

The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

The Land on the North West Side of Warwick Road Planning Brief Supplementary Planning Document

Statement of Consultation

This statement demonstrates how the Council consulted on the brief, "Land on the south west side of Warwick Road Draft Planning Brief" and met the regulations of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, complying with the Council's draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

Regulation 17 Public Participation

- The Supplementary Planning Document was consulted on during the six-week period from Monday 10th September, 2007, to Monday 22nd October, 2007 and then with some amendments and the inclusion of a masterplan, for a further four week period from Tuesday November 13th until Tuesday 11th December 2007.
- The draft SPD, with a statement of proposal matters and the sustainability report, were made available on the Council's website www.rbkc.gov.uk on the Planning web page. Copies were available on request or could be viewed at the Planning Information Office at the Town Hall between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday. They were also provided at the following libraries for inspection upon request: Kensington Central Library, Chelsea Library, North Kensington Library, Brompton Library, Notting Hill Gate Library and Kensal Library. Paper copies of the SPD were sent out to those who requested one. Information was provided on how to make representations via telephone (020 7361 3879), email (PlanningPolicy@rbkc.gov.uk) or via post to the Town Hall.
- The information on where to view the document and how to make representations was advertised in the local press.

Those consulted were;

- The Edwardes Square. Scarsdale and Abingdon Association; the Cromwell Road Association; the Kensington Society; West London Residents' Association; the Chelsea Society and the Earl's Court Neighbourhood Associations
- All those on the Local Development Framework Consultation Database.
- Statutory consultation bodies as identified in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Statutory bodies are Government Office for London, Greater London Authority, adjoining Planning Authorities and the Highways Agency.
- General consultation bodies considered to be appropriate to the Planning Brief site, Transport for London and Thames Water.

Regulation 18 Representations on Supplementary Planning Documents

- Representations were received from 29 consultees on the first consultation and 14 consultees on the second consultation, and the Council has considered the comments and made changes to the Supplementary Planning Document where considered appropriate. The recommendations from the Sustainability Appraisal have also been taken into account.
- Following this statement is a summary of the main issues raised and how they have been dealt with.
- This document will be available for review on the Council webpage, in the Planning Information Office at Kensington Town Hall and in the local libraries, along with the adopted Planning Brief and the final Sustainability Appraisal.

Draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

The purpose of consultation is to ensure people are involved in the creation of Supplementary Planning Documents and the Council's SCI specifies the steps for consultation. The Council followed the requirements as set out below:

- Consult on the draft Supplementary Planning Document for six weeks.
- Make the draft Supplementary Planning Document and supporting documents available for inspection during normal office hours at Kensington Town Hall and at all local libraries throughout the consultation period.
- Publish the Supplementary Planning Document and supporting documents on the RBKC website (www.rbkc.gov.uk) and state where and when it can be inspected.
- Advertise in the local newspaper where and when the draft Supplementary Planning Document and supporting documents can be inspected, how copies can be obtained, the closing date for representations and where they should be sent.
- Send copies of the draft Supplementary Planning Document and supporting documents to the Government Office for London if it has asked for a copy and to those specific and general consultations bodies the Council considered to be affected by what it contains.
- Explain how the Council has complied with the Statement of Consultation Involvement.
- Ensure adequate publicity is given to the documents.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
FIRST DRAFT Consultation				
General	GLA	The production of the SPD is welcomed by the GLA. There are, however, some key areas in which the GLA wish to see further work and discussion before the SPD is adopted.	Noted	A meeting to be arranged with the GLA to talk through key issues and finalise a joint way forward before the brief is adopted.
	LDA	The LDA supports the co-ordinated approach that has been taken by the Warwick Road draft Planning Brief to the four sites. The LDA welcomes the inclusion of commercial floorspace to service the proposed residential accommodation and the creation of an active frontage to Warwick Road. However, in accordance with London Plan Policy 3D.2 the LDA would recommend that the Council is sufficiently confident that such retail development will not affect the vitality and viability of the town centre. The LDA welcomes the inclusion of Planning Obligations within the brief, in particular, the inclusion of	Noted	The comments of the LDA have been incorporated into the wording of the brief. The retail units have a small floorspace and should primarily serve residents on the site. There should be no adverse effect on the vitality and viability of the nearest shopping centres on this basis.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		<p>Construction Training s106 agreements. However, in accordance with London Plan Policy 3B.12 the LDA requests that job and training opportunities are available to local people with regard to the site infrastructure such as the Youth and Employment facility. In addition goods and services provided by local businesses and small and medium sized enterprises both in the construction and in the operation of the proposed development should be utilised.</p>		
	British Waterways	<p>British Waterways does not own or manage any land or water within 150m of the land covered by the Warwick Road Planning Brief and therefore has no comments</p>	Noted	No change
	Ms E. Arbuthnot	<p>Land to the south west side of Warwick Road is south of Cromwell Road and therefore the brief should refer to land on the northwest side of Warwick Road.</p>	Agreed	The brief title has been amended.
	Ms E. Arbuthnot	<p>It would be sensible to compile one plan for the Tesco/Multiplex development and the rest of the north west side of Warwick Road. The</p>	Not Agreed	<p>The purpose of the brief is to coordinate development on four adjoining sites so that the optimum development potential can be obtained from the sites whilst at the same time securing a sustainable community. 100 Cromwell Road is not an adjoining site</p>

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		Tesco building will need residential infrastructure in just the same way as the rest of the sites.		and therefore does not fit into the aims as explained above. However, the infrastructure requirements for the four Warwick Road sites will be taken into account when an application for 100 Cromwell Road is submitted.
	Theatres Trust	The consultation is not directly relevant to the Trust's work we have no specific comment to make but having read the brief we suggest that a multipurpose community building would be appropriate to incorporate a fitness centre, youth activities and a performance space for local amateur dramatic groups. Audiences coming to an event will enliven the surrounding area in the evening and provide regular custom for the new local bars, cafes and the Radnor Arms outside normal working and shopping hours.	Noted	The brief will include the need for space for a community hall which could fulfil a variety of uses, including performance space for local groups.
	Kensington Society	Ideally this brief should include the site next to Tesco, 100 West Cromwell Road which is currently the subject of two planning applications. In the meantime the planning brief for Fenelon Place should be re-endorsed to make it clear what type and scale of development would be acceptable on this site. Consideration should be given to the possibility of	No Agreed	The purpose of the brief is to coordinate development on four adjoining sites so that the optimum development potential can be obtained from the sites whilst at the same time securing a sustainable community. 100 Cromwell Road is not an adjoining site and therefore does not fit into the aims as explained above. However, the infrastructure requirements for the four Warwick Road sites will be taken into account when an application for 100 Cromwell Road is submitted.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		turning the enlarged planning brief into an Area Action plan. This will require an amendment to the LDF scheme. An Area Action Plan would have greater status.		
	Open Spaces Society	The Society welcomes the importance given to open space in the brief but we are not too happy about the suggested arrangements for public open space, especially as illustrated in Appendix 2. There are two important aspects to this: recreation and nature conservation. With care these need not conflict.	Noted	The illustrative masterplan shown in the original draft brief has now been amended to an indicative masterplan.
	Jehovah's Witnesses	There are no provisions for Places of Worship in the draft document. This is essential as communities become increasingly secular and fragmented. It is requested this should be considered.	Agreed	The need for a community hall has now been included in the brief. Whilst this may not fit all the requirements for a place of worship it would enable a group of people to meet together in an act of worship if they so desired.
	Cromwell Road Association	While the need for certain community provisions are rightly included, the brief does not include the aparthotel or the remaining Tesco site and this seems likely to distort how these provisions are located between the various sites. What community provision included in the redevelopment	Noted	Community provision required for the other sites in Warwick Road, such as health and education provision is taken into account in what is required in the brief.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		of the Commonwealth Institute could also be relevant.		
	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)	The CPRE agree with the content of the planning brief. They have provided comments on the Non Technical Summary of the Sustainable Appraisal which are supportive of the brief.	Noted	No response required
Section 1.0 Purpose				
Section 1.0 Purpose	Kensington Society	This section needs to be more visionary in its purpose – not just about function and design, but about place making, creating sustainable communities, getting the right mix of uses in the right places and to make this a demonstration project for sustainability. It is of a scale that it could be an Action Area Plan. Line 1: south –west rather than north west side	Agreed	The draft brief has been reworded in terms of its sense of purpose and vision to create a sustainable community in all its forms. However, it is not agreed that an Action Plan is required for the whole of the Warwick Road. The brief specifically is concerned with coordinating development and creating permeability on adjoining sites. An Action Plan is not required to do this and would not fit into the timescale required.
Section 1.0	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners wish to change the emphasis of paragraph 1.2 from the Council wish to create the right conditions for a sustainable neighbourhood with a sense of identity and place, creating a	Not Agreed	It is acknowledged that there is a need to create more housing in the Royal Borough and to meet the borough's strategic allocation as stipulated in the London Plan. It is important to develop sites to their optimum, but not at the expense of over development or the provision of supporting infrastructure. The creation of a sustainable community in all its forms is

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		mix of uses that will support this aim and to create a model template for exemplar architecture. They wish to change to the Royal Borough meeting its strategic planning objectives by including the critical priority to provide more housing and to optimise development density through the creation of new townscape in highly sustainable locations.		more important.
Section 1.0	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners wish to substitute the word, “masterplan” for a “framework approach”. The Council’s wish to ensure that the overall development of the sites is not compromised contrary to the public interest and the proper planning of the area should be deleted from the brief.	Noted	This comment has been superseded by the publication of an indicative masterplan with the second amended draft brief.
Section 1.0	Councillor Husband	Owners may make individual applications but the draft brief’s co-ordinated approach is essential if a successful development is to be achieved.	Noted	No further response required.
Section 2.0 Status				
Paragraph 2.1	Developers/ Landowners	The reference to the SPD providing statutory guidance should be changed to non statutory guidance	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended.
Section 3.0				

