but, across into the Core Strategy	No changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>subject of planning frameworks to be produced jointly with key landowners, local and strategic authorities and other stakeholders. At this stage, the lack of identification of suitable locations for tall buildings may result in the Council having an unclear position on tall buildings, which may allow tall building proposals to come forward in inappropriate locations across the borough in the more sensitive locations identified in the SPG rather than in identified locations or emerging clusters. The approach could undermine the Mayor's approach to management of tall buildings and weaken the Core Strategy in terms of its effectiveness with regard to the tests set out in PPS12. The omission is, therefore, a matter of non-conformity with the London Plan, however, there is sufficient work to be able to overcome the concerns, and the GIA would suggest the two locations identified above go forward for discussion at any subsequent examination.</p> <p>40. The Core Strategy does not identify specifically the relevant strategic views set out in the London View Management Framework. In particular the strategic linear view from King Henry VIII's Mound, Richmond to St Paul's Cathedral. Policy 4B.16 of the London Plan states that Boroughs should base the designation and management of local views in their DPDs on Policies 4B.16-4B.1 B. The Core Strategy should reference the relevant views.</p>			
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		Policy CL 2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings		No	Effective	PSubCS232	<p>Identification of views and vistas (4B.16):</p> <p>Strategically important views are designated in the London Plan (Table 4B.1) and managed through the London View Management Framework. This is currently being refined, although this is largely about how views should be managed rather than adding further views and vistas. The policy, however, says that "boroughs should base the designation and management of local views in their DPDs on Policies 4B.16 to 4B.18".</p> <p>The Core Strategy has not tackled this issue - it has not even identified the views and vistas covered by the UDP; see for example UDP policies covering views:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • along and across the Thames (CD1; CD2; CD6); • of the Royal Hospital (CD8); • of the South Kensington Museums Area (CD10 and CD11); • from Kensington Gardens (CD13 and CD14); • of and from Holland Park (CD15); as well as • the strategic view from King Henry's Mound (Richmond Park) to St Paul's (CD17); and • those contained in conservation area proposals statements (CAPS). <p>The Core Strategy has only passing references to views and vistas, including Policy CL1 (d) and (e); CL2 (j) and CR5. This omission is particularly concerning given the Areas of Metropolitan Importance (the Thames and the Museums), the Royal Parks, Holland Park, the fine townscape as well as important local views that need protection.</p> <p>Test of soundness:</p> <p>The Society believes that there is therefore a risk that this area of the plan will fail the effectiveness test of soundness, because what is intended may not be achieved. For this reason, we make the following proposal to rectify the soundness issue.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>The Society proposes that those views and vistas that have already been identified should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • shown on the diagram for Renewing the Legacy (page 202); • where appropriate, shown on diagrams in the "Place" chapters - already shown on diagrams for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Earl's Court (p82) ○ Kensington High Street (p88) 		<p>The strategic high level policy for the protection of views and vistas can be found at Policy CL1 (e) which resists development which interrupts, disrupts or detracts from strategic and local vistas, views and gaps. This provides the high level policy for the more detailed policies which have been saved and retained in the adopted Unitary Development Plan, namely Policy CD8 which protects important views and vistas around the Royal Hospital; Policy CD10 which protects views around the South Kensington Museums Area; Policy CD13 which restricts building height around Kensington Gardens and Hyde Park; Policy CD14 which ensures that buildings do not impose themselves on Kensington Palace; CD15 which resists proposals encroaching or affecting the setting of Holland Park and CD17 protecting the long distance view from King Henry's mound to St. Pauls.</p> <p>The Conservation Area Proposals Statements (CAPS) have not been superseded at this stage by Supplementary Planning Documents and therefore remain in force as material considerations and detailed lower level policy.</p> <p>The specific reference to protecting views and vistas in the Submission Core Strategy is Policy CL1(e). However, Policy CL2 (j) which relates to 'High Buildings' also requires a district landmark to articulate positively a point of townscape legibility of significance for the wider Borough and neighbouring boroughs, such as deliberately framed views and specific vistas.</p> <p>With reference to specific views along and across the River Thames the overarching high level policy in the Submission Core Strategy CL1 (e). However, the Policy Replacement Schedule at Chapter 41 in the Submission Core Strategy shows that Policies CD1 and CD2 are being superseded by the Core Strategy. This is in fact, an error and these two policies should be shown as being retained.</p> <p>With regard to the specific recommendations of the Kensington Society a reference to the Mayor's strategic view from King Henry's mound to St. Paul's is recommended to be made at reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.10. However, it is not considered appropriate to include further views on the 'Renewing the Legacy' map as this would not be a comprehensive reflection of all views and a 'Views' SPD will deal with these in detail.</p>	Recommend a reference to the strategic view from King Henry's mound to St. Paul's at reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.10.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Knightsbridge (p102 - but vista not shown) ○ King's Road and Sloane Square (p108) ○ Notting Hill Gate (p114) <p>Almost all of them should show views and vistas of Borough importance.</p> <p>In addition, in order to support the Core Strategy, the SPD on Tall Buildings and CAPS, the Borough should undertake research, as has been done in Westminster to define "Metropolitan Views", to produce an SPD on views and vistas. This will help ensure that new buildings, especially large or tall buildings make a positive contribution to our townscape and enhance rather than harm our views and vistas.</p>			
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		Policy CL2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings		No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS267	23. We also note that Policy CL2(h-m) seeks to 'resist a proposal that exceeds the prevailing building height within the context, except where...'. Development management policies should be positive policies aimed at promoting the strategy. PPS3 supports the efficient and effective use of land while the Mayor supports tall buildings where they create attractive landmarks (London Plan, Policy 4B.9). It will be for the Inspector to review and consider the evidence at examination to determine whether it is sufficient to justify the Council's position regarding density in Policy CL1 and tall buildings in CL2.		This is noted.	No changes are recommended.
The London Planning Practice LLP	The London Planning Practice LLP		Policy CL2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS289	<p>Part (f) sets out that the Council will "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."</p> <p>This policy and its supporting text at paragraphs 34.3.22-34.3.28 of the Core Strategy are extremely prescriptive in establishing a scale of development that would be considered acceptable by the Council across the Borough as a whole. This is a blanket approach policy and would not allow for each site to be considered on its own merits.</p> <p>As such the Council's policies should be promoting development and design solutions that optimize the potential of sites whilst addressing the need to create high quality and inclusive design that responds to local context and reinforces a sense of place.</p> <p>Within some parts of the Borough higher buildings could be appropriate to define important routes, crossings, nodes and retail hierarchies.</p> <p>Part (g) requires that it can be demonstrated that subterranean development does not involve excavation underneath a listed building.</p> <p>This part of the policy is unsupported by technical evidence or analysis from a reputable historical buildings expert and the Council's arbitrary approach to resisting subterranean development under listed buildings is unjustified.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.12 of PPG15 states that "in judging the effect of any alteration or extension it is essential to have assessed the elements that make up the special interest of the building in question."</p>		<p>The policy refers to additional storeys and roof level alterations (Policy CL2 f) rather than the high buildings. The supporting text referred to is not in fact in relation to this policy, but that relating to high buildings. With regard to the policy itself the approach can be interpreted in relation to each case and the idea that it is a 'blanket' approach is not entirely understood. However, in view of the fact that the Royal Borough has a distinctive townscape of high quality which we wish to enhance, additional storeys and roof level alterations should not individually or cumulatively dominate the original building. On this basis it would appear reasonable that they are sympathetic to the original architectural style and character of the building and do not rise above the prevailing building height. It is accepted, however, that whilst they should generally be a subservient feature of the original building there is no need for them to be below the prevailing height for a detached building, but instead should not rise above the prevailing building height. On this basis a change to the wording of Policy CL2 (f) is recommended. The submission that it would result in a flat and uninspiring skyline is not accepted. The distinctive townscape of the Royal Borough varies from the contrasting grandeur of terraces, squares and crescents to the relative modesty of mews. However, there is a consistency with regard to height with the architectural set pieces in general following a uniform height. To permit varying heights which do not respect the context, architectural style or character of the building would result in harm to the existing high quality townscape of the Borough rather than a flat and uninspiring skyline.</p> <p>With regard to the 'prescriptive' nature of the text at paragraphs 34.3.22-34.3.28 which is in relation to tall buildings, it is important that the Council's approach to tall buildings is fully explained and justified in the supporting reasoned justification to the policy. The</p>	<p>No change to wording of Development Management policies with the exception of Policy CL2 (f) where the revised Policy would read:</p> <p>f) 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 no higher than the prevailing building height.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Paragraph 3.15 also follows on to state that " A c h i e v i n g a p r o p e r b a l a n c e b e t w e e n t h e s p e c i a l i n t e r e s t o f a l i s t e d b u i l d i n g a n d p r o p o s a l s f o r a l t e r a t i o n s o r e x t e n s i o n s i s d e m a n d i n g a n d s h o u l d a l w a y s b e b a s e d o n s p e c i a l i s t e x p e r t i s e ; b u t i t i s r a r e l y i m p o s s i b l e , i f r e a s o n a b l e f l e x i b i l i t y a n d i m a g i n a t i o n a r e s h o w n b y a l l p a r t i e s i n v o l v e d " .</p> <p>It is therefore argued that as an alternative, if subterranean development is proposed beneath a listed building, the harm to the special interest of the building should be assessed based on specialist expertise. It can already be demonstrated that the structural integrity of buildings are not affected by most subterranean development providing it is carried out in a sensitive and structurally sound manner.</p> <p>If the policy remains the Council should at least demonstrate that harm is caused by such development in order to justify this part of Policy CL2.</p> <p>This policy is therefore wholly inappropriate, and not in accordance with the advice in PPS12 and PPG15.</p>		<p>Council has demonstrated in the text their locally distinctive approach to tall buildings in the Borough and the reason why tall buildings are very much the exception. It is important that this is understood in relation to the policy together with the factors that have been taken into account to determine the height of buildings in the Borough. This may be regarded as prescriptive, but the reasoned justification must be clear.</p> <p>The policy itself is clear and unambiguous. It is based upon a robust evidence base which demonstrates that high buildings will continue to be the exception in the Royal Borough given the context of medium height high density development. The areas of high public transport accessibility and town centres within the Borough are not characterised by high buildings and therefore the context is the principal consideration. On this basis it would not be appropriate, given the local context and the exceptional townscape to permit tall buildings on the basis of transport accessibility, for regeneration reasons or the fact that the site happened to be within a town centre. The problem of derelict and underused buildings is not one fortunately from which the Borough suffers to any degree.</p> <p>In terms of the policies contained within the 'Renewing the Legacy' chapter the Council considers that they promote development and design solutions that optimize the potential of sites whilst addressing the need to create high quality and inclusive design that responds to local context and reinforce a sense of place.</p> <p>With regard to high or tall buildings defining important routes, crossings, nodes and retail hierarchies it is not accepted that a landmark building necessarily needs to be a tall building. If there is a need to mark certain areas this can be undertaken in a variety of ways without resorting to a tall building.</p> <p>Policy CL2 (g) resists excavation underneath a listed building. Harm is caused to the special architectural character and historic interest of a listed building if a basement is introduced beneath the building because of its detrimental effect on the hierarchy of the historic floor levels and on the scale of the original building as well as the unwelcome removal of historic fabric, including the original foundations. The creation of a basement inevitably involves lightwells being excavated which further harm the special architectural character and historic interest of a listed building if these were not part of its original character. This stance has been supported by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal, notably at 3 Halsey Street and 15 Mallord Street. However, it has also been supported on appeal in relation to other London Boroughs, notably 44 Priory Avenue, Bedford Park in the London Borough of Hounslow. Further technical evidence is not required on this point as objection is raised in principle to excavation. It is never appropriate.</p>	
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		Policy CL 2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS299	We suggest that Policy CL 2 should refer to health and wellbeing in the context of function (how the building is used) and robustness (its ability to influence and adapt to (healthy) lifestyles and changing demography, ie children and older people.		Policy CL2 refers to development having to be robust which includes the need for it to be adaptable to changes of use, lifestyle, demography and climate. It should also be functional which is fit for purpose and legible. The concepts of health and wellbeing are secondary considerations which would fall within being	No changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
				Buildings							fit for purpose, lifestyle and demography. The proposed reference to changing demography ie people and children would fall within demography which is already referred to.	
