

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

RBKC Proposed amendments in response to third party statements  
Edition: Beginning of Day 3, 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2010

**Matter ONE**

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

	10 am – 1 pm (Approx)		
<b>Week 1</b>			
<b>Day 1</b> Tuesday 20 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	<b><u>Matter 1 Vision &amp; Objectives</u></b> <b><u>C1,CV1,CV11</u></b>	<b><u>Proposed changes by RBKC in response to statements</u></b>	<b><u>Notes from the hearings</u></b>
	RBKC	None proposed through the hearing statements in addition to the changes already shown in the Submission CS.	None
	178257 DP9 for Brookfield Developments  Did not attend hearing	None The comments were considered and some changes made (although not the specific changes sought) in the submission document.	None
	101812 The Chelsea Society  Did not attend hearing	None: stemming population growth is not something we can address through planning. Over half the new homes are on large sites that will provide new infrastructure. C1 allows for the collection of contributions for social infrastructure from those and other sites.	None
	139439 DP9 for Capital & Counties	CV1  Accept introduction of Earl's Court along with Kensal and Latimer, but as part of opportunity area not regeneration area: "... The deficiency in local shopping will have been addressed with <del>two</del> new town centres at Kensal and Latimer <u>and the Earl's Court Opportunity Area. ..."</u>  Suggest changing 'around' to 'at least' in relation to 2000 houses [Note: this is based on summing Warwick Rd Strategic Site Allocation with Earl's Court, and is not derived from the Earl's Court Opportunity Area in Draft Replacement London Plan]. "... Earl's Court will remain an important cultural destination, as well	Change likely to be acceptable to Capital and Counties: statement of common ground under discussion will confirm or amend.  Capital and Counties sought further clarification that the 2000 are all in the Royal Borough. Council agreeable: statement of common ground under discussion will confirm wording.

**RBKC/18A**

		as providing offices and <del>at least around</del> 2000 new dwellings on surrounding sites. ...”	
	<i>197185 Kensington &amp; Chelsea Social Council</i>	<p>Please note: statement of common ground has been agreed with the KCSC regarding public involvement in the LDF process.</p> <p>Regarding health: CV1, add after first bullet point ‘aiding better health’: “stimulate regeneration in North Kensington through the provision of better transport better housing and better facilities, <u>aiding better health</u>.”</p> <p>Also note: Health impact assessment was undertaken prior to the publication of the CS. This issue was not raised at publication stage.</p> <p>Regarding access – CO5 already includes the statement “inclusive for all”, thus the statement that there are ‘no proposals either in the vision or the SOs to address disability issues’ is untrue.</p> <p>Regarding housing – incorrect to state that the policy is to ‘place all affordable housing in the north of the borough’ – policy CH2 specifically precludes this.</p> <p>Regarding transport, the place sections already include provisions to reduce the isolation of Kensal, Delgarno and Latimer. Access to hospitals in the south is also already noted in terms of the weak north-south bus routes.</p> <p>Regarding importance of social and community uses, the vision, in relation to residential quality of life refers to “facilitating local living”, and there is a whole strategic objective on keeping life local, at the heart of which is social and community uses.</p>	KCSC accepted.
	<i>179625 DP9 for Chelsfield</i>  <i>Did not attend hearing</i>	<p>None.</p> <p>A statement of common ground has been offered.</p> <p>It is suggested that this matter might be better dealt with under Matter 7 in relation to CF5.</p>	None
	<i>129913 The Golborne Forum</i>	None	None
	<i>372420 Knightsbridge Association</i>	None	None

**RBKC/18A**

	175783 <i>The Kensington Society</i>	None	None
	335612 <i>The Norland Conservation Society</i>	None This is addressed fully in Matter 8 Q 1	None
	306971 <i>Westway Development Trust</i>  <i>Did not attend hearing</i>	None	None