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Vision				
General	Councillor Husband	Within the design principles I feel the most important are high design standards including in the public realm; sensitive enclosure of Warwick Road; useable public open space and the new school.	Noted.	No further response is required
Paragraph 3.2	Developers/ Landowners	The reference to the creation of new public open space should be changed to the creation of new open space	Agreed	The linear park will be public open space, the remaining space will be private, but will be publicly accessible.
Paragraph 3.2	Kensington Society	The brief needs to address the physical barrier of Warwick Road including possible re-design of width, footways and crossings to integrate the sites with the rest of the area- these could be part of the related benefits from the developments.	Noted	The brief now mentions the possibility of crossings rather than one crossing to Warwick Road. The pavements will be repaved. However, altering the width of the road is not envisaged by the brief. Warwick Road is part of the Transport for London (TfL) Road Network (TLRN) and TfL are the highway authority for managing traffic movement and the road. Discussions are continuing with TfL to address these aspects.
Paragraph 3.3	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners wish for the word, “objectives” to be substituted for “principles” in relation to the aspects of key design. They wish to add an additional objectives, “led by a high quality residential development”; “Development which optimises density”; and substitute “landmark school” for “school”. They wish to delete references to medium rise	Not Agreed	It is agreed that the word “objectives” can be substituted for “principles” in relation to the key design aspects. The objectives can also be led by the need to achieve a high quality residential development. However, development which optimises density, whilst important, must be accompanied by other safeguards. The reference to “landmark” school has been deleted. The need for medium sized development, sensitive enclosure of Warwick Road, and active street frontages are all important components of the brief. The creation of public open space as a focus is also important.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		development; sensitive enclosure of Warwick Road; active street frontages and change “public open space” to “open space”		
Paragraph 3.3	Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA)	The MPA recommends a reference to safety and policing is included in the list of key design principles.	Agreed	This objective has been included in the amended brief.
Section 4.0 History and Preferred Use				
Paragraph 4.2	Kensington Society	Suitable uses will be strongly determined by current and proposed public transport accessibility levels and will need to have transport assessments. Since these sites are outside town centres and will have medium/high public transport accessibility, uses with high trip generation, especially large scale offices (see UDP Chapter 6) should not be encouraged as they should be within a 400m walking distance of a high capacity underground station. This is also in line with PPS6 and PPG13. See also TfL’s Transport Assessment Best Practice Guide, May 2006.	Noted	Public transport accessibility levels will be taken into account when future applications are received for the Warwick Road sites. However, all the sites have medium to high public transport accessibility. The reference to a 400m walking distance has been included in the draft brief.
Section 5.0 Development				

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Opportunity				
General	London Development Agency	The LDA supports the coordinated approach that has been taken by the Warwick Road draft planning brief to the four sites on the south west side of Warwick Road to ensure comprehensive redevelopment of this area.	Noted	No further response is required
General	Councillor Husband	<p>I agree with the key residential section of the draft. The provision of family sized affordable homes is a priority and I am keen to see innovative approaches to intermediate housing explored.</p> <p>There should be more flexibility about commercial uses although I agree that a casino or nightclub would not be acceptable. Overall, provision of affordable housing is bound to be the most onerous obligation for developers but it must not be allowed to completely dominate other vital benefits – public open space, educational and social amenities, fine streetscape etc.</p> <p>The new primary school is welcome and will provide an opportunity for design of an</p>	Noted	With regard to commercial uses, there is a limit with regard to floorspace because of the out of centre location and the concern of traffic generation. A large destination type A3, A4 or A5 use would not be appropriate on these grounds. The site is earmarked for residential uses with low key commercial uses providing a supporting role.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		outstanding public building in this part of the Royal Borough.		
Paragraph 5.1	Developers/ Landowners	Substitute the word “could” for “would” in terms of specifying development opportunities.	Not Agreed	This removes an element of certainty that is required by the brief.
Paragraph 5.2	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners wish to change the emphasis from the Council stating the primary use of the sites for residential accommodation to the Council supporting the primary use of the sites for residential accommodation	Not Agreed	The Council is very clear on this point, the primary use of the sites will be for residential accommodation and the brief provides certainty in this respect.
Paragraph 5.2	Kensington Society	The residential densities will need to be assessed using the methodology in the London Plan which enables boroughs to establish “appropriate density ranges” for areas, with each range having an upper and lower limit, based on broad location, public transport accessibility and townscape. It is possible that different sites could fall into different appropriate density ranges depending on relative proximity to underground stations (see	Noted	Whilst this is acknowledged it is not considered appropriate to provide individual density ranges to each site. The PTAL level is not so sensitive as to control density in this manner.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		London Plan Alterations, Table 3A.2 and UDP Map 9).		
Paragraph 5.2	Kensington Society	<p>The Kensington Society is concerned that an open ended approach to density with the only limitations being height, townscape, massing, layout, sunlight/daylight and quality of design. Several of these are subjective. The only real limitations are the footprint of the blocks and height limits. The effect of open ended briefs is that the developer will fill the 3 dimensional envelopes and place a considerable pressure on infrastructure.</p> <p>We consider that in line with the London Plan density matrix, the sites should specify appropriate density ranges and we suggest 650-800 hrha as the appropriate density range.</p>	Not Agreed	<p>Density is considered to be a very blunt tool in indicating appropriate development for these sites. The adjoining sites have different site areas and the manner in which open space on the indicative masterplan has been divided between them would lead to some misleading results if the density was calculated using the boundaries of ownership. It is considered far better to examine all the parameters that can indicate that a site is being overdeveloped and determine a planning application on this basis.</p>
Paragraph 5.2	Kensington Society	<p>The accessibility of these sites is consistently overestimated. The UDP public transport accessibility map overestimates actual walking distance as it does not take into account physical barriers. Each of the sites has a different accessibility and improving bus services will not see a marked difference, neither will</p>	Noted	<p>PTAL maps measures accessibility without acknowledging physical boundaries. This is a further reason as to why using different densities to control the form of development on the Warwick Road sites is considered to be a blunt tool.</p>

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		improvements to the West London line services		
Paragraph 5.2	Kensington Society	Detailed analysis of the accessibility of each of the sites should be undertaken, using actual walking distances and frequency of services, to establish an appropriate density range for each site.	Noted	PTAL maps measures accessibility without acknowledging physical boundaries. This is a further reason as to why using different densities to control the form of development on the Warwick Road sites is considered to be a blunt tool.
Paragraph 5.2	Greater London Authority	The brief identifies a density above 650 habitable rooms per hectare. In this case the density indicates matrix indicates that the central location and reasonably high public transport accessibility level suggests a density in the range of 650 to 1,100 habitable rooms may be considered appropriate, subject to other policies in the London Plan. On this basis the brief is consistent with the London Plan approach to density. Reference to the density matrix should be made in the brief.	Agreed	There is now a reference to the density matrix within the draft brief.
Paragraph 5.2	Ms E Arbuthnot	A density above 650 ha/rooms/Ha is far too high and will provoke people to think of themselves as numbers rather than individuals. It is likely to cause properties to become run down much sooner than would a lower density. We have the	Not Agreed	The sites are suitable for a residential density above 650 ha/rooms/Ha given their transport accessibility and relative lack of townscape constraints compared with some other parts of the borough. This is in line with the London Plan and has the support of the GLA as explained above.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		highest residential densities in the country and need to resist governmental pressures to increase still further.		
Paragraph 5.3	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners wish a mix of residential units to be in accordance with the UDP. The specification included in the draft brief including a minimum of 25% proportion of family sized units should be deleted	Not Agreed	The need for family sized units
Paragraph 5.3	Kensington Society	Mix of market units still to be decided.	Noted	The mix will be considered as part of any planning application submitted for the sites
Paragraph 5.5	Greater London Authority	Reference to the 50% target for affordable housing is supported.	Noted	No response required
Paragraph 5.5	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners wish the affordable housing component to be calculated on the number of habitable rooms rather than the number of units, habitable rooms or floorspace depending on overall planning considerations of the proposal.	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended to take this into account.
Paragraph 5.5	London Planning Practice on behalf of the then owners of the Telephone Exchange site (since sold to Northacre) and	The expected provision of 50% of the affordable housing and the required provision of 25% of the market housing as family units linked to the ground floor amenity space is unlikely to be possible on a site that is expected to deliver development of approximately	Not Agreed	The amount and mix of affordable housing will be expressed as targets in the brief in line with the London Plan. Further flexibility than this is not justified.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	Gerald Eve on behalf of the Charles House developers	10 storeys. We believe the housing mix should be provided in accordance with current planning policy and applied flexibly with reference to Policy H19 of the UDP. The market housing mix should be expressed as a target in this context.		
Paragraph 5.5	Gerald Eve on behalf of the developers of the Charles House site	We believe a calculation for affordable housing based on habitable rooms is appropriate and by limiting the calculation to this, it avoids any discrepancies in comparing the different schemes as they come forward. We believe issues of viability will need to be factored in to the assessment of the affordable housing package for each scheme.	Agreed	The percentage of affordable housing based on habitable rooms has now been included in the draft brief together with reference to a test of viability.
Paragraph 5.6	Greater London Authority	Reference to 70% affordable housing delivery is welcome and consistent with the London Plan. Reference to viability remains consistent with London Plan policy 3A.8 and is appropriate. The requirement for lifetime homes and wheelchair accessible homes is also welcomed.	Noted	No response required.
Paragraph 5.6	London Planning	The brief should be more explicit in stating that the	Not Agreed	It is accepted that the amount of affordable housing and mix of units are targets as mentioned in the