DP9	DP9		Policy CL 2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS337	<p>Policy CL2: New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings</p> <p><i>Unsound: Not effective</i></p> <p>It is considered that this policy must be less prescriptive and allow scope for taller buildings on appropriate sites, where appropriately designed. There is no policy at the national or strategic level supporting an acceptable height ratio or cap of 4 times the context height of a building. As drafted, the Council's approach is highly restrictive and the suitability of a site for a high or tall building should be considered on a site by site basis.</p> <p>Furthermore, the policy should take account of London Plan 2008 policy which states that the Mayor will work with Boroughs to identify suitable locations for tall buildings and promotes the development of tall buildings where they would create attractive landmarks, act as a catalyst for regeneration and are acceptable in terms of design (Policy 4B.9). For these reasons it is considered that points (h) to (m) of this policy are unsound.</p> <p>In addition client submits that the proposed wording regarding high buildings is unduly restrictive and therefore suggests the following rewording:</p> <p><i>"h. ensure that proposals for new tall buildings that exceeds the prevailing building height [delete: proposal within the context, except where the proposal is]:</i></p> <p>i. of a slender profile and proportion; and</p> <p>ii. not within any identified linear views; and]</p> <p>iii]. are [delete: of] the highest [delete: exceptional] design quality;"</p>		<p>The Borough's approach to high buildings which is laid out at Policy CL2 (h) to (m) is justified as it is based on the evidence contained within the Urban Initiatives Urban Design Study dated July 2006. A sieve analysis was undertaken which analysed the Borough's existing townscape and concluded that a building between 3x and 4x the typical height (a 'District Landmark') - has a dominant effect on its immediate and wider surroundings. The policy, as drafted is a local response to the Borough's relatively homogenous and level roofscape. It is not meant to be based on a national or strategic level policy, but a locally distinctive policy tailored to accommodate the unique circumstances of the Royal Borough. The policy is not considered unduly restrictive as there is scope for tall or higher buildings providing that they meet the criteria which are specified and a planning application would be judged against these criteria on a site by site basis.</p> <p>The Borough has given a response to the Mayor regarding the lack of designation of specific areas in the Borough for tall buildings and this is based on sound evidence. With regard to the suggested changes in wording, the removal of the word 'context' in relation to prevailing height is not accepted as it effectively waters down the policy. The context is the wider surrounding area whilst prevailing height could be interpreted in a much narrower way, for example the height of a building in close proximity, or within the immediate area of the proposed high building. Existing isolated tall buildings may also be assigned undue weight if the reference to 'context' is removed.</p> <p>With regard to the removal of the policy criteria that they should be of slender profile and proportion, this is not accepted. Given the exceptional quality of the Borough's townscape which is relatively homogenous, tall buildings will only be acceptable if their impact on the skyline is reduced. This is achieved by having a slender profile and proportion.</p> <p>With reference to the proposed deletion of linear views, one of the characteristics of tall or high buildings is that they have an impact beyond the immediate area and therefore it is perfectly legitimate to avoid them being constructed within identified linear views.</p> <p>The reference to a 'high' design quality rather than an 'exceptional' design quality is not accepted. Tall buildings have an impact beyond their immediate surroundings and given the exceptional quality of the Borough's built environment only 'exceptional' design quality will be acceptable. Anything less than this requirement would be harmful.</p>	No changes recommended.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CL 2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings		No	Effective	PSubCS426	<p>p206 Policy CL2 New buildings, extensions and modifications to existing buildings</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The proposed changes reflect strategic policy which identifies Opportunity Areas as potential locations for tall buildings where</p>		With reference to the suggested changes to Policy CL2 these will be addressed in the order that they appear in the policy. In relation to Policy CL2 (h)(i) which refers to resisting the prevailing building height within the context , <i>except where the proposal is of slender profile and proportion having regard to its proposed use and function</i> , the proposed wording allows a degree of flexibility which will essentially undermine the purpose	No changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>there is good access by public transport.</p> <p>The change proposed in (j) recognises that a taller building may be acceptable when it fulfils other strategic benefits. This may be the case with respect to the Opportunity Areas where future development is anticipated to provide a strategic role.</p> <p>The proposed change allows flexibility for development proposals that have a neutral impact on the townscape. A buildings that is visible from different locations, may be acceptable providing it has a positive or neutral impact on local townscape. In addition, a negative impact may be outweighed by other benefits to be generated by the scheme.</p> <p>The proposed change is consistent with Capital & Counties' proposed changes to Policy CL1. Combined, the two policies provide guidance for development having an adverse, neutral or positive impact in key views.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CL2</p> <p>The Council will require new buildings, extensions and modifications to existing buildings to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, taking opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings and the area and the way it functions.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will, in relation to:</p> <p>High Buildings</p> <p>(h) resist a proposal that exceeds the prevailing building height within the context, except where the proposal:</p> <p>(i) is of a slender profile and proportion having regard to its proposed use and function ; and</p> <p>(ii) does not give rise to an adverse townscape impact within any identified linear views; and</p> <p>(iii) is of high design quality;</p> <p>(i) require a proposed local landmark to:</p> <p>(i) be compatible with the scale of its context; and</p> <p>(ii) articulate positively a point of townscape legibility of local significance;</p> <p>(j) require a proposed district landmark to:</p> <p>(i) articulate positively a point of townscape legibility of significance for the wider Borough and neighbouring boroughs, such as deliberately framed views and specific vistas; and</p> <p>(ii) provide a strategic London-wide public use or fulfil a strategic planning objective;</p> <p>(k) require an assessment of the zone of visual influence of a</p>		<p>of the policy. The impact of a tall building on the skyline should not be dictated by its function and use as these are secondary considerations. To reduce the impact a slender profile and proportion will be required - the use and function do not directly relate to the physical manifestation of the building and again would serve to weaken the policy.</p> <p>The fact that a proposed tall building does not harm the townscape is insufficient to make it acceptable - it must articulate positively a point of townscape legibility of local distinctiveness so that it adds positively to an area and makes a contribution to the townscape. It will be viewed over a wide area and must be a positive enhancement.</p> <p>High design quality does not raise the bar high enough in terms of the potential impact of such a building on the existing townscape of the Borough which is generally of exceptional quality. Only a building of exceptional design quality will be acceptable.</p> <p>With regard to j(ii) and the requirement for a district landmark to provide a strategic London-wide public use and the suggestion that it can fulfil a strategic planning objective, this is not accepted. It would essentially allow any planning objective to justify the use of a district landmark building.</p> <p>(k) The reference to a wholly positive is to ensure that a high building will have a positive impact when viewed from all angles. In view of the fact that a high building will be visible over a wide area it is important that this is the case. A neutral impact is insufficient, the impact must be positive given the fact that the building will be able to be viewed over a wide area and also bearing in mind the exceptional quality of the Borough's townscape.</p> <p>(l) Buildings of metropolitan scale ie more than four times their context are inappropriate in the Borough, including the proposed Opportunity Areas and the reasons for this have been explained elsewhere.</p> <p>(m) Only a full planning application for a high building can fully assess the impacts of such a building and the reference to 'sufficient information' is inadequate.</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>proposed district landmark within or visible from the Borough, to demonstrate that when considered in the round the building has a [delete wholly] positive or neutral visual impact on the quality and character of the Borough's or neighbouring boroughs' townscape;</p> <p>(l) resist a proposal that is of a metropolitan scale unless is it within an Opportunity Area and accessible by public transport and fulfils the criteria applicable to a district landmark in (j) and (m);</p> <p>(m) require sufficient information to enable a full assessment of the impacts [delete a full planning application for] of a proposed district landmark; etc</p>			
English Heritage	English Heritage		Policy CL 2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings	Yes	Yes		PSubCS467	<p>After some consideration, English Heritage has determined that it is satisfied with the Royal Borough approach to tall buildings. We have decided this on the basis of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> thorough baseline evidence on the topic, which includes a specific high buildings strategy and urban design strategy as recommended by our joint publication with CABI <i>Guidance on Tall Buildings</i> (July, 2007). contextual emphasis of the proposed high buildings element of Policy CL2; and proposed supplementary document (SPD) on building heights which is recently awaiting adoption. <p>We have been advised by the Royal Borough that this Building Heights SPD is not substantively different from the Draft Tall Buildings SPD which we supported. That document gave clear indication as to the locations in the Royal Borough that were considered appropriate for tall buildings and those which are considered inappropriate. This also accords with our joint guidance with CABI. Consequently we must note that we would be concerned if this has materially changed in the new Building Heights SPD as we think it is an important exposition on Policy CL2 (h) - (m).</p>		English Heritage's support for the approach to Tall Buildings is noted.	No changes are recommended.