Changes sought during the hearing

	<i>Chapter/Section</i>	Change Sought	Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)
	<i>General</i>	Better signposting of the document	Mid August (this is a detailed matter that needs careful consideration. It will not alter the content of the plan, and thus it is not considered essential for it to be tabled during the hearings)
		Council to consider writing in some reference to localism	The Council has considered this, but concluded that it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy.
	<i>Chapter 1</i>	New paragraph agreed needed to explain the Core Strategy may need an early review, subject to the result of the London Plan EIP	End of Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (PT)
	<i>CV1</i>	Council to check regarding inclusion of Golborne with to Portobello in North Kensington section	Council agrees to this change: "... The unique character of <u>Golborne and Portobello Roads</u> will have flourished, including the antiques and street markets, adding to the vitality of the area..."
		Council to consider potential of including ref to social infrastructure provision	End of Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (PT)
		Council to consider reference to neighbourhood centres in last section of Vision (see KS statement)	The Council agrees to the following change: "Our residential quality of life will be improved for everyone and we will remain the best place to live in London with <u>our network of local neighbourhood centres offering a wide range of everyday services within easy walking distance</u> , our glorious built heritage protected and improved etc..."
		Council asked to consider inclusion of equalities in the vision	The Council have considered this but concluded the matter is adequately dealt with elsewhere.
	<i>Section 4.3</i>	Council to include in this section reference to plan phasing	End of Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (PT)

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

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

**Changes sought during the hearing**

	Chapter/Section	Change Sought	Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)
	<u>Policy CP1</u>	To align with CH1 and London Plan expectation to exceed target	End of Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (JMed)
	<u>Assumptions behind retail and office floor space quanta in CP1</u>	RBKC to draft papers in response to those of the Kensington Society on this subject	End of Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (CT)
	<u>Chapter 1,</u>	Council agreed to include text on the nature of the infrastructure delivery plan and summary table, and that it will be updated	End of Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (PT)
	<u>Chapter 37</u>	Council to check wording to ensure that it refers to the fact that the infrastructure table will be updated through the AMR	End of Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (JMed)

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

	<u>10pm – 1 pm (Approx)</u>		
Week 1			
Day 2 Wednesday 21st July 2010	<u>Matter 3 Policies for Places</u> <u>CA7,CP1, CP11</u>		
	<i>RBKC</i>	<p>It is proposed that sections 4.4 Places and 4.5 North Kensington ‘swap places’, so that the section on Places immediately precedes the Place chapters. This is not reflected in the post-submission schedule of changes, although is included in RBKC response to Matter 3, Question 1.</p> <p>Note: changes proposed in Matter 3 Question 3 regarding the monitoring section in each Place are shown in the post-submission schedule of changes near to references to Chapter 38 (Monitoring) and not near Chapters 5-14 (Places).</p> <p>Likewise, changes in the same paper proposed regarding infrastructure and the places are shown adjacent to Chapter 37, Infrastructure, in the post submission schedule of changes.</p>	Agreed
	<i>178257 DP9 for Brookfield Developments</i>	None	None
	<i>306971 Westway Development Trust</i>	None	None
	<i>175783 The Kensington Society</i>	Regarding Earl’s Court one-way system, see Capital and Counties below for a proposed modification to Earl’s Court Vision (CV10)	Noted
	<i>129913 The Golborne Forum</i>	None	
	<i>372420 The Knightsbridge Association</i>	None [change to remove ‘alfresco dining’ from Monpelier Street shown in the post-submission schedule of changes]	Noted
	<i>197185 Kensington &amp; Chelsea Social Council</i>	<p>Regarding the Vision for Latimer (Chapter 9): proposed change to first sentence is supported as the Council considers will add clarity. This change has already been included in the “post submission changes” document.</p> <p>Changes to the rest of the vision not considered necessary, as the Council considers these issues are addressed elsewhere. These changes are not included in the schedule of post submission changes. However, the Council would not object to making these changes were the inspector so</p>	

		<p>minded. These changes are shown in italics below.</p> <p>Matter 3 – Policies for Place: Specific</p> <p>Qu. 7 (iv)</p> <p>Change Vision for Latimer CV9</p> <p>Latimer will have been rebuilt, in a phased way, to a new street pattern, <u>guaranteeing all existing tenants the opportunity of a new home as well as creating capacity for new residents to move to the area.</u> It will be a place that focuses on the provision of high-quality services through excellent urban design. It will provide accessible, <u>safe</u> and adaptable spaces that are valued and used by the local community. New development, including a new neighbourhood shopping centre, will be located around the Latimer Road Station. <u>The area will be better served by public transport, and</u> there will be clear links to Ladbroke Grove and White City. A community sports centre with a swimming pool will be retained in the area and a new academy will be established.</p>	<p>KCSC welcomed all the changes. All changes therefore to be included.</p>
	233936 <i>The Ladbroke Association</i>	None	None
	134910 <i>CB Richard Ellis for Kensington Housing Trust</i>	None	None
	139439 <i>DP9 for Capital &amp; Counties</i>	<p>Regarding the One way system, the Council offers the following modification to Earl's Court Vision (CV10) regarding the one way system</p> <p>Vision for Earl's Court in 2028 The western edge of the Borough will be reintegrated with and Earl's Court Neighbourhood Centre <del>will so that the centre is be</del> able to blossom, offering an attractive 'urban-village' environment which local residents can enjoy. <u>Crucial to this is reducing the impact of the one-way system on residential amenity, the pedestrian environment and public transport users, will be significantly improved by careful design and traffic measures, such as environmental improvements, reducing traffic and By preferably by returning the one-way system to two-way working or other environmental</u></p>	<p>DP9 for Capital and Counties confirmed this change was acceptable in principle. It was noted it may be revisited in the light of the discussion on Day 3, Matter 6.</p>