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	Practice on behalf of the then owners of the Telephone Exchange site (since sold to Northacre)	affordable housing percentage and mix of units are targets and will be applied flexibly based on the individual circumstances of each site.		London Plan and the draft brief has been altered accordingly. Whilst there may be other material considerations to take into account it is not considered appropriate that the need for flexibility should be required in the brief. Individual applications for the sites will be determined on their own merits.
Paragraph 5.6	Developers/landowners	The developers/landowners wish for the a <u>target</u> of 70% affordable housing as social housing for rent rather than a minimum of 70% as specified in the draft brief. In a similar manner they wish for a <u>target</u> of 50% to be family sized units rather than the minimum of 50% stated in the draft brief. They wish to substitute the words “where possible” for the provision of large family sized units and wheelchair accessible housing on the ground floor and the words “where possible” in relation to affordable housing units being constructed to the Lifetime Homes standard.	Not Agreed	The reference to the amount of affordable housing being a target is agreed. The words, “where possible” dilute the requirements of the brief and are not agreed.
Paragraph 5.7	Developers/Landowners	The developers/landowners wish for the provision of off site affordable housing to be permitted in exceptional circumstances rather than the draft brief stating that this will not be permitted. The developers/landowners	Not Agreed	There is no justification for affordable housing to be provided off site. This is contrary to the aim of a mixed and balanced community and there are no constraints which would justify such an approach.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		wish to the merits of the scheme to be considered rather than each application being treated on its own merits with regard to the amount of affordable housing provided.		
Paragraph 5.8	London Development Authority	The LDA welcomes the inclusion of commercial floorspace to service the proposed residential accommodation and the creation of an active frontage to Warwick Road. However, in accordance with London Plan policy 3D.2 the LDA recommends that the Council is sufficiently confident that such retail development will not affect the viability and vitality of the town centre. In addition the LDA requests that any opportunity to include additional small scale employment uses within the overall redevelopment is considered.	Noted	The scale of retail development is such that it should not affect the vitality or viability of Earl's Court Road or Kensington High Street. The commercial floorspace provided in the brief should provide small scale employment opportunities.
Paragraph 5.8	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners wish the words, "Opportunities should be explored" rather than using the word, "provide" in relation to commercial floorspace on the Warwick Road frontage. In a similar vein they wish the word, "could" to be substituted for "would" in	Not Agreed	All these comments are considered to dilute the function of the brief which is to state what the requirements of the Council will be on these sites. The developers will need to demonstrate why they cannot meet or address the requirements of the brief with regard to individual planning applications.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		relation to the form of the units. With regard to shopfronts instead of stating that they must be provided on all units facing the Warwick Road the words, "shopfronts should be provided" would be preferred.		
Paragraph 5.8	Greater London Authority	The commercial section of the brief seeks low key uses, and option for the retention of the Radnor Arms. The thrust of this section is generally supported.	Noted	No response required.
Paragraph 5.9	London Planning Practice on behalf of the then owners of the Telephone Exchange site (since sold to Northacre) and Gerald Eve on behalf of the developers of the Charles House site.	It is not considered desirable to require all of the ground floors along Warwick Road to be retail/commercial floorspace as this is very much a secondary location for retail. A variety of uses including restaurants, community uses, small offices etc should be considered favourably as a means of enabling viable active frontages along Warwick Road where these are considered appropriate.	Agreed	The need for an active frontage along the Warwick Road with a mix of uses including social and community uses is the overriding requirement within the brief
Paragraph 5.9	Ms E. Arbuthnot	The small scale café restaurant should provide gluten free meals. The Coeliac Society believes that 10% of the population may be celiac, but at the moment there is no provision to eat in the borough.	Not Agreed	The provision of Gluten free meals goes beyond the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act.
Paragraph 5.11	Developers/	In relation to the retention of	Agreed	The brief has been amended accordingly.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	Landowners	the Radnor Arms this should be qualified by stating that demolition may be required in order to achieve a comprehensive design solution.		
Paragraph 5.12	Kensington Society	The brief is silent on large scale office development- it should be discouraged.	Agreed	The brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 5.13	Kensington Society	Agree that the Homebase site could be multi-storey, mixed use development –retail with several floors of housing above.	Noted	This aim is reflected in the brief, but the precise configuration of development will be the subject of further discussion with the developers.
Paragraph 5.14	Developers/ Landowners	In relation to open space, the developers/landowners wish the word “public” to be deleted, but rather to state, “accessible to the public.” They also wish for a series of linear parks or gardens squares to be referred to rather than the one linear open space or garden square referred to in the draft brief. The stipulation in the draft brief that children’s play facilities should be included should be changed to, “could be included” and a reference to the illustrative framework at appendix one could be made.	Not Agreed	The proposed linear park will be public open space. The remaining space will be private open space which may be publicly accessible depending on the boundary treatment. The provision of Children’s play facilities are a fundamental requirement of the brief.
Paragraph 5.14	Kensington Society	Strongly support the provision of amenity space/park. However, the draft brief only says it “would be welcome” and	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		then says it must not be incidental to the building layout and should include children's play facilities. Change "would be welcome" to "should be provided."		
Paragraph 5.14	Greater London Authority	The principles identified within the brief regarding amenity space are generally supported. The provision of a new linear park is particularly welcomed. There is, however, a lack of detail. The section should include reference to the Mayor's draft SPG "Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation" (October 2006). New development should provide space and play facilities that seek, as a minimum, 10 sq m per child including on-site play space for the under five year old age group for specific schemes.	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended to include the on-site play space standard.
Paragraph 5.14	Open Spaces Society	UDP paragraph 11.3.6 suggests that small open spaces can contribute to areas of deficiency (such as this is) but that does not mean they should be as tiny as a developer can get away with. The brief should indicate the area (sq metres) that is	Not Agreed	Given the central London location of the sites and the potential inflexibility of stipulating the amount of open space that will be required, it is considered inappropriate to stipulate the square metres of open space to be provided. The indicative masterplan provides a layout that responds to permeability and open space requirements.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		desirable here and give reasons from which it can be judged.		
Paragraph 5.14	Ms E. Arbuthnot	In addition to the private fitness club and children's play space, there needs to be somewhere for the teenagers to play football etc.	Agreed	It is envisaged that the playground area associated with the school can be used outside school hours for recreational activity.
Paragraph 5.14	Cromwell Road Association	We emphasise the need for facilities for older children and young adults to get meaningful exercise, both indoors and outdoors. A series of private fitness clubs would not meet this need, and restricting the use of the potential play space by the school to the 3-16 age group would prevent natural progression. Its is essential to provide an environment to provide a breeding ground for a gang culture.	Agreed	The use of the school play space outside school hours is not restricted to a particular age group and the brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 5.14	Open Spaces Society	For public open space to be of maximum benefit it should not be broken up by roads. Users do not want to worry about traffic. In particular, children, the elderly and disabled should be able to wander about the greatest possible area in total safety. This also permits the maximum flexibility in layout for ornamental and more active purposes, and facilities	Noted	The open spaces on the sites shown in the indicative masterplan (that serve the surrounding residents) are not broken up by roads. However, access roads between the sites are required for service and access purposes.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		maintenance.		
Paragraph 5.15	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners wish to provide private amenity space and children's playspace for family sized accommodation where possible rather than for it to be expected. They also wish to add the words, "where appropriate" for communal open space not being segregated between affordable and market housing. The reference to ground floor amenity space being preferred in lieu of balconies for family sized affordable accommodation should be deleted.	Not Agreed	Amenity space must be provided for family sized accommodation. The form that this will take can be discussed. However, ground floor amenity space is preferred. Communal open space should also not be segregated and an appropriately worded s106 agreement may be required to secure this aspect.
Paragraph 5.16	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the word, "public" from open space provision	Agreed	The wording in the brief will be amended to reflect the linear park being public open space whilst other spaces will be private but may have public access.
Paragraph 5.17	Kensington Society	Public realm improvements – this needs to include improvements to the pedestrian environment in Warwick Road and the provision of new crossings.	Agreed	The brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 5.18	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners wish to clarify that any reference to buffer zone land will be Network Rail land. They wish for the reference to suitable species being planted which contribute towards the	Not Agreed	The final demarcation of land primarily devoted to ecological purposes and that devoted for residential garden space has yet to be agreed.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		biodiversity of the area and suitable species being planted which reflect the diverse nature of native species in the area and wildlife needs, to be deleted.		
Paragraph 5.18	Natural England	We are supportive of the principle that open space should be an integral part of any development rather than an incidental result of it. We support the inclusion of a buffer zone at the rear of the site to protect and contribute to the existing biodiversity of the West London line and the consideration of a range of biodiversity enhancements that can be incorporated within the design of the development and increase the site's permeability to wildlife. We are also supportive of the inclusion of the above elements as part of a s106 agreement. Without this it becomes difficult to guarantee that these elements will be carried through and maintained.	Noted	No response required.
Paragraph 5.18	Open Spaces Society	Paragraph 5.18 does not mention that the West London Line embankment behind the brief area forms part of a Nature Conservation Site of	Agreed	The wording of the draft brief has been amended accordingly.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		Borough Importance – Grade 1 – and a Green Corridor. This should be taken advantage of by providing links into the proposed development. UDP Policy L17 should be added to the relevant policies to be borne in mind.		
Paragraph 5.18	Kensington Society	Support a buffer zone.	Noted	No response required.
Paragraph 5.19	Developers/ Landowners	The word “sought” should be substituted for “proposed” in relation to the new level two primary school.	Not Agreed	A new level two primary school is required.
Paragraph 5.19	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners suggest that the background information as to why a school is required should be provided separately.	Not agreed	This background information provides appropriate justification for the school in the context of the sites and it therefore should be included.
Paragraph 5.19	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners query whether parking requirements should be discussed in relation to the school.	Not Agreed	Parking requirements for the school are discussed at paragraph 9.6 of the draft brief and this is considered entirely appropriate.
Paragraphs 5.19 to 5.22	Kensington Society	Support the provision of educational facilities – nursery and primary provision- funded through developments located on the Charles House site.	Noted	No response required.
Paragraph 5.19	Developers/ Landowners	Substitute the would “could” for “will” in terms of the primary school catering for the needs of the wider area.	Agreed	The brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 5.19	Bernard Selwyn	Paragraph 5.19 does not	Not Agreed	Given the central London location of the sites none of

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		<p>convince in identifying the Charles House site as the best for a new primary school. It would be open to traffic noise and atmospheric pollution from both north and east directions. The railway potentially could see its use increase for both freight and passenger traffic, the latter often hauled by diesel locomotives. If windows have to be kept closed, air conditioning is necessary. This will increase costs of construction and fuel consumption.</p>		<p>them are ideal for a school. However, the Charles House site is considered most appropriate in terms of its size and accessibility. Issues of noise and air pollution are likely to be common to all the sites.</p>
Paragraph 5.19	Bernard Selwyn	<p>No school site west of Warwick Road can be ideal for prospective pupils but there may be no realistic alternative in the foreseeable future. However, unless the whole of the land subject to the brief is in single ownership giving full flexibility on how it may be developed, it is necessary for the exact boundaries of the school site to be defined formally in preparation for its acquisition by the Council. As part of this, consideration needs to be given to the provision of adequate safe pedestrian accessibility across Warwick Road, especially at</p>	Not Agreed	<p>It is not fundamental to the delivery of a school that a precise boundary needs to be agreed at this stage. Discussions are continuing with the landowners/developers as to whether the front or rear of the site as it faces Warwick road is the most appropriate. The brief considers the question of crossings to Warwick Road.</p>