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CL 2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings	Yes	Yes		PSubCS514	<p>Policy CL 2: New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings</p> <p>KHT broadly supports Policy CL 2 which requires new buildings, extensions and modifications to existing buildings to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, taking opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings and the areas and the way they function. KHT notes part 'h' of Policy CL 2 which seeks to resist proposals which exceed the prevailing building height within the context, except where the proposal is:</p> <p>i. of a slender profile and proportion; and</p> <p>ii. not within any identified linear views; and</p> <p>iii. of exceptional design quality.</p> <p>PPS1 seeks to avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and notes that design policies should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally. KHT considers that part 'h' of Policy CL 2 should reflect this and should not arbitrarily constrain</p>		The broad support for the policy is noted.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									development.			
DP9	DP9		Policy CL 3	Historic Environment	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS338	<p>Policy CL3: Historic Environment</p> <p><i>Unsound: Not consistent with National Policy</i></p> <p>The proposed drafting of the Policy and the supportive text is too restrictive and goes beyond the assessment in PPG15 which states that the desirability of preserving or enhancing a conservation area is a material consideration where development proposals would be seen in views in to or out of the area. The visibility of a new building could have a neutral or positive impact on the setting of a conservation area or listed building or in other sensitive views. For these reasons the policy is considered to be unsound.</p>		With reference to Policy CL3 this is based on the principle in PPS1 of resisting 'design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area and the way it functions.' On this basis we are constantly seeking to improve the environment and new development must improve on the existing situation (see reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.3). The wording of the strategic high level policy of CL3 reflects this notion by stating that the Council will require development to preserve and to take opportunities to enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas, historic places, spaces and townscapes, and their settings. This is in accordance with national policy.	No changes are recommended.
Barclays Bank Plc	Barclays Bank Plc	Shireconsulting	Policy CL 4	Historic Assets	Yes	Yes		PSubCS484	<p>As noted above a number of policies do not need to be within a LDF document at all as they are already more than adequately covered by existing national or regional policy. Further examples would be CL3 "Historic Environment" & CL4 "Historic Assets" which amongst a number of anodyne platitudes also pledge to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "require development to preserve and to take opportunities to enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas, historic places, spaces and townscapes, and their settings" (Policy CL3); • "require development to preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments and their settings, and the conservation and protection of sites of archaeological interest" (Policy CL4); or • require the preservation of the original architectural features, and later features of interest, both internal and external; (Policy CL4c). <p>As the draft plan itself points out (at paragraph 34.3.31) these are all requirements of statute anyway and do not need to be repeated in a Core Strategy. In connection with criterion (e) of Policy CL4, as the Bank pointed out before) there may be occasions when a change of use of a listed building is the best means of ensuring its preservation and as a result some alterations and changes to its fabric must be accepted. Helpful advice upon all these matters is already contained in PPG15 (see for instance paragraphs 2.18 and 3.8 to 3.13, which advise that very often a new use is the 'key' to ensuring an historic building's survival).</p>		<p>The Council would contend that the management of historic assets is of such importance and of a locally distinct nature that the proposed wording of Policy CL4 must be included in the Core Strategy. In addition PPG15 is being superseded and it is unclear at this stage what the content will be. However, it can safely be assumed that the current wording of PPG15 will not be retained in PPS15 and it is important to lay out the Borough's approach to managing its historic assets.</p> <p>It is wholly justifiable to resist the change of use of a listed building which would materially harm its character. Other material considerations would of course, be considered on their own merit.</p>	No changes are recommended.
53-56 Hans Place		London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CL 5	Amenity		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS53	<p>vi) Residential Amenity</p> <p>3.34 Policy CL5 relates to the requirement for new development to achieve high standards of amenity for good daylight and sunlight amenity for all buildings and amenity spaces, which includes commercial uses as well as other residential properties.</p> <p>3.35 The policy sets out a requirement for development to require good daylight and sunlight amenity for all buildings and amenity spaces, which includes commercial uses as well as other residential properties.</p> <p>3.36 This requirement for the preservation of sunlight and daylight to commercial properties cannot be applied as rigorously as it can for residential properties, as the BRE Guidelines does not apply as rigorous requirements for natural light and sunlight to these uses. The policy should therefore take on board the requirements of the BRE Guidelines and adhere more appropriately to these in seeking the preservation of amenity</p>	achieve high standards of amenity for good daylight and sunlight amenity for all buildings and amenity spaces. This will include commercial properties. Reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.43 refers to the fact that when assessing development the Council will, where necessary, have regard to the guidelines in 'Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight: a Guide to Good Practice' published by the Building Research Establishment. The guidelines clearly applies to all buildings including non - domestic buildings . The BRE guidelines makes reference to rooms that are not normally analysed and it is considered that these are sufficient guidelines for the purpose of the policy.	No Changes are recommended.	
Owners of 31 Holland Park		London Planning Practice LLP	Policy CL 5	Amenity		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS93	<p>vi) Residential Amenity</p>		Policy CL5 which relates to 'Amenity' deals with the need for good daylight and sunlight amenity for all buildings and amenity spaces. This will include commercial properties. Reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.43 refers to the fact that when assessing developmentthe	No Changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>3.25 Policy CL5 relates to the requirement for new development to achieve high standards of amenity both in relation to the development proposed and to adjoining occupiers.</p> <p>3.26 The policy sets out a requirement for development to require good daylight and sunlight amenity for buildings and amenity spaces, which includes commercial uses as well as other residential properties.</p> <p>3.27 This requirement for the preservation of sunlight and daylight to commercial properties cannot be applied as rigorously as it can for residential properties, as the BRE Guidelines does not apply as rigorous requirements for natural light and sunlight to these uses. The policy should therefore take on board the requirements of the BRE Guidelines and adhere more appropriately to these in seeking the preservation of amenity.</p>		<p>Council will, where necessary, have regard to the guidelines in 'Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight: a Guide to Good Practice' published by the Building Research Establishment. The guidelines clearly apply to all buildings including non - domestic buildings. The BRE guidelines makes reference to rooms that are not normally analysed and it is considered that these are sufficient guidelines for the purpose of the policy.</p>	
The London Planning Practice LLP	The London Planning Practice LLP		Policy CL5	Amenity	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	PSubCS290	<p>Policy CL5 relates to the requirement for new development to achieve high standards of amenity both in relation to the development proposed and to adjoining occupiers.</p> <p>The policy sets out a requirement for development to require good daylight and sunlight amenity for buildings and amenity spaces, which includes commercial uses as well as other residential properties.</p> <p>This requirement for the preservation of sunlight and daylight to commercial properties cannot be applied as rigorously as it can for residential properties. as the BRE Guidelines does not apply as rigorous requirements for natural light and sunlight to these uses. The policy should therefore take on board the requirements of the BRE Guidelines and adhere more appropriately to these in seeking the preservation of amenity.</p>		<p>Policy CL5 which relates to 'Amenity' deals with the need for good daylight and sunlight amenity for all buildings and amenity spaces. This will include commercial properties. Reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.43 refers to the fact that when assessing development the Council will, where necessary, have regard to the guidelines in 'Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight: a Guide to Good Practice' published by the Building Research Establishment. The guidelines clearly applies to all buildings including non - domestic buildings. The BRE guidelines makes reference to rooms that are not normally analysed and it is considered that these are insufficient guidelines for the purpose of the policy.</p>	No Changes recommended.
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		Policy CL5	Amenity	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS301	<p>Policy CL5 seeks to control levels of daylight and sunlight, privacy and noise and air quality. These factors have an impact on health and should be recognised. (see also Policies CE 5 and CE6)</p>		<p>Whilst it is recognised that access to daylight and sunlight, privacy, controlling noise to acceptable levels and good air quality can have an impact on health this is a secondary consideration and is implicit when considering these factors. On this basis it is considered that a direct reference to health benefits is unnecessary.</p>	No changes are recommended.