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 10 pt, Underline

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 10 pt, Underline

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 10 pt, Strikethrough

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 10 pt, Underline

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 10 pt, Strikethrough

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 10 pt, Underline, Not Strikethrough

**RBKC/18A**

		<p><del>improvements that have a significant improvement to the pedestrian environment, reducing the traffic flow, and improving the pedestrian environment, the western edge of the Borough will be reintegrated and Earl's Court Neighbourhood Centre will be able to blossom, offering an attractive 'urban village' environment which local residents can enjoy.</del></p> <p>Regarding the Earl's Court Policy, the Council would like to offer the following wording: Policy CP10 The Council will ensure an attractive 'urban-village' environment in Earl's Court by supporting improvements to the public realm, pedestrian environment and open space. <u>The Council will and resisting development proposals which prejudice the opportunities for wider regeneration of the area and compromise delivery of the vision realisation of the full potential of opportunities in the area.</u></p> <p>Regarding all other potential changes sought by CapCo regarding Earl's Court Place are those required of consistency depending on the outcome of discussion regarding the strategic site. It is therefore requested that these are dealt with alongside Matter 6 on Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> July.</p>	<p>DP9 for Capital and Counties confirmed this change was acceptable in principle. It was noted it may be revisited in the light of the discussion on Day 3, Matter 6.</p> <p>Noted</p>
	<p><i>Also Transport for London</i></p>	<p>Regarding Earl's Court one-way system, see Capital and Counties below for a proposed modification to Earl's Court Vision (CV10)</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Formatted: Font: Calibri, 10 pt, Strikethrough

Changes sought during the hearing

	<i>Chapter/Section</i>	Change Sought	Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)
	<i>Policy replacement schedule</i>	Council asked to consider improving readability by having the full text of the remaining UDP policies in the policy replacement schedule	The Council believes this would make the schedule very cumbersome, and would separate the policy from its supporting text. Instead, the remaining policies of the UDP will be produced as an appendix when the Core Strategy is adopted.
	<i>Glossary – areas of metropolitan importance</i>	The Council agreed to check it includes the Thames	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (JW)
	<i>General</i>	The Council agreed to the need to	Mid August (in conjunction with

**RBKC/18A**

		better signpost where matters relating to the Thames are found in the document	the general signposting item identified on day one)
	<i>Para 4.3.7 and map on following page</i>	The Council agreed to include reference to the Earl's Court One Way System, and put it on the map.	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (PT)
	<i>Para 4.4.2</i>	Include residents in the list of partners and stakeholders	Agreed
	<i>Earl's Court Place (paras 10.1.3 and 10.3.10 in particular)</i>	Council agreed to review the way that the provision of social and community facilities is referenced in relation to the Earl's Court Strategic Site	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (BR)
	<i>Chapter 9, Latimer</i>	Council asked to consider requiring the continuous provision of swimming facilities in the north of the borough, in relation to the redevelopment of the sports centre	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (PT)
	<i>Latimer Place (Chapter 9)</i>	Council agreed to include text at or near 9.3.8 to explain new housing for existing tenants would meet their housing needs, and to consider if it should be included in the vision for Latimer	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (CT)
	<i>9.3.11</i>	Council agreed to change "new local shopping centre" to "new neighbourhood centre"	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (CT)
	<i>9.4.6</i>	Council agreed to take out the word 'shopping'	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (CT)
	<i>Knightsbridge (Chapter 14)</i>	Council agreed to remove reference to Alfresco Dining in relation to Montpellier St on the Knightsbridge plan	Prior to adoption
	<i>South Kensington (Chapter 12)</i>	Council to consider what changes could be made to the supporting text to include reference to the existing residents in this place	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (PT)
	<i>18.1.4 (Lots Road)</i>	Council agreed to include text clarifying that the Lots Road Power Station planning permission includes considerable development in Hammersmith and Fulham	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (PC)