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		peak hours.		
Paragraph 5.19	Bernard Selwyn	If the Charles House site is not allocated for education, then the obvious alternative is housing. If this is the case serious consideration should be given to the conversion of the existing building. As paragraph 6.2 says, it is robust, thoughtfully designed and not unattractive. One could be more enthusiastic and say no alternative development is likely to be visually superior. However, if practicable, the retention of the charities offices at low rents would be welcome.	Not Agreed	The brief requires a primary school for part of the Charles House site as part of a mixed use scheme on the site. Whilst the present building is considered not to be unattractive, this should not fetter the development of this site. A replacement building could be visually superior.
Paragraph 5.21	DP9 on behalf of the developers of the TA site	We welcome the removal of the standard education formula.	Noted	No response required.
Paragraph 5.22	Greater London Authority	Whilst the GLA recognise the aspirations of the Council for a new school, the formal identification of Charles House and requirements of financial contributions should not prejudice the schemes ability to deliver the Mayor's strategic priorities, specifically the delivery of affordable housing and where relevant, any transport improvements. Further discussion will be	Noted	Officers will meet the GLA before the brief is finally adopted. However, the wording of the brief will not be amended at this stage.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		required on this matter to ensure an appropriate solution is met before the Council formally adopts the SPD.		
Paragraph 5.23	Developers/ Landowners	Substitute the words “play area” for “play ground”	Not Agreed	Play area may imply the use of internal play space whereas playground implies outside playing space which is what is required.
Section 6.0 Design Opportunities				
General	Greater London Authority	The tone of the design section is overly prescriptive and does not adequately or flexibly allow for innovation in design beyond the parameters of the brief. For example, throughout the document adherence to a particular building height is dictated which is substantiated by the character of the locality. Whilst the character remains an important feature, the brief should be flexible to allow additional height or density in certain areas (particularly those with higher levels of accessibility) in order to maximise development opportunity having regard to the points of concern raised in the brief, such as avoiding the canyon effect and sense of enclosure.	Noted	The reference to storey heights has been amended to reflect this concern to respond flexibly. However, it is considered important to give clarity to developers regarding the maximum principal storey heights that may be possible on these sites given surrounding townscape and residential amenity concerns. In order to achieve varying roof heights the possibility of further setback storeys (expressed in brackets) has been added to the brief.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		The concepts identified with demolition, layout, built form, Homebase site, legibility and permeability section are generally supported.		
General	Councillor Husband	I do not see a need to retain any of the existing buildings. Personally, I am less concerned than some about taller buildings provided they are of high quality and in the right setting. A development with a variety of different heights would be preferable to a large number of 8-10 storey boxes. We need to accept that there will be separate entrances to market and affordable housing but we should not allow segregation to follow through into outside space and other facilities.	Noted	No response required.
Paragraph 6.3	Kensington Society	Strongly support the retention of the Radnor Arms – the last sentence needs to be much more conditional - demolition will only be allowed if significant wider planning benefits would otherwise be lost. The current wording promotes demolition.	Agreed	The brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 6.3	Bernard Selwyn	The Radnor Arms is recommended for retention although it is now closed and boarded up. However,	Noted	Demolition is supported if significant wider planning benefits are secured.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		demolition should be more positively supported. Widening the pavement and opening up sightlines here would be a significant planning benefit outweighing retention. It does not have such unique character as to warrant retention.		
Paragraph 6.4	Developers/ Landowners	The developers/landowners wish to delete the reference to the setback of the telephone exchange from Warwick Road as an important feature. The fact that it reduces the sense of enclosure in Warwick Road should also be deleted. The reference to the mural being removed provided public art is provided elsewhere on the site should also be deleted.	Not Agreed	The setback and how it reduced enclosure to Warwick Road is an important design principle. It is made clear in the brief that this was for road widening purposes.
Paragraph 6.4	London Planning Practice on behalf of the then owners of the Telephone Exchange site (since sold to Northacre) and Gerald Eve on behalf of the developers of the Charles House site.	In relation to the Telephone Exchange, the building's setback was only required for a long abandoned road widening scheme and it is not considered that the current position should dictate any future proposals on this and neighbouring sites, as the illustrative masterplan attached to the brief already shows. We would request that paragraph 6.4 be amended with the wording set out in the collective landowners	Not Agreed	The setback and how it reduced enclosure to Warwick Road is an important design principle. It is made clear in the brief that this was for road widening purposes.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		representations.		
Paragraph 6.4	Kensington Society	Greater enclosure of Warwick Road could be achieved if the whole townscape of this road were reassessed and reconfigured as part of a greater integration with the surrounding area.	Not Agreed	Reassessing all the townscape within Warwick Road goes beyond what can be achieved in relation to the brief. It is questionable what would actually be achieved by undertaking such an analysis. Greater enclosure could be interpreted as increasing the height of the existing buildings in Warwick Road which would not be welcome.
Paragraph 6.5	Bernard Selwyn	Homebase as a retail DIY centre is of considerable value as there are no others comparable within easy reach from much of Kensington. It is also pointed out that this store provides employment opportunities. However, the space above the warehouse can be better utilised and whilst housing, as suggested is one possibility, sport and recreational purposes might be considered in conjunction with the adjacent school development.	Noted	It is possible that the space above the Homebase store could partly be used for leisure and recreation purposes. However, this will be the subject of further discussion and there is the question of accessibility.
Paragraphs 6.7 and 6.8	Kensington Society	Generally welcome a more coherent structure with a block structure to make the sites more permeable, through both north/south and east/west routes, and allow for less massive developments	Noted	It is considered that this is achieved in the new indicative masterplan.
Paragraph 6.7	Cromwell Road Association	More detailed architectural rules should be laid down to prevent a hotchpotch of	Not Agreed	It is not the purpose of the planning system to interfere with detailed matters of design. The height and general massing of buildings are important considerations

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		conflicting unrelated styles. It is the homogeneity of the much admired streets and squares in the borough which is one key to their attractiveness.		which are addressed in the brief. The planning department will play a coordinating role to ensure that different detailed design styles do not clash, although contrasts in style can often provide variety and interest.
Paragraph 6.8	Developers/ Landowners	Substitute the word "would" for "could" in terms of the need for an orthogonal grid. Substitute the word "could" for "should" in relation to site layout needs.	Not Agreed	In view of the adoption of an indicative masterplan it is considered appropriate to be robust in terms of the layout that is being sought.
Paragraph 6.8	Developers/ Landowners And London Planning Practice on behalf of the former owners of the Telecom site.	Delete the reference to an upgraded rear service road forming a new public highway that extends through the sites to link Kensington High street, preferably lining up with Russell Road.	Agreed	It is agreed that a rear service road is not required and reference to it has been deleted from the brief.
Paragraph 6.8	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to an additional north-south route through much of the site, preferably aligned with Warwick Road (north) and having pedestrian priority and limited servicing use.	Agreed	This has been replaced with the proposal for a public linear park.
Paragraph 6.11	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the word "public" with reference to the provision of open space	Not Agreed	It is envisaged that the highways will be adopted as part of the scheme and therefore reference to public highways is appropriate.
Paragraph 6.13 Scale	Developers/ Landowners	The reference to a high building being out of scale with the established scale and character of this part of Kensington	Not Agreed	A tall building (normally taken as above) is not considered appropriate for these sites given the townscape context. The brief responds as flexibly as it can in relation to the lack of constraints regarding listed

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		should be deleted. Instead make reference to the limited opportunities for coordinated regeneration within the borough which can maximise the development potential of the site without the immediate constraints of conservation area and historic building considerations.		buildings or immediately abutting conservation areas.
Paragraph 6.13	Developers/ Landowners	Add sentences, "Collectively these sites represent a major opportunity within the Royal Borough to create a new high quality urban environment that maximises the potential of each of the sites through a coordinated approach. Also: "the size of the site as a whole provides the opportunity to optimise density through high quality urban design"	Not Agreed	"Maximising the potential of each site" in a paragraph dealing with the scale of buildings may be open to misinterpretation. In a similar vein, "optimising density" may indicate that the Council is content to support large scale buildings on this site without the safeguards stipulated in the brief.
Paragraph 6.13	DP9 on behalf of the developers of the TA site	We believe it is inappropriate to prescribe heights in the brief, particularly on relatively unconstrained sites such as these.	Not Agreed	This is a surprising comment given the fact that the developers/landowners have indicated that they wish the brief to deliver as much certainty as possible in relation to these sites. A guideline to storey height is considered appropriate in relation to the coordination of the four sites in order that they respect and relate to one another and the wider townscape.
Paragraph 6.13	Gerald Eve on behalf of the developers of the Charles	The four sites offer a unique opportunity to bring together a large scale coordinated redevelopment project that	Not Agreed	A guideline to storey height is considered appropriate in relation to the coordination of the four sites in order that they respect and relate to one another and the wider townscape.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	House site	maximises the use of the land and offers a coordinated urban design solution. We believe it is premature to seek to dictate exact building heights. We hope through a process of technical and urban design analysis to reach broad agreement on the scale of development.		
Paragraph 6.13	Kensington Society	Strongly support the rejection of high buildings and strong guidance of height of buildings, including 5 storey limit along Warwick Road	Not Agreed	A 5 storey limit on the Warwick Road is considered unduly restrictive.
Paragraph 6.13	London Planning Practice on behalf of the then owners of the Telephone Exchange site (since sold to Northacre)	Notwithstanding the position set out in the representations set out by all the landowners, we believe that there is little justification to seek a lower height of development on the TE and TA sites when compared to the Homebase and Charles House sites. In the interests of maximising the potential of each site to deliver a high quality new urban quarter containing new housing, community facilities and public open space, heights of between 6 and 9 storeys are considered overly restrictive. We believe that the buildings fronting Warwick Road could	Noted	The approach to the indicative heights in the masterplan has been revisited with these comments in mind. An indication of the number of principal storeys has now been included together with the possibility of subservient roof additions that would have to be set in.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		sustain a height of 7 principal storeys without causing any detrimental impacts.		
Paragraph 6.14	Developers/ Landowners	Insert the words, “In its current form” in relation to the height and massing of Charles House and its limit of development. Add, that through high quality design and architecture it can be demonstrated that additional height is appropriate in terms of design and townscape and given the sites prominent location on Kensington High Street, the Council may consider a moderate increase in height of development coming forward. In order to achieve this, the high street façade should retain set backs.	Not Agreed	The indicative masterplan provides sufficient scope for some flexibility in relation to building heights. It is not considered appropriate to invite the developers/landowners of this site to provide additional height.
Paragraph 6.14	Kensington Society	Delete reference to the height of a replacement building at Charles House “not expected” to go higher than the existing building and insert “should not”	Not Agreed	It is considered that the developers/landowners of the Charles House site should be given the opportunity to demonstrate that any additional height would not harm the surrounding townscape.
Paragraph 6.15	Developers/ Landowners	Delete this reference to the front blocks facing Warwick Road having a height of up to 5 principal storeys. Instead insert the sentence, “Building heights should complement local townscape context and the need to optimise new development”	Not Agreed	In reality this replacement sentence means very little and dilutes the draft brief.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Paragraph 6.16	Kensington Society	The last sentence appears to precipitate demolition of the Radnor Arms	Agreed	The Radnor Arms will realistically have to be demolished to fit in with the indicative materplan.
Paragraph 6.17	Developers/ Landowners	Delete paragraph dealing with the height of development within the site which is meant to be medium rise and expected to be between 6 and 9 storeys and remain below the height of the Charles House building.	Not Agreed	A guideline to storey height is considered appropriate in relation to the coordination of the four sites in order that they respect and relate to one another and achieve a satisfactory townscape.
Paragraphs 6.19 to 6.25 Built Form	Kensington Society	Welcome the need for variation in building form and heights – there is a danger in having a uniform, density – maximising approach.	Noted	No response required.
Paragraph 6.21	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to large bulky developments with little visual and physical penetration being unacceptable and insert “visual and physical penetration of development sites will be welcomed.”	Not Agreed	Large bulky developments are not supported on the sites.
Paragraph 6.22	Developers/ Landowners	Delete this paragraph which relates to the height of any new development fronting Warwick Road not creating a canyon effect or sense of over-enclosure. This can be achieved by limiting development to five principal storeys.	Not Agreed	The avoidance of a canyon effect needs to be stipulated in the brief.
Paragraph 6.24	Developers/ Landowners	Delete reference to reduced storey heights in relation to reducing the bulk of the	Not Agreed	Reduced storey heights may be required in response to overshadowing problems. The reference to public open space in this context should be deleted as this point is