DP9	DP9		Policy CL5	Amenity	Yes	No	Effective	PSubCS339	<p>Policy CL5: Amenity</p> <p><i>Unsound: Not effective</i></p> <p>It is considered that the Policy should specifically make reference</p>		<p>With regard to sense of enclosure there is no recognised standard as to when an adverse sense of enclosure occurs and it is a matter of on site judgment. With regard to an acceptable standard of privacy it is not considered helpful to add a reference to a distance because of the variety of sites within the Borough and</p>	No changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									to the recognised standards for assessing the items referred to within the policy or to a future RBKC document that would outline what is considered to be an acceptable standard. For example, as currently drafted the Policy provides no guidance as how to measure privacy or the sense of enclosure. For these reasons it is considered that the policy as drafted is unsound and is not effective.		the need for on site judgement. The current adopted Unitary Development Plan makes reference in reasoned justification paragraph 4.3.23 to a distance of about 18 metres between opposite habitable rooms which reduces inter-visibility to a degree acceptable to most people. However, in practice this figure was not very useful and was honoured in its breach. On this basis it is considered that on site judgement is more useful.	
Mr Michael Bach	The Kensington Society		Policy CL 6	Small-scale Alterations and Additions		No	Effective	PSubCS240	<p>CL6: Small-scale alterations and additions,</p> <p>This policy is written with two distinct types of development in mind, and it does not suit both of them.</p> <p>It would appear that CL6 has deliberately been written not to require a positive test, using the more conventional 'no harm', because satellite dishes and air conditioning units, however carefully sited, can, if regulated, only 'cause no harm' and cannot be seen as actual positive improvements. But the Council has lumped windows, mouldings, balustrades and other architectural details into the same policy.</p> <p>Proposal</p> <p>The Society suggests that to resolve this problem the Council should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> add at the end of CL2 a further category 'windows and other architectural details', with text that would then read: <p>p. require new or replacement windows or other architectural details to be of a high quality in terms of form, detailed design and materials, and to take opportunities to enhance the character or appearance of the existing building, its setting or townscape.</p> <p>In the associated reasoned justification, 'windows and other architectural details' should be defined as 'to include items such as changes to windows or glazing patterns; front walls, and railings; projecting mouldings, balustrades, chimneys and other architectural details.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CL6 should be renamed as 'technical and servicing equipment' and it should read as now, but with 'alterations and additions' and 'small-scale development' to be replaced with 'technical and servicing equipment'. <p>The reasoned justification would define tech and s equip as 'to include alarms, cameras, grilles and other security equipment; servicing, plant and telecoms equipment and the like.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'balconies and terraces' in the current list of small-scale alterations at para 34.3.48 should be subsumed into 'extensions and modifications' in policy CL2. 		<p>Policy CL6 has been written with the neutral or 'no harm' test in mind because of the difficulty in ensuring that small-scale alterations and additions must result in a positive enhancement to the host property. These are listed at reasoned justification paragraph 34.3.48 as including works to improve accessibility; changes to windows or glazing patterns; projected mouldings; balustrades; chimneys and other architectural details; alarms, cameras, grilles and other security equipment; plant and telecommunications equipment; front walls, railings and forecourt parking; and balconies and terraces.</p> <p>It is accepted that for some of these changes a more positive test can be made than 'no harm' and to this end it is recommended that some alterations such as windows, glazing patterns, projected mouldings and small architectural details be removed from the list and included under the reasoned justification for Policy CL2 as modifications. These can be determined under Policy CL2 which refers to extensions and modifications to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, taking opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings and is therefore a positive test. To ensure that this is made clear an additional paragraph is suggested as part of the reasoned justification which will make it clear that modifications include elevational alterations, and this will include changes to windows, or glazing patterns, projecting mouldings and other small architectural details.</p> <p>However, with regard to the other items mentioned, such as security equipment, forecourt parking and balconies and terraces, it is not accepted that a positive enhancement test can be applied in all circumstances and therefore they should remain in the list included at paragraph 34.3.48. It would also follow that in view of the limited proposed changes there is no compelling reason to rename the policy 'Technical and servicing equipment' because that would not include all the categories of development that the policy applies to.</p>	<p>The existing list is recommended to be divided so that some items are referred to as adaptations under Policy CL2 (those where a positive test of enhancement is expected) and the remainders where only a neutral impact is anticipated will remain at paragraph 34.3.48.</p>
Government Office for London	Government Office for London		Policy CP 1	Core Policy: Quanta of Development		No	Justified	PSubCS269	<p>25. Policy CP1 states that the Council will provide 26,150m² of comparison retail floorspace to 2015 in the south of the borough. This figure was identified in the Retail Needs Assessment. We question why the comparison floorspace is only identified to 2015 (rather than the full plan period) and also where and how this floorspace will be delivered over the plan period ?</p>		<p>Following discussions with officers, GOL are satisfied with the Council's explanation as to why the Core Strategy is only attempting to identify sites to meet need to 2015, rather than 2028, the end of the plan period. This will be confirmed in a statement of common ground.</p>	<p>If the Inspector is minded to approve the change, the Council would support adding further text to the reasoned justification or the Core Strategy, to justify the Council's position.</p> <p>New para 31.3.1</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
											<p>At the request of GOL, an additional paragraph has been added to the supporting text which explains the position taken. The RNA does predict need, but the RNA itself recognises that only need till approximately 2015 can be estimated to an acceptable degree of accuracy. Longer longer term forecasts are more susceptible to change. The Core Strategy, therefore, seeks to plan for, and accommodate, retail need to 2015 only. This approach is consistent with PPS4 (Policy EC5.5) which states that Local Planning Authorities need only to allocate sufficient sites to meet identified need for the first five years of the plan. The Council will review retail need on a regular basis, and where necessary amend the Core Strategy accordingly.</p> <p>Attempting to plan for the retail need till 2026 would be an exercise, in little more than educated guesswork, with a real danger that over inflated estimated of retail need inform schemes based on equally optimistic assumptions, resulting in proposals which either stand empty or where do attract spend, have a detrimental impact upon existing centres.</p>	<p>The Council's Retail Needs Assessment predicts retail need up till 2028, the end of the plan period. Whilst need until 2015 can be estimated to an acceptable degree of accuracy, longer term forecasts are more susceptible to change. The Core Strategy, therefore, seeks to plan for, and accommodate, retail need to 2015 only. This approach is consistent with PPS4 which states that Local Planning Authorities need only to allocate sufficient sites to meet identified need for the first five years of the plan. The Council will review retail need on a regular basis, and where necessary amend the Core Strategy accordingly.</p>
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CP 1	Core Policy: Quanta of Development		No	Effective	PSubCS359	<p>p43 Policy CP1 Core Policy: Quanta of development</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p> <p>The proposed changes are required to reflect the development potential of the Earls Court Strategic Site and the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area, having regard to its Opportunity Area status in the Replacement London Plan and the mix of uses envisaged on the site elsewhere in the PS Core Strategy and the Replacement London Plan. The PS Core Strategy recognises that the Strategic Site has considerable potential and capacity which will be in excess of the current allocations. Analysis presented in the Evidence Base accompanying Capital & Counties' representations support a Land Use Budget of up to 1,640,000 sqm across the EC Regeneration Area. Further refinement of the quantum and mix of uses on the site will be informed by the GLA's transport capacity study and other assessments and through a Planning Framework and Masterplan process.</p> <p>In relation to office floorspace, the 10,000m2 of allocation should be flexible to incorporate a wider range of non-residential uses, including potential commercial, office, retail and leisure uses - a change is sought in this regard, as is set out below.</p> <p>The proposed changes are consistent with Capital & Counties' representations to chapters 10 and 26 and achieve an effective policy basis for the Core Strategy to deliver its vision.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CP1</p> <p>The Council will provide:</p> <p>(1) 350 additional new homes a year until the London Plan is reviewed, and a minimum of 600 a year (of which 200 will be</p>		<p>Core Strategy Policy CA7 and Policy CP1(a and b), in accordance with the draft London Plan, states that the quantum for residential and office floor space are minimums. The exact quantum of development and land use distribution across the entire site will be confirmed in the joint planning brief, which will be based on the findings of the transport study and urban design analysis. However, some of the non-residential land uses might be located on the LBHF part of the site, which may result in higher residential units being proposed. Policy CA7 has been revised to reflect this, but this need not be explicit in Policy CP1.</p> <p>There is a forecast for a 15% growth in demand for office floorspace in Kensington and Chelsea. This equates to nearly 70,000sqm of new floorspace. Whilst Policy CF5 will protect offices, the need to satisfy this demand remains.</p> <p>The Core Strategy allocates 10,000sqm in two of its main strategic sites, namely Kensal and Earl's Court as these (Crossrail permitting) will be in two highly accessible locations.</p> <p>Furthermore the Draft London Plan proposes to designate Earl's Court as a Opportunity Area with a minimum employment capacity of providing a minimum of 7000 new jobs and it is considered that the most likely means of delivering this would be stimulated by office developments.</p> <p>This allocation will therefore remain unchanged as it is considered to present the best means of delivering a mixed-use development.</p>	No change proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>affordable) thereafter for a 10 year period;</p> <p>(2) up to 69,200m² of office floorspace to 2028;</p> <p>(3) 26,150m² of comparison retail floorspace to 2015 in the south of the Borough and additional retail development as part of the Earls Court Regeneration Area;</p> <p>(4) Infrastructure as set out in the infrastructure plan, including through developer contributions.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council has, in this document:</p> <p>(a) allocated strategic sites with the capacity for a minimum of 53 800 dwellings;</p> <p>(b) allocated in the strategic sites of Kensal and Earl's Court a minimum of 2 10,000m² business floorspace to meet identified unmet demand above the existing permissions;</p> <p>(c) allocate a minimum of 10,000sqm of non residential floorspace for potential commercial, office, retail and leisure uses and a new urban quarter as part of the Earls Court Regeneration Area;</p> <p>(d) identified in the south of the Borough sufficient small sites with the potential for retail development to demonstrate identified retail needs of the borough can be met;</p> <p>(e) set out current infrastructure requirements, to be updated as part of the regular infrastructure plan review process.</p>			