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

	2 pm – 5 pm (Approx)		
<b>Week 1</b>			
<b>Day 2</b> Wednesday 21st July 2010	<b><u>Matter 4 Keeping Life Local</u></b>	<b><u>RBKC responses to statements submitted for the hearings</u></b>	
	- 101812 <i>The Chelsea Society</i>	None	None
	- 179625 <i>DP9 for Chelsfield</i>	None	None
	- 178257 <i>DP9 for Brookfield Developments</i>	None	None
	- 337749 <i>Gerald Eve for Martins Properties (Chelsea) Ltd</i>	None	None
	- 175783 <i>The Kensington Society</i>	- Corporate Action: - Point 1: Line 2: after retailers" add ", landlords, residents, and other stakeholders" (cf p185 Action 1) - Point 10: last line: change "in" to "throughout"	Kensington Society accepted this change
	- 197185 <i>Kensington &amp; Chelsea Social Council</i>	<i>New Corporate Action</i> "The Directorate of Planning and Borough Development will work with Kensington and Chelsea Social Council to ensure there is effective consultation with hard to reach groups on the ongoing production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan."	KCSC accepted this change
	- 233936 <i>The Ladbroke Association</i>	None	None
	- 198604 <i>LPP for clients ( to be confirmed)</i>	None	None
	- 139439 <i>DP9 for Capital &amp; Counties</i>	<i>New Corporate Action</i> <i>RBKC:</i> "The Directorate of Planning and Borough Development will work with LBHF and the GLA to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document/Opportunity Area Framework to bring forward the redevelopment of the Earls Court, including social and community uses as required to sustain a balanced community"	DP9 for Capital and Counties accepted this change
	-284 <i>Melyssa Stokes</i>	None	None

**Changes sought during the hearing**

	<i>Chapter/Section</i>	Change Sought	Council response (or deadline by which response will be made)
	<i>Chapter 7, Portobello</i>	Council to consider how the chapter could better emphasise the local	Mid August (CT/JH)

**RBKC/18A**

		(neighbourhood) function of the centre	
	<i>Chapter 7 (Portobello)</i>	Council to consider if the plan could better reflect the street network around Portobello Road	Prior to adoption
	<i>Glossary</i>	Council agreed to check the definition of social and community uses in the Glossary	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (JMas)
	<i>Chapter 30 (Keeping life local)</i>	Council agreed to include a corporate and partner action in relation to the KCSC assembling a register of social and community uses	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (JMas)
	<i>30.2.4</i>	Council agreed to standardise phrasing to neighbourhood from local	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (JMas)
	<i>Policy CK1c (protecting social and community uses)</i>	Council agreed to remove 'successfully' before demonstrate	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (JMas)
	<i>Policy CK1 (protecting social and community uses)</i>	Council to consider the representation tabled on the day by Gerald Eve, and prepare a written response for the Inspector to consider	Friday 30 <sup>th</sup> July (JMas)
	<i>Throughout plan, but particularly in Chapter 9</i>	Council to update text regarding Building Schools for the Future if necessary, and to forward the revised text to the inspector.	Mid August (JMas)
	<i>30.3.13 – 1-.3.17 (walkable neighbourhoods)</i>	Council to consider modifying wording to allow for monitoring on 600m in the future should that be found to be a more useful indicator of accessibility.	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> July (JMas)
	<i>30.3.4 (post offices)</i>	Council to reconsider the 'red text' following the paragraph, and whether the text could not record that there are 'two types' of social and community uses, those able to be controlled through planning, and others – so that if the use classes order is changed, the plan is transparent in its wish to extend planning controls	Friday 30 <sup>th</sup> July (JMas)

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

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

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

	<i>2 pm – 5 pm (Approx)</i>		
<b>Week 1</b>			
<b>Day 3</b> Thursday 22nd July 2010	<b><u>Matter 6 Strategic Sites</u></b> <b><u>Allocations: Earl's Court and</u></b> <b><u>Warwick Road</u></b>	<b><u>RBKC responses to statements</u></b> <b><u>submitted for the hearings</u></b>	
	- 139439 <i>DP9 for Captial and Counties</i>	See statement of common ground	
	- 175783 <i>The Kensington Society</i>	See statement of common ground between RBKC and Capital and Counties	
	- 197185 <i>Kensington &amp; Chelsea Social Council</i>	See statement of common ground between RBKC and Capital and Counties	
	- 178257 <i>DP9 for Brookfield</i>	See statement of common ground between RBKC and Capital and Counties	