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		development and problems of overshadowing. Delete reference to “public” open spaces.		relevant to all open space on the site
Paragraph 6.26 Legibility	Developers/ Landowners	Include reference to larger setbacks from the street may be acceptable (ie to allow for street tree planting)	Not Agreed	Minor setbacks in appropriate places may be acceptable, but this is not a principal design consideration for Warwick Road. A Setback would be appropriate for the Kensington High Street elevation.
Paragraph 6.26	Kensington Society	This section should cover the need to redesign the Warwick Road townscape/streetscape.	Noted	This matter is addressed elsewhere within the draft brief.
Paragraph 6.26	Developers/ Landowners	Remove the reference to continuous and active street frontages being sought on to all buildings facing onto Warwick Road subject to servicing considerations. Also in relation to public open space. The reference to entrances being placed at frequent intervals, helping to ensure activity, should also be deleted.	Not Agreed	Active frontages are sought on all buildings on the Warwick Road elevation with the exception of the school (if it is provided on the frontage). Entrances are considered to be an important component of active frontages.
Paragraph 6.28	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to “public” in relation to open space	Noted	The word “linear” has been added to the public open space
Paragraph 6.30	Developers/ Landowners	In relation to creating a new bicycle network delete the reference to connecting with Kensington High Street and Russell Road.	Not Agreed	It would appear logical that the bicycle route should link up with the existing network.
Sustainability section	Greater London Authority	The tone of the sustainability section is welcomed but should be stronger. Reference to the Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 is welcomed. There are,	Noted	Further amendments have been made to the brief to reflect these comments.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		however, areas of ambiguity in terms of energy efficiency and renewable requirements of the brief that require further work.		
	Kensington Society	Strongly support sustainability measures – these developments should be demonstration projects.	Noted	No response required.
	Environment Agency	Support the inclusion of the section titled “Sustainability” and the inclusion of the policies in this section. These measures are in line with Government Policy and in line with our aspirations for all new developments. Adoption of these measures will lead to more sustainable developments in the Royal Borough in the future.	Noted	No response required.
Paragraph 6.31	Cromwell Road Association	The Code for Sustainable Homes standard (four) is not high enough. The brief should ask for a six star rating as recommended in the sustainability appraisal. Otherwise the section seems good.	Not Agreed	A six star rating would require carbon neutral development. It is debateable whether present technology can achieve carbon neutral development and this requirement would be unduly onerous on developers/landowners given current the limitations of current technology on the subject.
Paragraph 6.32	Greater London Authority	The objective of paragraph 6.32 is supported. Passive design measures (ie reducing energy requirement through design, as a starting point remains a key objective,	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		however, the order of preference for heating and cooling systems should be set in accordance with new policy 4A5i, “Decentralised Energy: Heating, Cooling and Power” in the Further Alterations to the London Plan.		
Paragraph 6.32	Developers/ Landowners	Insert “energy efficient design” as the first preferred option in terms of proposed heating and cooling systems.	Not Agreed	The reference in the alterations to the London Plan for reducing carbon dioxide emissions has been used instead.
Paragraph 6.34	Developers/ Landowners	Delete reference to the target of 20% of a development’s operational energy requirements being sought through on –site power generation. Insert a target of 10%.	Not Agreed	The further alterations to the London Plan propose a target of 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions. As this is a target it will be up to the developers to demonstrate why it is not possible to meet this target. The brief has been amended to reflect the fact that this is a target, not a requirement.
Paragraph 6.34	London Planning Practice on behalf of the then owners of the Telephone Exchange site (since sold to Northacre) and Gerald Eve on behalf of the developers of the Charles House site.	All the landowners in the process are committed to sustainability but the target of 20% of the developments operational energy requirements to be sought from on site renewable power generation goes beyond current policy requirements and those set out in the London Plan. As such we have recommended a reduction to the level used in the London Plan.	Not Agreed	The further alterations to the London Plan propose a target of 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions. As this is a target it will be up to the developers to demonstrate why it is not possible to meet this target. The brief has been amended to reflect the fact that this is a target, not a requirement.
Paragraph 6.34	Ms. E.	Any new building on this site	Not Agreed	It is debateable whether present technology can

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	Arbuthnot	should be capable of producing a long term zero carbon footprint.		achieve carbon neutral development and this requirement would be unduly onerous on developers/landowners given current the limitations of current technology on the subject.
Paragraph 6.35	Developers/ Landowners	The reference to provision being made for sufficient capacity to be built into a small scale district heating system for expansion onto adjacent sites should be deleted in favour of the exploration of opportunities for such a system.	Not Agreed	It is considered that the proposed wording dilutes the draft brief. The onus should be on the developers to demonstrate why this is not possible.
Paragraph 6.40 Green transport opportunities	Kensington Society	Strongly support green transport initiatives, but these should not be limited to on –site facilities. A better pedestrian environment along the Warwick Road and improved crossing facilities should be part of the package. Contributions to public transport improvements may also be needed.	Noted	These requirements are discussed elsewhere in the draft brief.
Paragraph 6.41	Kensington Society	Car parking standards significantly below the Council's minimum standards should be required, not just accepted. We welcome the proposal to seek permit free housing.	Not Agreed	Paragraph 6.41 is actually referring to bicycle parking standards, not car parking standards. However, the brief deals elsewhere with significantly less off street parking than the maximum standards quoted in the UDP (specifically paragraph 9.7). In view of the fact that the UDP requires full off street parking in accordance with adopted standards and in the absence of an adopted SPD on the subject the wording in the brief is considered appropriate. Permit free development is required in the brief.
Paragraph 6.43	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to parking being significantly below the	Not Agreed	The suggested wording does not make clear that reduced levels of off street parking will be expected. It

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		Council's maximum standards being expected. Insert, "levels of car parking will be measured against the Council's maximum standards" also insert, "Any residual parking needs not catered for by each development will be required to be permit free."		is unclear what "residual parking needs" means.
Paragraph 6.43	Transport for London (TfL)	Given the high accessibility of the sites, TfL supports a strong restriction of parking spaces together with a refusal of on street residential parking permits. TfL would support no car parking for non residential uses.	Noted	The support of TfL is noted. However, for Homebase to continue to function customer parking will be required and the brief has been amended on this basis.
Paragraph 6.42	Developers/ Landowners	Delete reference to Permit Free Development being required because of air quality in Warwick Road and to reduce levels of traffic generation	Not Agreed	The justification for this deletion is not clear. Permit Free Development should reduce levels of traffic generation which should assist in preventing a further deterioration in air quality.
Paragraph 6.42	Transport for London (TfL)	TfL requires that all land uses are accompanied by travel plans, not just educational uses.	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 6.45	Developers/ Landowners	Delete reference to "public" open space	Agreed	The reference to "public" open space has been deleted.
Paragraph 6.46	Developers/ Landowners	In relation to crime and security remove the reference to a limited number of dwellings being accessed by a single communal entrance door. Delete reference to "public"	Not Agreed	Limiting the number of dwellings accessed by a single door should improve passive surveillance. The removal of the word "public" in relation to the open space is agreed.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		open space.		
Paragraph 6.47	Developers/ Landowners	Delete references to “public realm” in relation to development and instead insert “high quality streetscape and landscape.”	Not Agreed	The “public realm” is considered an appropriate term in relation to the draft brief as it reflects the aims of the Council for the sites.
Paragraph 6.47	Transport for London	The brief should make reference to TfL’s Streetscape guidance (2006)	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 6.46 Crime and security	Local Police	Please insert a standard paragraph in briefs, “An Important factor in designing any sustainable development within this site concerns issues around community safety and fear of crime. Whatever development takes place, the principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) must be taken into account when drawing up any specific designs. As designing out crime issues are site specific pre-development consultation must take place with the local Crime Prevention Design Advisor (CPDA) prior to submitting a formal application. The CPDA will advise on all areas of crime prevention including Secured by Design accreditation of the development under consideration. The advice of	Agreed	The advice of CPDA is currently sought on larger planning applications and those which involve public access. It is considered appropriate to bring this to the attention of developers within the draft brief.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		the CPDA will be material in deciding any planning application for development within this site.”		
Paragraph 6.46	Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA)	The MPA welcomes the inclusion of the policies. It is suggested that the policy base be extended to ensure “Secured by Design” principles and the ODPM’s “Safer Places: the Planning System and Crime Prevention” are also included.	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 6.47 Public realm	Kensington Society	The planning brief should cover Warwick Road, not just tree planting	Agreed	The frontage to Warwick Road has now been included.
Paragraph 6.48	Developers/ Landowners	In relation to the provision of a high quality shared surface the word “could” rather than “will” should be used in relation to pedestrian priority. Delete reference to the shared surface area possibly enabling servicing and sitting out areas in connection with the ground floor commercial units in the pavilion buildings.	Agreed	This paragraph has been reworded to reflect that servicing may take place from basement level and that the public linear park will be reserved for pedestrians.
Paragraph 6.51	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to “public “ open space and the fact that it should be central to the development sites. Also delete reference to, where gated public open space must be maintained during daylight hours.	Noted	This paragraph has been reworded to clarify the public open space which will be the linear park and the private open space, which will be the central open space. The reference to gated developments is amended to make it clear that they will not be supported.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Paragraph 6.52	Developers/ Landowners	Delete reference to “public” open space	Not Agreed	The public open space in this case is referring to the linear park.
Paragraph 6.53	Developers/ Landowners	Insert “management” and “access” in relation to developing a strategy for the high quality landscaped areas.	Agreed	It is agreed that access and management issues are important components that should be included in the draft brief. They will be subject to further discussion with Officers and will be secured by a suitably worded s106 agreement.
Paragraph 6.55	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to “public” open space with reference to freestanding sculptures and public art.	Not Agreed	Public Art should clearly be provided in an area of public open space as should sculptures.
Section 7.0 Planning Obligations				
General	The Greater London Authority (GLA)	This section is generally supported. However, as Mayoral priorities for planning obligations indicate, TfL requirements (transport improvements and infrastructure) should be prioritised along with delivery of affordable housing. The planning obligations section should make this explicit.	Noted	This aspect is to be discussed with the GLA prior to the adoption of the draft brief.
General	The Greater London Authority	Those matters raised in youth/employment facility, construction and training, and residential and amenity section and the refuse paragraph are generally supported. Access to a new fitness club should remain affordable for all future residents of the community,	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		reference should be made for this in the brief and it should be set out in a s106 agreement.		
General	London Development Authority (LDA)	The LDA welcomes the inclusion of Planning Obligations within the planning brief, in particular Construction Training. However, in accordance with London Plan Policy 3B.12 the LDA requests that any s106 agreement seeks to ensure job and training opportunities are also available to local people. In addition the use of goods and services provided by local businesses and enterprises, both in construction and the operation of the proposed development should be utilised.	Agreed	The requirements for the borough are as laid out in the Construction Training SPG. The draft brief has been amended accordingly although the requirements go beyond those stipulated in the adopted SPG.
General	Kensington Society	This list should be in the LDF.	Noted	A Planning Obligations SPD is due to be published in 2008 as part of the LDF process
General	London Planning Practice on behalf of the former then owners of the Telephone Exchange site	It is fully accepted that necessary planning obligations may arise out of development and these should be judged in accordance with Circular 05/05. We note the agreement that the formulae for calculating education contributions will be subject to a separate process to scrutinise its form and application.	Noted	No response required.
General	Metropolitan	The MPA request that this	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	Police Authority (MPA)	<p>section be altered to ensure provision for a safer neighbourhood base to be allocated on the site. It is requested that 125 sq m at ground floor level be allocated. This would help meet the need for a facility in the area and it would be well placed to meet the strategic policing needs in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. The size of the allocation is in line with a development of this scale and size.</p>		
General	Gerald Eve on behalf of the developers of the Charles House site	<p>It is accepted that as the Charles House site is giving up developable land for a new primary school the other development sites will need to contribute financially to the provision of a new school in line with the demand created by the development of housing going ahead. The formula for this has not been tested independently however, and like healthcare contributions this will need to be resolved and scrutinised under a separate process to the adoption of a site specific</p>	Agreed	<p>The formula itself has been removed from the draft brief. However, the reference to the use of a standard education formula in the brief is retained as there should be consistency in requesting developer contributions based on child yields.</p>