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CP 1	Core Policy: Quanta of Development		No	Effective	PSubCS360	<p>p44 Quantum of Development diagram</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>See Key Themes Summary in Capital & Counties' submission document.</p> <p>The supporting text should acknowledge that town centre uses are proposed in the Earls Court Regeneration Area. The strategic site policy (with Capital & Counties' proposed changes) confirms the site as a suitable location for cultural, leisure, hotel office and retail uses. There are a number of factors supporting a future town centre on the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the strategy refers to the site being able to meet existing retail deficiencies in the area (para 3.3.10) - the Council in its response to Capital & Counties' earlier representations recognises that new development on the site will generate additional demand for town centre uses - the Vision anticipates an cultural destination on the site - the Opportunity Area status of the site means it is a focus for high density mixed used development. The draft London Plan refers to the site having a strategic role - initial assessment work undertaken by C&C supports approx 720,000 sqm of town centre uses (office, retail, hotel, destination) on the Regeneration Area although the proposed quantum will be considered in greater detail as part of the transport study being carried out for the area and the forthcoming Planning Framework 		The Council agree with this amendment to illustrate a possible new neighbourhood centre within the Earl's Court Opportunity Area on the Key Diagram map	Propose change to Map on page 44.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>The location of a new centre within the Regeneration Area will be determined through the Masterplan process and it may potentially be concentrated more within the LBHF part of the Regeneration Area.</p> <p>The Council's response to Capital & Counties' earlier representations advises that designating a new centre would be premature and that a new centre could only be designated if the Council is satisfied it would not have a detrimental impact on existing centres. It also is concerned to avoid an indication that the Council is giving carte blanche for retail uses on the site.</p> <p>Reference to an "appropriate" centre together with the additional text in the proposed change makes it clear that the designation is subject to further assessment. The Council in its response suggests that policy CF1 provides scope to permit out of centre retail development. However, the proposed designation is relevant as a Masterplan for the Regeneration Area will also include town centre uses other than retail. The Council recognises that town centres are about more than just shopping providing important places where people live, work and visit for leisure activities (para 31.3.21). This is reflected in the Strategic Site allocation and inherent in promoting new cultural destination facilities.</p> <p>The proposed change will comply with the "town centre first" approach advocated in para 31.2.1 and advice in PPS6 that boroughs should adopt a positive and proactive approach to planning for the future of centres. The change will provide clarity, making the strategy effective and sound.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Add "Appropriate New Centre" notation on the Earls Court Regeneration Area.</p> <p>See map extract at attached</p>			
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CP 1	Core Policy: Quanta of Development	Yes	Yes		PSubCS497	<p>Policy CP 1 - 26,150 sq m of comparison floorspace to 2015 to the south of the Borough</p> <p>floorspace to 2015 in the south of the Borough. KHT recognises that c. 21,000 square metres of comparison retail floorspace has been identified in Knightsbridge, South Kensington, Brompton Cross and a number of smaller sites on the King's Road, as stated in paragraph 4.3.6 of the Core Strategy. KHT therefore considers that the majority of comparison retail floorspace (c. 21,000 square metres) can be provided within the south of the Borough.</p> <p>PPS6 and the London Plan positively encourage the provision of retail as part of mixed use developments in accessible locations. KHT considers that Policy CP 1 should acknowledge that comparison retail floorspace may be appropriate outside areas within the south of the Borough, as part of delivering mixed-use, balanced and sustainable development as advocated in PPS1 and PPS6 to meet local needs.</p> <p>The proposed redevelopment of Wornington Green includes the provision of an element of comparison retail floorspace along the ground floor of Portobello Road. KHT considers it appropriate for an element of comparison retail floorspace to be provided as part of the comprehensive redevelopment of Wornington Green to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, to address the perceived qualitative deficiency as identified within the Core Strategy, to be consistent with the Wornington Green Planning Brief (Supplementary Planning Document) and with the principles set out in PPS6 and the London Plan. KHT also considers it</p>		Whilst the Council seeks to direct new retail floorspace to centres in the south of the Borough and to areas of identified deficiency CF1(f) offers a degree of flexibility with regard the creation of new retail floorspace. Retail floorspace will be permitted in other areas where it meets the requirements of the sequential test and the development will not have an unacceptable impact on existing centres. This would be relevant for both comparison and convenience floorspace. No change to the policy is therefore, considered appropriate.	No change.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>appropriate for an element of comparison floorspace to be provided as part of the redevelopment of Wornington Green given the surplus identified within paragraph 4.3.6 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>KHT would welcome recognition within the Core Strategy that the provision of comparison retail floorspace, at an appropriate scale to meet the day-to-day needs of residents and perceived local deficiency, would be acceptable in locations outside the south of the Borough.</p>			
828 Pte Ltd	828 Pte Ltd	DP9	Policy CP 10	Kensington High Street				PSubCS79	<p>Policy CPI0 refers to the Council seeking the continued success of the High Street as a quality shopping street. Again, other appropriate town centre uses as set out in PPS6, such as leisure type uses should also be referred to in order to improve the character of the High Street.</p>		Policy CP10 does not make specific reference to leisure use types but this would not preclude more entertainment use, as set out in PPS4.	No change required.
Welcome Trust		Cluttons LLP	Policy CP 12	Brompton Cross		Yes		PSubCS155	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We support policy CP12 to promote the retail nature of Brompton Cross and the pedestrian links to South Kensington Underground Station and the further residential use of the upper floors above Fulham Road West and East. 		Support to the soundness of the Core Strategy. No further action required.	Support to the soundness of the Core Strategy. No further action required.
Metro Shopping Fund LP	Metro Shopping Fund LP	King Sturge on behalf of Metro Shopping Fund LP	Policy CP 15	Notting Hill Gate		No	Justified	PSubCS9	<p>Draft Policy CP15 is an entirely new policy that has not been the subject of any consultation in either its current or some previous form. There is therefore no evidence of participation by the local community of other stakeholders.</p> <p>Draft Policy CP15 should therefore be deleted or reworded to make it more consistent with the rest of chapter 16, which has been the subject of extensive consultation by the Council.</p> <p>The vision for Notting Hill Gate, as set out in CV16 is rightly to strengthen its role as a District shopping centre with improved shops and restaurants that reflect the needs of the local catchment. This should be reflected in the draft policy, but is not.</p> <p>In addition, the second half of this new additional policy (CP15) gives cause for concern in that Notting Hill Gate is in many ownerships and aspirations held by some for a complete redevelopment are simply not deliverable (and this has been confirmed by the Council's own consultants who have explored a range of options). To secure the much needed improvements to the District Centre, development is going to need to come forward on a site-by-site basis and the Metro Shopping Fund is anxious that the second half of the policy could be used to frustrate improvement projects that might come forward, if the new policy remains in its current form.</p> <p>In order for this element of the Core Strategy to be found sound, draft Policy CP15 should either be deleted or alternatively be reworded to be consistent with the rest of chapter 16, which has been consulted upon, as follows:</p> <p>"The Council would ensure Notting Hill Gate's role as a District Centre is strengthened by enhancing its shopping function, so that</p>		This policy has been introduced as a result of comments by the Government Office and the Council's legal advice. The purpose of the Policy is ensure that all development in the area contributes to delivering the vision and does not compromise the ability for development to deliver this vision. The various ownerships would result in the vision being delivered incrementally when applications come forward for development. Notting Hill Gate has a high Public Transport Accessibility Level. Policy CT1 requires high trip generating uses to be located in areas of PTAL 4 or higher. However, the wording will be revised to better reflect the vision for the place.	Propose change to CP15.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									it is better able to meet the needs of local residents. To assist long term viability, Notting Hill Gate needs to be able to compete in an evolving and competitive marketplace. Development which achieves this and enhances its appearance will be encouraged, providing it would not prejudice the regeneration of other sites in the area."			