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		planning brief.		
General	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)	Request that all amenities for the Warwick Road sites are in operation before the housing component is completed.	Not Agreed	Each case will be treated on its own merits. It would be too onerous to expect this blanket approach for all amenities.
Paragraph 7.1	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the word, "public" in relation to open space, with reference to its long term management and maintenance. Amend "improvements to the public transport network" and replace with "any required improvements to the public transport network"	Agreed	It is agreed that long term management and maintenance is not confined to the public open space and that improvements to the public transport network need to be assessed in relation to Traffic Impact Assessment for all of the sites.
Paragraph 7.2	Developers/ Landowners	Insert, "subject to confirmation from the PCT" in relation to the provision of a new health polyclinic	Agreed	The healthcare requirements will be substantially altered in line with the latest comments from the Kensington and Chelsea Primary Care Trust (PCT). As a result this paragraph will be deleted.
Paragraph 7.3	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to financial contributions for health infrastructure being expected from the developers of the other Warwick Road sites that have not provided floorspace for a polyclinic. Also the basis for contributions based on the Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU) model should be deleted.	Not Agreed	In view of the fact that these sites will be generating additional residents who will require health treatment it is legitimate to request a developer contribution. The HUDU model provides a consistent approach to how these contributions may be calculated based on capital and revenue contributions and can form a useful starting point for negotiations.
Paragraph 7.3	Greater London Authority	The provision of a new health and social care facility is welcomed. Reference in paragraph 7.3 to the required delivery being assessed	Agreed	The reference to the amount of affordable housing provided to be offset against other infrastructure requirements has been deleted.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		against affordable housing is not supported. This type of facility should not prejudice the brief's (and the Mayor's target) to meet 50% affordable housing units with a 70/30 social/intermediate split.		
Paragraph 7.4	Developers/ Landowners	Delete "contributions towards the cost of a new surgery" and replace with, "Any provision of a new surgery would be subject to confirmation from the PCT..."	Agreed	This paragraph has been deleted in line with the latest comments from the Kensington and Chelsea Primary Care Trust (PCT).
Paragraph 7.8	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to the adopted standard formula suggested by the West London Construction training Planning Forum to calculate the value of the contribution.	Not Agreed	The standard formula is included within the adopted SPG on Construction Training.
Paragraph 7.9	Developers/ Landowners	Delete this paragraph relating to the developer having to provide £2,500 for every one million worth of construction costs and the Council will to negotiate the contribution on very large schemes.	Not Agreed	The standard formula is included within the adopted SPG on Construction Training.
Paragraph 7.10	Developers/ Landowners	Delete this paragraph which relates to the figure of £2,500 being used which represents approximately two thirds of the cost of a construction programme. Also delete the references to the adopted SPG on construction training and the	Not Agreed	The standard formula is included within the adopted SPG on Construction Training.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		Mayor of London's Plan.		
Section 8.0 Residential, amenity and public utility aspects				
Paragraph 8.1	Developers/ Landowners	Delete "public" in relation to open space. Delete "open space will be expected to have good light conditions" and insert, "the conditions expected for a central London high density urban environment." Delete "good light conditions" and insert "reasonable light conditions". Delete "reasonable" levels of sunlight and insert "appropriate" levels of sunlight.	Not Agreed	Agree the deletion of the word "public" in relation to open space. The other requirements are as set out in the adopted Unitary Development Plan and there is no reason to depart from this. Each planning application will continue to be treated on its own merits subject to the particular circumstances.
Paragraph 8.1	London Planning Practice on behalf of the former then owners of the Telephone Exchange site	Under paragraph 8.1 we believe that regard should be had to both guidelines in "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to Good Practice" published by the Building research establishment BRE and to the conditions expected for a central London high density urban environment.	Not Agreed	The sunlight/daylight requirements are as set out in the adopted Unitary Development Plan and there is no reason to depart from this. Each planning application will continue to be treated on its own merits subject to the particular circumstances.
Paragraph 8.3	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to 18 metres in terms of the distance between opposite habitable	Not Agreed	The 18m space provides a useful guideline for development. However, each application will continue to be treated on its own merits taking into account the

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		rooms and the reference to gardens and open spaces being included in an assessment.		position of windows and the use of particular rooms.
Paragraph 8.4 Land contamination	Environment Agency	In line with your requirements for new development on potentially contaminated sites we also require sufficient information in the form of a site history through to a desktop study and details of any remediation works to be submitted with planning applications in line with Planning Policy Statement 23.	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 8.6	Thames Water Property Services	Reference to “water and sewerage” infrastructure should be included. There should also be reference to “water pressure.” Reference to London Plan policies 4A.11 and 4A.12 should also be referred to.	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 8.6	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to “development not commencing until impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure have been submitted” and substitute “any development should be accompanied by impact studies.” Also insert, “This will be a	Not Agreed	Thames Water have specifically stated that development should not commence until impact studies on the existing water supply and sewerage have been submitted and approved. There would appear no good reason to depart from this approach.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		matter to be addressed through a planning condition”		
Paragraph 8.8	Environment Agency	We strongly support the inclusion of paragraph 8.8 which is in line with Planning Policy Statement 25 and our requirements for new developments over 1 hectare in Flood Zone 1.	Noted	No further response required.
Paragraph 8.8	Kensington Society	Flood attenuation. What measures will be taken to increase permeability?	Noted	As described in the draft brief, particularly paragraph 8.8
Paragraph 8.8	Environment Agency	Soft and hard landscaping in the public realm should incorporate the use of native species and can also form part of a SUDS scheme such as swales and attenuation ponds. We also encourage the provision of bat roosts in new buildings and green walls.	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Section 9.0 Air Quality, Access and Parking				
General	Transport for London (TfL)	TfL confirms that it generally supports the aspirations for increased permeability, improved pedestrian and cyclist access and facilities and high quality public realm for the sites to be developed.	Noted	No further response required.
General	Transport for	TfL suggests the potential for a	Not Agreed	It is disappointing to note that TfL do not address the

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	London (TfL)	new pedestrian and cyclist footbridge over the railway is investigated. This is particularly important if there is to be a new school, which is likely to generate pedestrian and cycle trips to and from the site.		problems of the Warwick Road being a barrier to the development sites or address the issues of improving public transport. The provision of an additional footbridge across the West London line is not viewed as a priority as to the development of the sites and further clarification will be sought from TfL.
Paragraph 9.3	Developers/ Landowners	Delete this paragraph which refers to the concern regarding the cumulative impact of traffic on the junctions with Kensington High Street and the West Cromwell Road and the adverse effect on air quality. Significantly reduced levels of parking are therefore sought.	Not Agreed	This is a legitimate concern which should be addressed in the brief.
Paragraph 9.4	Developers/ Landowners	Amend to “a servicing management plan for each site will be required. This will be a matter to be addressed through a planning condition.”	Not Agreed	It may not be appropriate to leave the servicing management plan to be addressed as a planning condition. Details may be required as part of assessing the overall merits of a scheme.
Paragraph 9.4	Transport for London (TfL)	TfL supports the requirement for servicing management plans aiming at ensuring that servicing takes place off Warwick Road	Noted	No further response required.
Paragraph 9.6	Developers/ Landowners	Insert sentence that limited parking will be permitted for any health facility.	Noted	As a health facility is no longer required as part of the brief this reference is now superseded.
Paragraph 9.6	London Planning	Car parking should be provided at a level that balances the	Not Agreed	The brief is seeking significantly reduced levels of off street parking are sought in the brief to reduce the

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	Practice on behalf of the then owners of the Telephone Exchange site (since sold to Northacre)	needs of the development and its occupants together with the highway impact and air quality implications. We agree that any residual parking needs not met on site can be permit free to prevent any overspill requirements placing pressure on local on street parking provision.		impact of the developments on air quality and the road network. It is not clear what balance can be achieved. The proposed wording is considered to dilute the requirements of the brief.
Paragraph 9.7	Gerald Eve on behalf of the developers of the Charles House site	Current UDP Policy TR42 requires development to provide car parking up to the maximum parking standards in Chapter 13. There has been no change to this policy and so these are the standards developments are expected to follow. Permit free development is acceptable to prevent any overspill requirements placing pressure on local on street parking provision.	Not Agreed	The current UDP standards are material considerations which will be taken into account. However, the brief is seeking significantly reduced levels of off street parking are sought in the brief to reduce the impact of the developments on air quality and the road network.
Paragraph 9.7	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to significantly less off street parking will be expected than the maximum standards quoted in the UDP.	Not Agreed	The current UDP standards are material considerations which will be taken into account. However, the brief is seeking significantly reduced levels of off street parking to reduce the impact of the developments on air quality and the road network.
Paragraph 9.8	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to "limited" in relation to off street parking.	Not Agreed	The brief is seeking significantly reduced levels of off street parking to reduce the impact of the

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
				developments on air quality and the road network.
Paragraph 9.8	Kensington Society	Strongly support proposals for limited parking.	Noted	No response required.
Paragraph 9.8	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to an internal access from a rear service road being the most appropriate.	Agreed	The brief has amended accordingly.
Paragraph 9.9	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reason why permit free parking is required ie to reduce levels of traffic generation and to prevent further deterioration of air quality. Delete the reference to the forthcoming Transportation Supplementary Planning Document.	Not Agreed	The brief is seeking significantly reduced levels of off street parking to reduce the impact of the developments on air quality and the road network. The reference to the forthcoming Transportation SPD has been deleted.
Paragraph 9.11	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to bicycle parking being provided at one space per unit, substitute for "one space per unit where practical."	Not Agreed	There is no justification from departing from this standard at this stage.
Paragraph 9.11	Transport for London (TfL)	Non residential cycle parking should be provided in accordance with the Cycling Parking Standards TfL Proposed Guidelines (which is higher than 1 space per 200sq m). TfL would also support showers and changing facilities.	Not Agreed	Bicycle parking facilities will be provided as required in the adopted UDP.
Paragraph 9.11	Ms E. Arbuthnot	It is excellent that a bicycle friendly approach is being	Not Agreed	It is not practical to provide a dedicated cycleway through all the development sites which is free from

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		sought. For safety and well being all bicycles should be segregated from motorised vehicles. It is crucial to reduce the number of cyclists hurt or killed on the roads.		road traffic.
Paragraph 9.13	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to what a Transportation Assessment should contain and the reference to the forthcoming Transportation SPD for further guidance.	Not Agreed	The brief should stipulate what is expected as part of a Transportation Assessment for the sites. It is agreed that the reference to a Transportation SPD can be deleted.
Paragraph 9.13	Kensington Society	A transport assessment (not transportation assessment) should be undertaken for the whole of the planning brief, not just individual sites.	Agreed	A Transportation Assessment will take into account the cumulative impact from all the sites.
Paragraph 9.14	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the sentence, "There should be no intensification of the use of the access from Charles House onto Kensington High Street" and insert "any intensification of the use of the access from Charles House onto Kensington High Street should provide appropriate mitigation measures."	Not Agreed	The brief is very clear on this point. Mitigation measures (if any) may not be able to address the concerns regarding the intensification of an access from Charles House onto the High Street.
Paragraph 9.15	Transport for London (TfL)	TfL is concerned about the number and type of vehicle accesses on Warwick Road and High Street Kensington. The number of accesses should be strictly controlled	Noted	These concerns have been addressed in the draft brief.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		with a view to overall limiting the number of vehicle accesses to two on the Warwick Road and one on Kensington High Street, all with left in, left out arrangements. In addition to the internal roads should not be linked or designed to provide a rat run.		
Paragraph 9.15	Developers/ Landowners	Substitute “illustrative framework” instead of “illustrative masterplan”	Noted	These comments have been superseded in the light of the indicative masterplan.
Paragraph 9.18	Developers/ Landowners	Delete the reference to seeking a contribution on behalf of TfL for cycle safety and pedestrian improvements to the junctions of Warwick Road and Warwick Road itself.	Not Agreed	These requests for contributions are legitimate in the light of increased levels of traffic generation.
Paragraph 9.19	Transport for London (TfL)	TfL note that there may also be a need to increase the frequency or capacity of the local bus network, not just the upgrading of bus stops.	Noted	It is disappointing that TfL do not provide clear support for this requirement.
Paragraph 9.21	Developers/ Landowners	Substitute, “A communal satellite dish(es) serving all residential dwellings should be provided” with, “ A communal satellite dishes(es) serving all residential dwellings within a building should be provided on each building”	Agreed	Subject to some rewording it is agreed that one communal dish to serve all development on the sites is an unrealistic proposition.
SECOND AMENDED DRAFT BRIEF				

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
consultation				
General	The Greater London Authority GLA)	The GLA is concerned at the Council's priorities within the development brief. The Mayoral priorities remain the delivery of affordable housing and the delivery of transport infrastructure. The GLA will need to understand the Council's position regarding the delivery of a new school within the brief and invite discussions before the brief is adopted.	Noted	Officers will discuss this point with the GLA before the draft brief is adopted.
General	Gerald Eve on behalf of PRUPIM (acting for the Prudential Assurance Company Limited which owns Homebase)	Paragraph 1.4.1 of the Sustainability Appraisal should be updated to reflect the changes which have been made to paragraph 3.3 of the Amended Draft Brief.	Noted	The Sustainability Appraisal is a supporting document to the draft brief to provide guidance. The key objectives have been augmented in so far as a high quality residential development is now sought, but they remain essentially the same as previously.
General	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edwards Homes	As above.	Noted	As above.
General	Open Spaces Society	The indicative layout continues to show a number of small areas of open space which may add to the amenity of adjacent buildings, but are of no practical benefit to the public. They could be helpful to the mischievous. Is it really	Not Agreed	It is not clear from the indicative masterplan where these spaces are that are being referred to. Clearly some of the open space on the site is for private residential amenity rather than for the benefit of the general public, but it is generally open to surveillance. The space to the rear of the site adjacent to the West London line may be utilised for residential gardens or for a more informal use, but this space is considered to

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		possible to plan for the area on the assumption that four properties can each be developed as self contained units.		make a valuable contribution to the site as a whole.
General	George Wightman	RBKC Planning and Development department is to be congratulated on seeking to make the best of what might have been (and what without close scrutiny could still be) a bad job. Its fresh aspirations, diligence and attention to detail are welcome.	Noted	No further response is required.
General	English Heritage	English Heritage is of the view that the SPD needs to demonstrate greater awareness of the archaeological potential of the site and therefore recommends that the fact that this is an Archaeological Priority Area with potential for Roman or Medieval remains. In other areas English heritage welcome s the SPD approach to the development area, particularly the attention to design and height details. English heritage concurs with the Borough that new development should not exceed existing building heights.	Agreed	The comments from English Heritage regarding possible archaeological remains will be included in the draft brief.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
General	Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment CABE	Unfortunately, due to limited resources, we are unable to comment on this document. However, some general comments are included which stress the importance of design in the development process.	Noted	The role of good design is emphasised in the draft brief.
Section 1.0 Purpose				
Paragraph 1.1	Kensington Society	The brief is trying to influence the mix of uses as well as the function and appearance. Add “mix of uses” before “function”	Agreed	The mix of uses is a concern of the draft brief and therefore this has been included.
Paragraph 1.2	Kensington Society	What is a “holistic development?”	Noted	This is considering all the development on the site as one.
Paragraph 1.3	Gerald Eve on behalf of PRUPIM	PRUPIM support the indicative masterplan, but its reflection of block disposition and heights must be seen as indicative only as it is early stages in the development process. Provided it does not prejudice the aims of the masterplan, alternative block dispositions and heights may be acceptable.	Noted	The comments of PRUPIM are noted. However, indicative principal storey heights were generally welcomed by the developers/landowners as they gave greater certainty. Each case will continue to be treated on its own merits taking into account the individual circumstances of the building and layout of the scheme as a whole. The indicative heights are only indicative and are subject to a number of considerations which are fundamental to their acceptability. These considerations are stipulated in the draft brief.
Paragraph 1.3	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	St Edward Homes support the indicative masterplan, but its reflection of block disposition and heights must be seen as indicative only as it is early stages in the development process. Provided it does not prejudice the aims of the masterplan, alternative block	Noted	The comments of St Edward Homes are noted. However, indicative principal storey heights were generally welcomed by the developers/landowners as they gave greater certainty. Each case will continue to be treated on its own merits taking into account the individual circumstances of the building and layout of the scheme as a whole. The indicative heights are only indicative and are subject to a number of considerations which are fundamental to their

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		dispositions and heights may be acceptable.		acceptability. These considerations are stipulated in the draft brief.
Paragraph 1.3	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd, developers of the TA site.	This paragraph refers to the “indicative masterplan” and elsewhere as an “indicative layout”. We are concerned that the masterplan attached to the brief may be interpreted too literally. It is important that it does not become too prescriptive.	Noted	These comments are surprising in the light of the fact that the developers/landowners wanted greater certainty and hence a masterplan approach was considered to be helpful in this respect.
Section 2.0 Status				No comments.
Section 3.0 Vision				
General	Kensington Society	There is a need to be clearer about the minimum requirements/components for exemplar architecture and exemplar sustainable development. This needs to be explained more fully in the opening section.	Not Agreed	The opening section is long enough without further discussion of minimum requirements. It is not clear exactly what the Society is seeking in this respect and how it can be succinctly expressed.
General	George Wightman	It is recommended that a artistic and cultural area is included in the key design principles which could include studios, galleries, craft units, workshops etc. Kensington’s artistic tradition is just as rich as Chelsea’	Not Agreed	Warwick Road is not considered suitable for designation as a cultural quarter. A cultural quarter may be suitable for Kensington High Street taking into account the surrounding existing cultural attractions.
Paragraph 3.2	Kensington Society	There is a need to tackle the barrier of Warwick Road. Reconfiguring the space and	Not Agreed	Seeking to break down the barrier represented by Warwick Road is included in the vision for the Warwick Road sites and this is part of the opening section.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		adding crossings to break down the barrier which has marginalised these sites for the last 40 years since the one way system was introduced. This needs to be signalled in the opening section.		
Paragraph 3.3	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	Bullet 7 of paragraph 3.3 identifies a new school as a key design principle. St Edward reiterate that, whilst working with the Royal Borough to examine the possibility of a school coming forward on this site, this is wholly dependent on being able to resolve key design issues and the offset of other planning obligations. St Edward considers the only practical solution is the inclusion on the front of the site as their analysis shows. It is therefore requested that the brief is amended to reflect this.	Not Agreed	Discussions have not yet reached the stage where the location of the school can be identified within the brief.
Paragraph 3.3	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	A new bullet should be added to the key design principles which states the strategy should be led by “high quality residential development.” Bullet two states “medium rise development, but a variety of building heights”. This is too prescriptive and should state “development which optimises	Not Agreed	The objective of high quality residential development is agreed. However, development which optimises density without all the other safeguarding components which are expected is not agreed. Active street frontages are an important component of creating a sustainable community on these sites.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		density". Given the residential nature of the site reference to "active street frontages" should be omitted.		
Section 4.0 History and Preferred use				
Paragraph 4.2	Kensington Society	After the reference to commercial uses in line 3 add, "such as offices and major retail uses" With reference to line 5 what is "high quality"? Is this design, materials, or just high income housing?	Not Agreed	<p>Whilst there is no objection in principle to the creation of small scale offices this is not a priority for these sites. Retail and active ground floor uses including social and community uses are more important. On this basis the inclusion of small offices may mean the exclusion of other uses which are considered to provide a more beneficial role in this location.</p> <p>Reference to high quality residential development refers to quality in a number of forms. It does not necessarily follow that quality can only be achieved through high quality housing.</p>
Paragraph 4.3	Gerald Eve on behalf of PRUPIM	While PRUPIM recognise the need for new commercial uses to be subject to the key tests of PPS6, it is important to state that the re-provision of commercial uses which currently exist on the sites (in the case of the Homebase site, retail) will be considered acceptable subject to other design considerations, as referred to later in the brief with regard to Homebase.	Noted	The position regarding the Homebase site has been clarified in the brief. However, the need for parking to serve a retail development of this type has also now been included.
Paragraph 4.3	Gerald Eve on behalf of St	While St Edward Homes recognise the need for new	Noted	The position regarding the Homebase site has been clarified in the brief. However, the need for parking to