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		Policy CR 1	Street Network		Yes		PSubCS294	Policy CR1 is supported. However, there is no reference to the map of street connectively (on page 190) and the need to focus on those areas where connectivity is poor.		There is a reference to the street connectivity map at reasoned justification paragraph 33.3.3. Parts of the Borough where the street network is less well connected are shown as blue areas on the map. It is acknowledged in the reasoned justification at 33.3.3 that these areas need to be reconnected by breaking down or otherwise overcomiing barriers.	No changes arerecommended.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CR 1	Street Network		No	Effective	PSubCS412	<p>Policy CR1</p> <p>The Council will require a well connected, inclusive and legible network of streets to be maintained and enhanced.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>(a) require, in areas of regeneration and large scale redevelopment, the new street network to be inspired by the Borough's historic street patterns whilst also taking in to account the proposed land use and scale of redevelopment and urban design rationale for place-making to ensure optimal connectivity and accessibility; etc</p>		The existing wording of the policy refers to the street form and character <u>drawing</u> from the traditional qualities and form of the existing high quality streets, not replicating it. Land use is a secondary consideration to the physical form of development and does not necessarily dictate it and whilst the scale of redevelopment may have an affect on the street pattern, it will not always be the case such as in the City of London. It is considered that the existing wording has sufficient flexibility to accommodate different re-development scenarios. The reference to taking into account the urban design rationale for place making is too imprecise and this recommendation is not accepted.	No changes are recommended.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CR 2	Three-Dimensional Street Form		No	Effective	PSubCS413	<p>p192 Policy CR2 Three Dimensional Form</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The Policy is not effective as it is too prescriptive to achieve the masterplanning objectives for the strategic sites.</p> <p>Large scale development proposals such as the Earls Court Regeneration Area should embrace a range of urban typologies to reflect different land uses and ranges in density. Whilst a finer grain of development may be appropriate for residential areas, alternative plan forms will be more suited to accommodate larger commercial premises and achieving necessary building efficiencies.</p> <p>Additional flexibility is sought in (c) as the relationship with existing context need not be uniform to achieve a successful piece of townscape. By Design gives the following guidance "Relating new development to the general pattern of building heights should not preclude a degree of variety to reflect particular circumstances" (p11).</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CR2</p> <p>The Council will require that where new streets are proposed, or where development would make significant change to the form of existing streets, the resultant street form and character must draw from the traditional qualities and form of the existing high quality streets whilst also taking in to account the proposed land use and scale of redevelopment and urban design rationale for place-making.</p>		The existing wording of the policy refers to the street form and character <u>drawing</u> from the traditional qualities and form of the existing high quality streets, not replicating it.Land use is a secondary consideration to the physical form of development and does not necessarily dictate it and whilst the scale of redevelopment may have an affect on the street pattern, it will not always be the case such as in the City of London. It is considered that the existing wording has sufficient flexibility to accommodate different re-development scenarios.The reference to taking into account the urban design rationale for place making is too imprecise and this recommendation is not accepted.	No changes are recommended.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>statements (CAPS).</p> <p>The Core Strategy has only passing references to views and vistas, including Policy CL1 (d) and (e); CL2 (j) and CR5. This omission is particularly concerning given the Areas of Metropolitan Importance (the Thames and the Museums), the Royal Parks, Holland Park, the fine townscape as well as important local views that need protection.</p> <p>Test of soundness:</p> <p>The Society believes that there is therefore a risk that this area of the plan will fail the effectiveness test of soundness, because what is intended may not be achieved. For this reason, we make the following proposal to rectify the soundness issue</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>The Society proposes that those views and vistas that have already been identified should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • shown on the diagram for Renewing the Legacy (page 202); • where appropriate, shown on diagrams in the "Place" chapters - already shown on diagrams for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Earl's Court (p82) ○ Kensington High Street (p88) ○ Knightsbridge (p102 - but vista not shown) ○ King's Road and Sloane Square (p108) ○ Notting Hill Gate (p114) <p>Almost all of them should show views and vistas of Borough importance.</p> <p>In addition, in order to support the Core Strategy, the SPD on Tall Buildings and CAPS, the Borough should undertake research, as has been done in Westminster to define "Metropolitan Views", to produce an SPD on views and vistas. This will help ensure that new buildings, especially large or tall buildings make a positive contribution to our townscape and enhance rather than harm our views and vistas.</p>		<p>Supplementary Planning Documents and therefore remain in force as material considerations and detailed lower level policy.</p> <p>The specific reference to protecting views and vistas in the Submission Core Strategy is Policy CL1(e). However, Policy CL2 (j) which relates to 'High Buildings' also requires a district landmark to articulate positively a point of townscape legibility of significance for the wider Borough and neighbouring boroughs, such as deliberately framed views and specific vistas.</p> <p>With reference to specific views along and across the River Thames there is an overarching high level policy in the Submission Core Strategy - CL1 (e). However, the Policy Replacement Schedule at Chapter 41 in the Submission Core Strategy shows that Policies CD1 and CD2 are being replaced by Policy CL (e) of the Submission Core Strategy. This is in fact, an error and these two policies will be recommended to be retained. All these views will be included in a Views SPD which according to the Local Development Scheme will be adopted by March 2013.</p> <p>With regard to the specific recommendation of the Kensington Society regarding identified views to be included on the 'Renewing the Legacy' map at page 202, this is not accepted. The 'Renewing the Legacy' map is of a scale which is not appropriate to lend itself to the illustration of such views. Of more significance, a comprehensive study of all views in the Borough will take place as part of the Views SPD and it would be premature at this stage to include some views.</p>	
Mr Malcolm Souch	NHS London Healthy Urban Development HUDU		Policy CR 5	Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways	No	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS296	<p>Policy CR5 is supported, but the supporting text doesn't match with the policy. Paragraph 33.3.25 doesn't consider new public open space to be a strategic issue, but the policy requires all major development in areas of deficiency to provide new open space. The policy (criterion e) refers to provision of child playspace, but there is no reference in the importance of providing opportunities for child play and the health benefits, i.e. childhood obesity.</p> <p>Criterion h refers to promoting the use of the Thames and the Grand Union Canal for health and wellbeing, but this is not explained in the text.</p>		<p>It is agreed that the provision of new public open space is indeed a strategic issue and therefore the reference which states it is not is recommended to be removed from the reasoned justification paragraph 33.3.25. The health benefits of child play are considered to be well known without having to be stated at every opportunity.</p>	<p>Recommend deletion of the reference to new public open space not being a strategic issue at reasoned justification paragraph 33.3.25.</p>
Port of London Authority Lucy Owen	Port of London Authority		Policy CR 5	Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS323	<p>Public Realm</p> <p>Strategic Objective C04 is concerned with an engaging public realm and the associated policy CR5 is specifically concerned with parks, gardens, open spaces and waterways.</p>		<p>Reasoned justification paragraph 33.3.28 mentions that the Thames as a transport resource remains under utilised and Policy CR5 (h) refers to the promotion of the Thames for transport purposes.. Considering that Policy CT1 (m) specifically requires that new development adjacent to the Thames takes full advantage of, and improves the opportunities for public transport and</p>	<p>Recommend a cross reference between policy criteria CT1 (m) and CR5 (h).</p> <p>Recommend the Port of London Authority be included with British Waterways at Partnership Action 12for delivering improved 'blue infrastructure.'</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>The PLA supports the amendment to policy CR5 which now includes at CR5(h) reference to transport. However, in line with Policy CT1 of the Core Strategy and planning policy from the National Level downwards it should be made clear that this includes transport of passengers and freight.</p> <p>In this section of the document reference is made to servicing. The use of the River for the transport of goods could be a sustainable way of getting goods to and from sites. Policy CR7 Servicing and its supporting text should therefore be re-drafted to encourage the use of the river for the transport of goods.</p> <p>It is proposed that the Planning and Borough Development Directorate will work in partnership with British Waterways to help deliver improved blue infrastructure.' The PLA should be included in this given its land ownership and roles and responsibilities relating to the tidal river Thames.</p>		<p>freight on the River Thames, it is not considered that it needs to be repeated as part of Policy CR5. However, a cross reference between Policy criteria CT1 (m) and CR5 (h) will be recommended..</p> <p>Policy CR7 specifically deals with servicing facilities as part of the road network. Whilst using the Thames for the transport of freight is supported by the Council it is dealt with elsewhere in the Core Strategy, specifically at Policy CT1 (m) and CR5 (h). To repeat it again here would confuse the purpose of Policy CR7.</p> <p>It is agreed that Partnership Action 12 for 'An Engaging Public Realm' should be recommended for alteration so that the Planning and Borough Development Directorate will work in partnership with British Waterways and the Port of London Authority to help deliver improved 'blue infrastructure.'</p>	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CR 5	Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways		No	Effective	PSubCS414	<p>p195 Policy CR5 Parks, gardens, open spaces and waterways</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The policy is not effective as it is too restrictive and not consistent with advice in PPS1 allowing flexibility for appropriately designed buildings taking in to account their townscape impacts. The visibility of a new building could have a neutral or positive impact on the Parks and Gardens that are on the Borough's Register or their setting.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CR5</p> <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.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>(b) assess the impact of development [delete 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; etc</p>		Assessing development is the methodology for forming a view, it is not a policy. The proposed change is not accepted.	No changes are recommended.
Ms Claire McAlister	British Waterways		Policy CR 5	Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways	Yes	Yes		PSubCS469	In general we were pleased to acknowledge the emphasis document gives to the Grand Union Canal in promoting sustainable and active redevelopment of North Kensington, creating an active public realm around, and on, the waterways.		Comment noted.	No changes are recommended.
Port of London Authority Lucy Owen	Port of London Authority		Policy CR 7	Servicing	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS324	<p>Public Realm</p> <p>Strategic Objective C04 is concerned with an engaging public realm and the associated policy CR5 is specifically concerned with parks, gardens, open spaces and waterways.</p> <p>The PLA supports the amendment to policy CR5 which now includes at CR5(h) reference to transport. However, in line with Policy CT1 of the Core Strategy and planning policy from the National Level downwards it should be made clear that this includes transport of passengers and freight.</p>		<p>Reasoned justification paragraph 33.3.28 mentions that the Thames as a transport resource remains under utilised and Policy CR5 (h) refers to the promotion of the Thames for transport purposes.. Considering that Policy CT1 (m) specifically requires that new development adjacent to the Thames takes full advantage of, and improves the opportunities for public transport and freight on the River Thames it is not considered that it needs to be repeated as part of Policy CR5. However a cross reference between policy criteria CT1 (m) and CR5 (h) will be recommended..</p> <p>Policy CR7 specifically deals with servicing facilities as</p>	<p>Recommend a cross reference between policy criteria CT1 (m) and CR5 (h).</p> <p>Recommend the Port of London Authority be included with British Waterways at Partnership Action 12 for delivering improved 'blue infrastructure.'</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>In this section of the document reference is made to servicing. The use of the River for the transport of goods could be a sustainable way of getting goods to and from sites. Policy CR7 Servicing and its supporting text should therefore be re-drafted to encourage the use of the river for the transport of goods.</p> <p>It is proposed that the Planning and Borough Development Directorate will work in partnership with British Waterways to help deliver improved blue infrastructure.' The PLA should be included in this given its land ownership and roles and responsibilities relating to the tidal river Thames.</p>		<p>part of the road network. Whilst using the Thames for the transport of freight is supported by the Council it is dealt with elsewhere in the Core Strategy, specifically at Policy CT1 (m) and CR5 (h). To repeat it again here would confuse the purpose of Policy CR7.</p> <p>It is agreed that Partnership Action 12 for 'An Engaging Public Realm' should be recommended for alteration so that the Planning and Borough Development Directorate will work in partnership with British Waterways and the Port of London Authority to help deliver improved 'blue infrastructure.'...</p>	
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CR 7	Servicing		No	Effective	PSubCS415	<p>p197 Policy CR7 Servicing</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>It is appropriate for the policy to refer to existing servicing requirements which may alter as a result of new development or changes in existing operational requirements involving development. The proposed changes provide an effective policy.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CR7</p> <p>The Council will require servicing facilities to be well-designed, built to accommodate the demands of new and existing 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>The recommended changes could be interpreted as requiring new development to accommodate the servicing demands of existing developments and as such could be regarded as unreasonable. The existing policy text is sufficient to cover changes to existing operational requirements as a result of development as this could reasonably be said to fall within the gamut of 'new development'.</p>	No changes are recommended.
Mr Patrick Blake	Highways Agency		Policy CT 1	Improving alternatives to car use				PSubCS23	<p>We do not wish to make a representation of soundness, our comments are general advice to ensure the document is in line with national policy.</p> <p>Section 2B: Policies and Actions As mentioned in our previous responses to Kensington and Chelsea major concerns with strategic sites identified in the due to there be the potential transport impact generated by any proposed develop (Policies and Actions) of the Core Strategy to set out the requireme development proposals above the threshold size stated in the adop (SPD). We understand that the Core Strategy should not repeat oth recommendation that a reference to the Transportation SPD is suff</p> <p>The Agency supports the council's statement that 'Travel Plans will however this is contradicted by the later statement that the council (Policy CT 1). Travel Plans should be produced by all developments <i>Workplace Travel Planning and Residential Travel Planning</i>, in line \ should be greater clarity over the requirements for Travel Plans an Assessments. This will help ensure that the CS is in line with nation.</p>		<p>To improve clarity an explicit reference to Transport Assessments will be added. There is no contradiction between 32.2.3 and CT1. The former states that all types (i.e. use classes) of development will have Travel Plans and CT1 sets out that whether a TP is required will be dependent on scale. The thresholds are set out in the Transport SPD and are broadly consistent with TfL's guidance.</p>	Added text in CT1h to make clear our requirement for Transport Assessments
Mr Patrick Blake	Highways Agency		Policy CT 1	Improving alternatives to car use				PSubCS89	<p>Section 2B: Policies and Actions</p> <p>As mentioned in our previous responses to Kensington and Chelsea's Core Strategy consultations, the HA does not <i>have</i> any major concerns with strategic sites identified in the borough due to there being no SRN in the Borough. However, it is important that the potential impact generated by any proposed</p>		<p>To improve clarity an explicit reference to Transport Assessments will be added. There is no contradiction between 32.2.3 and CT1. The former states that all types (i.e. use classes) of development will have Travel Plans and CT1 sets out that whether a TP is required will be dependent on scale. The thresholds are set out in the Transport SPD and are broadly consistent with TfL's guidance.</p>	Added text in CT1h to make clear requirement for TAs

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations	
									<p>Policy CT1 (or elsewhere in the document) should make reference to the twelve Cycle Superhighways that will be developed for commuters and others to cycle to central London. Cycle Superhighways will play an important role in encouraging and enabling cycling in London.</p> <p>London Plan Policy cross ref. 3C. 21. Draft London Plan 6.10</p> <p>Has this matter been raised previously? Yes Draft Core Strategy</p> <p>Policy CT1 (or elsewhere in the document) should make reference to Legible London. Some suggested wording is as follows:</p> <p>"The Borough's wayfinding strategy will be developed in consultation with Transport for London. One strategy and mapping system will be consistently applied across the borough. In this way, the principles of the Legible London wayfinding system can guide strategic development and simplify the pedestrian experience throughout London".</p>		appropriate forum for discussion of the LCHS, the Cycle Superhighways and Legible London. No changes to the Core Strategy text are proposed.		
Mr Terence Bendixson	The Chelsea Society		Policy CT 1	Improving alternatives to car use	No	No	Justified Effective	PSubCS252	<p>Para 2.2.1. Para 35.3.1 Policy C 1 Policy CH 1, CH 2 Policy CH 3 Para vi Policy CT 1 Para b</p> <p>HOUSING, ADDED POPULATION, DENSITY AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES</p> <p>The Core Strategy, taking its lead from the GLA and the London Plan, envisages some 6,000 new dwellings over a decade. (Population is forecast to rise by 20,000.) This housing expansion will occupy much of the developable land in the Borough and significantly increase the overall density of the densest local authority in Britain.</p> <p>But many of the ancillary social, medical and commercial services on which residents rely are already over-subscribed, have little of no room in which to expand and are faced by prohibitive K&C land values if they want to expand.</p> <p>If the Inspector was to talk to residents about this he would find them speaking of surgeries with waiting lists, standing room only on buses, long queues at post offices, lack of on-street visitor parking space, tiny flats and inhuman cramming on the Underground. These are, of course, the views of middle-income residents, not the rich. (But as Figure 8.3 shows, the Borough has a high proportion of residents with incomes of £35,000 and below.)</p> <p>The Society does not suggest that delivering additional houses on what are currently non-housing sites would be ineffective in meeting housing demand. The issue is the relationship between that new housing (and additional population) and the capacity of a wide range of social and physical facilities. There is insufficient evidence on the impact of this increase in population on social and community services. The question never seems to be addressed. It is assumed that higher population density is justified without exploring its side-effects.</p> <p>Policy C1 does, of course, require additional social facilities to be financed via S.106 Agreements. But there is no assessment of the scope for expanding the supply of the Borough's already overstretched infrastructure of public transport and roads, surgeries and post offices, playing fields and parks.</p>		Policy CT1a requires "high trip generating development to be located in areas of the Borough where public transport accessibility has a PTAL score of 4 or above and where there is sufficient public transport capacity, or that will achieve PTAL 4 and provide sufficient capacity as a result of committed improvements to public." CT1b states that any additional traffic generated by new development must "not result in any material increase in traffic congestion". Taken together these policies ensure new development must be able to operate within the capacity of the existing public transport and road networks or that they contribute to improvements in capacity to accommodate the increase in demand.	The impact of servicing vehicles is part of this assessment. Robust Transport Assessments will include baseline traffic surveys and the addition of traffic from nearby committed development. This ensures that new development will be assessed on the basis of a growing residential population and new development. It should be noted that residential development generates relatively little servicing demand in comparison to other land uses.	No changes proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>How, for instance, will the construction of new flats on the site of the Earl's Court Exhibition solve the problems of acute congestion (due both to District/Circle/Piccadilly line interchanging passengers and heavy local demand) at Earl's Court Underground Station?</p> <p>How, furthermore, does the Plan reconcile all the proposed new residents with Policy CT1 (b). 'Ensure that development will not result in any material increase in traffic</p> <p>congestion.....' ? Additional residents will lead to additional servicing vehicles ranging from refuse collection to plumbers, parcels delivery, computer technicians, lift engineers and building contractors. Additional residents will also generate additional business and family visitors. Even if residential development is 'permit free' it will still contribute to traffic.</p> <p>Increasing the Borough's population will put its social and community infrastructure under even greater pressure. This problem is not assessed. No evidence is advanced to justify the addition of 20,000 residents. The Society considers that the Plan is unsound.</p> <p>The plan needs either to scale down provision for increased population or show how the supply of social and community infrastructure should be expanded - or a mix of the two.</p>			
Port of London Authority Lucy Owen	Port of London Authority		Policy CT 1	Improving alternatives to car use	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS322	<p><i>Transport / Better Travel Choices</i></p> <p>Strategic Objective C03 is concerned with better travel choices and Policy CT1 seeks to improve alternatives to car use. Reference is made to public transport, walking and cycling and parking. The PLA is pleased to see reference at CT1(m) to a requirement that new development adjacent to the River Thames takes full advantage of, and improves the opportunities for, public transport and freight on the water and walking and cycling alongside it.</p> <p>The use of the River for the transport of passengers and freight is a sustainable method of transport that has policy support from the National Level downwards. Policy CT1 would therefore appear to be in broad conformity with <i>London Plan</i> policy. However, the Council should review the wording of Strategic Objective C03 as it appears to be related solely to the transport of people however, policy CT1 is a broader policy and is concerned with the movement of people and freight. In order to accord with planning policy from the National Level downwards and with the Council's own policy CT1, Strategic Objective C03 should therefore be widened to include reference to the transport of freight.</p>		Noted. CT1 provides a strong policy for use and improvement of opportunities for transport on the Thames. Although the vision does not explicitly refer to this policy, this does not undermine the policy intention of CT1.	No changes proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CT 1	Improving alternatives to car use		No	Effective	PSubCS409	<p>Policy CT1</p> <p>The Council will ensure that there are better alternatives to car use by making it easier and more attractive to walk, cycle and use public transport and by managing traffic congestion and the supply of car parking.</p> <p>To deliver this the Council will:</p> <p>(n) work with TfL to improve the streets within the Earl's Court One-Way System and investigate the potential of returning the streets to by seeking two-way operation, and by requiring developments to contribute to this objective;</p>		Policy CT1n has been amended and widened to include reference to pedestrian improvements and investigating returning the ECOWS to two-way operation.	Policy CT1n has been amended and widened to include reference to pedestrian improvements and investigating returning the ECOWS to two-way operation.
Ms Bobbie Vincent Emery			Policy CT 1	Improving alternatives to car use		No	Justified	PSubCS446	<p>This 'representation' is made on the grounds that the policies set out in the Borough's Core Strategy formulated to increase the use of cycling as a means of transport are not 'justified'. There is 'robust and credible evidence' that journeys by bicycle will only increase if they are safe'. The details of the policies chosen</p>		CT1f requires improvements to the walking and cycling environment, whilst CT1g requires development to include measures to improve road safety for cyclists. No changes are proposed. The Council's policies on cycling in terms of street management are contained in other	No changes proposed to CT1. Additional text has been added to 32.3.10 regarding north-south cycle routes.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>indicate that the 'most appropriate strategy' has not been adopted and that there are 'reasonable alternatives'. [PPS 12]</p> <p>The Core Strategy policies to reduce car use by residents, and increase journeys by foot and bicycle, are based on a desire to reduce congestion and street parking and improve air quality. The policies and initiatives contained in the Core Strategy do not address the fundamental issue of the need for safe cycle routes in order to bring about the desired increase in bicycle journeys. The plans incorporated in the Core Strategy do not address cycle routes: most existing cycle paths are not shown on the maps, future cycle paths are not linked into a coherent pattern, and through paths on new developments are not mentioned.</p> <p>There has been no 'joined up' thinking about continuous cycle routes!</p>		documents. Additional text has been added to 32.3.10 regarding north-south cycle routes.	
Ken Housing Trust - Manpreet Dillon	Kensington Housing Trust	CB Richard Ellis	Policy CT 1	Improving alternatives to car use	Yes	Yes		PSubCS509	<p>Policy CT 1: Improving alternatives to car use</p> <p>KHT supports the principle of Policy CT 1. KHT notes part 'k' of Policy CT 1 which seeks to resist new public car parks. KHT suggests that part 'k' is amended to differentiate from on-street Borough permit holder 'public' parking and private off-street parking. KHT suggests that part 'k' is amended to state 'resist new offstreet public car parks'.</p> <p>In addition, KHT notes part 'g' of Policy CT 1 which requires new development to incorporate measures to improve road safety, in particular the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists, and to resist development that compromises road safety. The proposed redevelopment of Wornington Green includes the reinstatement of the historical street pattern and reconnection of Portobello Road and Wornington Road to Ladbrooke Grove at Barlby Road, as set out within the Wornington Green Planning Brief (Supplementary Planning Document). The street layout of the proposed redevelopment has been developed in close consultation with RBKC Officers, with road safety being an important consideration.</p> <p>KHT suggests that part 'g' of Policy CT 1 is amended to 'require new development to incorporate measures consistent with the Borough's historic street pattern and usage to improve road safety, and in particular the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists, and resist development that compromises road safety.'</p>		<p>Part k of the policy refers, intentionally, to new public car parks, and there is no need for differentiation between permit-holder car parking and private off-street car parking arrangements which could be provided as part of a development.</p> <p>Part g of policy CT1 sets out the requirement to improve road safety measures. This does not require to be consistent with the Borough's historic street pattern and usage. It should apply equally to new developments, and while context will be a determining factor, the suggestion inclusion would not enhance the policy.</p>	No change.
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		Policy CT 2	New and enhanced rail infrastructure		No	Effective Consistent with national policy	PSubCS218	<p>London Plan Policy cross ref. 3C.4 - Draft London Plan 6.2</p> <p>Has this matter been raised previously? Yes, Draft Core Strategy</p> <p>TfL notes that some rail safeguarding issues e.g. for Chelsea Hackney</p> <p>Policy CT 2 New and enhanced rail infrastructure (page 187). How Strategy should include an explicit reference to Land for Transport be retained for transport uses, unless it can be proven that there is policy 3C.4 of the London Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance notes that there is no safeguarding of sites required for Crossrail. See also references to Kensal.</p>		<p>Additional text has been added to CT2c to include safeguarding for Crossrail.</p> <p>The borough does not contain any sites that have transport functions except for the disused Eurostar depot. The Council is aware that this site will be used for testing of the new Hitachi trains but believes long term that the best use of that site is for housing, office, social and community uses and local shopping as set out in Chapter 20 where the site is allocated as a strategic site. Given this, and the lack of any other significant transport sites in the borough, a specific reference to the Land for Transport Functions SPG is not necessary</p>	Additional text has been added to CT2c to include safeguarding for Crossrail.
Mr Mathew Carpen	Greater London Authority		Policy CT 2	New and enhanced rail infrastructure		No	Justified Effective	PSubCS220	<p>London Plan Policy cross ref. 3C.11, 3C. 12. Draft London Plan: 6.3, 6.4</p> <p>Has this matter been raised previously? Yes, Draft Core Strategy.</p>		Noted. The key diagram provides headline information graphically and is supported by the vision for the borough and seven strategic themes, which summarises the Council's policy. The key diagram should be used in conjunction with the wider plan and it is not possible to provide all relevant information in the one diagram.	No changes proposed.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>Concerning Policy CT2 a (and as noted in ref. 1 above reo paragraph 5.1.7), Crossrail is currently in discussion with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea over a potential station at Kensal Green (Kensal Gasworks site). However there is no provision for this station in the current Crossrailscheme, no commitment has been made and Crossrail is still investigating the viability of a station in this location.</p> <p>Concerning Policy CT 2 b, TfL London Rail does not object to borough aspirations for new stations but wish to make clear that TfL is not committed to a proposed new station at North Pole Road (it is not in the current TfL Business Plan and is not being considered as part of longer term proposals).</p> <p>TfL supports Policy CT2 c which protects the safeguarded route of the Chelsea Hackney Line/ Crossrail 2. TfL notes from Policy CT 2d that the council is promoting a station further west, potentially at Imperial Wharf, as part of the Chelsea-Hackney Line. TfL notes that this station is away from the safeguarded route but that the current review of the Chelsea-Hackney Line could consider this.</p> <p>The locations of new stations being promoted by the council should be checked and labelled on the Key Diagram (page 10). The Key Diagram as it currently stands is potentially misleading to stakeholders as it fails to identify the varying levels of probability surrounding these new station proposals. As noted in ref. 7 safeguarding of land for transport including Crossrail has been omitted from Policy CT2.</p>			
DP9	DP9		Policy CT 2	New and enhanced rail infrastructure	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	PSubCS340	<p>Policy CT1: Improving Alternatives to Car Use</p> <p><i>Unsound: Not consistent with National Policy</i></p> <p>It is considered that as currently drafted, the policy is unduly restrictive. Specifically, at (b) it is required that ' <i>new development should not result in any material increase in traffic congestion or on-street parking pressure</i>'. However, national planning guidance, as set out within Planning Policy Guidance 13 (2001), does not prevent new development from coming forward where it can be demonstrated that effects of the proposal on the road network are acceptable. It is considered that as worded this part of the policy is unsound.</p> <p>In addition, it should be acknowledged at (c) that occupiers of new residential development, particularly market housing are likely to require access to a car. There should be no absolute requirement for permit free development or development below the adopted standards.</p>		<p>Policy CT1b does not seek to prevent new development coming forward if it can be demonstrated that the effects on the road network are acceptable. No changes proposed.</p> <p>The Council does not agree that as a general principle market housing is likely to "require access to a car". Car ownership in the borough is lower than the national and London average despite higher than average levels of affluence. The permit-free policy does not preclude new residents from owning cars, only from parking them on-street. Existing levels of car parking occupancy are already high. No changes to policy proposed.</p>	No changes proposed.
Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Capital & Counties obo Earl's Court	DP9	Policy CT 2	New and enhanced rail infrastructure		No	Effective	PSubCS410	<p>p187 - Policy CT2 New and enhanced rail infrastructure</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The proposed changes are required for the policy to have some flexibility in (e) to be effective. The current drafting refers to the transport improvements as a requirement which is not deliverable. There may be scope to for some of the transport improvements sought in (e) as part of a comprehensive scheme for the wider Earls Court Regeneration Area. However, this will require detailed analysis into feasibility and viability involving third parties including TfL and Network Rail and will also depend on the final quantum and land use mix proposed across the Opportunity Area. Further detail will emerge through the masterplanning process and as a result of transport capacity analysis currently being undertaken by TfL.</p> <p>Changes sought</p> <p>Policy CT2</p> <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>It is accepted that the requirements at CT2e would be on the basis of additional work related to the redevelopment of the Earl's Court Exhibition Centre and the broader regeneration area. To this end a reference to the need to establish feasibility has been added.</p>	Changes made to CT2e to accomodate the suggestions made by CapCo.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent	Number	Title	Is this part Legally compliant?	Is this part Sound?	It is Unsound because	ID	Further Details	It is Sound because	Officer's response to comments	Officer's Recommendations
									<p>(a) require developments at the allocated Kensal Gasworks site to establish a Crossrail Station, subject to approval by Crossrail Limited;</p> <p>(b) promote the creation of a new station on the West London Line at North Pole Road;</p> <p>(c) protect the safeguarded route and associated land for the Chelsea-Hackney Line, including a station at Sloane Square and near Chelsea Old Town Hall on the King's Road;</p> <p>(d) promote a station further west, potentially at Imperial Wharf, as part of the Chelsea-Hackney Line;</p> <p>(e) subject to feasibility and viability testing seek opportunities for require improvements to the accessibility of West Brompton Station, measures to increase the capacity of the West London Line and improvements to its interchange with the underground network, as part of any comprehensive redevelopment of the Earl's Court Regeneration Area Exhibition Centre.</p>			