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	Edward Homes	commercial uses to be subject to the key tests of PPS6, it is important to state that the re-provision of commercial uses which currently exist on the sites (in the case of the Charles House site, offices) will be considered acceptable subject to other design considerations.		serve a retail development of this type has also now been included.
Paragraph 4.3	Councillor Gardner	Do we need to elaborate on the sequential test as members of the public may not understand what this means?	Not Agreed	It is considered that the brief is long enough without including an explanation of the sequential test. The aims and need for a sequential test is included within the adopted UDP .
Paragraph 4.4	Councillor Gardner	Do we need to be so categorical about large scale business development not being supported?	Not Agreed	It should be clear from the brief that residential development is the principal use for these sites which will assist in the borough achieving its housing allocation. The position regarding Homebase is explained in the draft brief.
Section 5.0 Development Opportunities				
General	Greater London Authority	As set out in the previous response, the Mayoral priority remains affordable housing delivery. In relation to the proposed school the GLA notes that the level of contribution towards affordable housing on the Charles House site will be assessed on the basis of a school being provided and other infrastructure contributions. The GLA request that the Council provide the	Noted	Officers will discuss this point with the GLA before the draft brief is adopted.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		needs based evidence for taking this approach. Officers would like to meet to discuss the Council's approach to ensure it is in line with London Plan Policy 6A.4 Priorities in Planning Obligations.		
Paragraph 5.2	Kensington Society	There is a need to specify appropriate density ranges for the sites – not an open ended density which will generate big, boring boxes filling out the full envelope determined by specific heights (proposed changes to section 5.2)	Not Agreed	
Paragraph 5.2	Earls Courtiers	The proposed density of above 650 habitable rooms per hectare is far too great. This is a severe case of “town cramming” not witnessed in the borough. This could sap the spirit of residents.	Not Agreed	A development above 650 habitable rooms a hectare is considered entirely appropriate for these sites given the surrounding townscape and public transport accessibility considerations and is supported by the Greater London Authority. This will not logically lead to a scenario of “town cramming.”
Paragraph 5.2	Councillor Gardner	Is a density above 650 habitable rooms per hectare correct?	Noted	A development above 650 habitable rooms a hectare is considered entirely appropriate for these sites given the surrounding townscape and public transport accessibility considerations and is supported by the Greater London Authority.
Paragraph 5.3	Councillor Gardner	Improve the wording to say “which should have access to private amenity space”	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 5.3	Home Builders Federation	We note the Council's intention to influence the type of market product specifying at least 25% 3 plus bedroom units. This	Not Agreed	The need for 25% family market housing has now been expressed as a target rather than a requirement. However, the latest Housing Needs Survey demonstrated the need for family housing within the

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		<p>should be deleted since PPS3 only allows local planning authorities to determine the size and type of the affordable housing element. We also question the realism of this policy to address an under supply of family units. The construction of 3 bedroom market housing is unlikely to generate much in the way of low cost housing. The Council should take into account site costs and set out a financial justification for its policy.</p>		<p>borough. The need to justify this financially is not accepted. The overall merits of each scheme will continue be considered on an individual basis.</p>
Paragraph 5.3	Gerald Eve on behalf of PRUPIM	<p>It is considered that there is a need for flexibility with regard to the proportion and mix of residential unit sizes. In this respect, it is requested that the percentage proportions are expressed as targets, rather than a minimum in order to provide flexibility in a range of circumstances.</p>	Agreed	<p>The proportion of affordable housing is now expressed as a target. However, the need for family sized affordable rented units is a particular requirement in the borough given housing needs and the minimum of 50% family units will remain as expressed in the draft brief.</p>
Paragraph 5.3	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	<p>It is considered that there is a need for flexibility with regard to the proportion and mix of residential unit sizes. In this respect, it is requested that the percentage proportions are expressed as targets, rather than a minimum in order to provide flexibility in a range of</p>	Agreed	<p>The proportion of affordable housing is now expressed as a target. However, the need for family sized affordable rented units is a particular requirement in the borough given housing needs and the minimum of 50% family units will remain as expressed in the draft brief.</p>

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		circumstances.		
Paragraph 5.3	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The reference to 25% proportion of family sized units should be omitted from this paragraph. Housing mix should be provided in accordance with current planning policy and market demand. The expected provision of 25% proportion of family sized units with access to private amenity space is unlikely to be achieved on sites with up to 14 storeys of development. This paragraph should be replaced with <i>a mix of residential units in accordance with the UDP.</i>	Not Agreed	The need for 25% family market housing has now been expressed as a target rather than a requirement. However, the latest Housing Needs Survey demonstrated the need for family housing within the borough. The overall merits of each scheme will continue to be considered on an individual basis.
Paragraphs 5.3 to 5.5	London Planning Practice on behalf of Northacre	The expected provision of up to 50% of affordable housing and the required minimum provision of 25% of the market housing as family units linked to ground floor amenity space is unlikely to be possible on a site that is expected to deliver 10 storeys in the form of flats. The housing mix should be provided in accordance with current planning policy and reference to Policy H19 in the UDP. It should be expressed as a target.	Not Agreed	The proportion of affordable housing is now expressed as a target. However, the need for family sized affordable rented units is a particular requirement in the borough given housing needs and the minimum of 50% family units will remain as expressed in the draft brief. The need for 25% family market housing has now been expressed as a target rather than a requirement. However, the latest Housing Needs Survey demonstrated the need for family housing within the borough. The overall merits of each scheme will continue to be considered on an individual basis.
Paragraph 5.4	Home Builders Federation	This paragraph should be revised to make clear that the	Not Agreed	The draft brief refers to the Council seeking all units to be constructed to the Lifetime Homes standard. This is

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		Lifetime Homes standard can be encouraged, but is not mandatory for the market housing element. Adaptability is covered by Part M of the Building Regulations.		therefore encouraged rather than a mandatory requirement.
Paragraph 5.5	Home Builders Federation	It is accepted that the London Plan refers to a target of 50% affordable housing and as a broad guide it should be proportioned as 70% Social and 30% Intermediate, but the draft SPD is more rigid than this. It should be emphasised these are benchmarks, not targets. The flexibility is allowed by paragraph 3.42 of the London Plan.	Not Agreed	Target is considered appropriate in these circumstances and allows for flexibility.
Paragraph 5.5	London Planning Practice on behalf of Northacre	The reference to 50% of all social housing to be 3 plus bedroom units is overly restrictive and inflexible. This should be expressed as a target and assessed in relation to the circumstances of each site.	Not Agreed	The proportion of affordable housing is now expressed as a target. However, the need for family sized affordable rented units is a particular requirement in the borough given housing needs and the minimum of 50% family units will remain as expressed in the draft brief.
Paragraph 5.5	Landowners of sites (St Edward Homes Ltd, PRUPIM and Northacre)	Welcome the recognition of flexibility in terms of the percentage of affordable housing and the use of habitable rooms. However, the reference to a minimum proportion for the mix is unhelpful and inflexible. It	Not Agreed	The proportion of affordable housing is now expressed as a target. However, the need for family sized affordable rented units is a particular requirement in the borough given housing needs and the minimum of 50% family units will remain as expressed in the draft brief.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		should be expressed as a target rather than a minimum.		
Paragraph 5.5	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	We agree that viability will need to be assessed to determine the affordable housing package for each scheme and should be agreed by using the GLA affordable housing toolkit.	Noted	No response required. Reference to viability is now included in the draft brief.
Paragraph 5.6	Gerald Eve on behalf of PRUPIM	It is suggested that there is a need for flexibility with regard to the mix of socially rented and intermediate housing accommodation. In this respect it is requested that the percentages identified are expressed as targets rather than a minimum.	Agreed	This mix has now been expressed as a target.
Paragraph 5.6	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	It is suggested that there is a need for flexibility with regard to the mix of socially rented and intermediate housing accommodation. In this respect it is requested that the percentages identified are expressed as targets rather than a minimum.	Agreed	This mix has now been expressed as a target.
Paragraph 5.6	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The allocation of 70% proportion of affordable housing for rent should be expressed as a target and not a minimum. The brief is very	Not Agreed	The proportion of affordable housing is now expressed as a target. However, the need for family sized affordable rented units is a particular requirement in the borough given housing needs and the minimum of 50% rented family units will remain as expressed in the draft

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		prescriptive in stating that social rental units should be family sized. In relation to the possible number of storeys with private outdoor space the 50% figure should be a target.		brief. The brief does not stipulate the type of outdoor space, only that it should be provided.
Paragraph 5.6	Councillor Gardner	The wording needs to be altered with regard to wheelchair accessible housing.	Agreed	Line 7 will now read, "...and a minimum of 10% should be wheelchair accessible housing."
Paragraph 5.7	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	In order to ensure mixed communities the Brief should confirm that market housing is also sought and this should comprise a minimum of 50% (measured by habitable rooms) on each site coming forward for development.	Not Agreed	This is not a recognised requirement for the provision of market housing in this borough, or indeed London as a whole.
Paragraph 5.8	Landowners of sites (St Edward Homes Ltd, PRUPIM and Northacre)	Welcome the recognition that the principal aim for Warwick Road is not necessarily to achieve retail facilities, but to create an active frontage.	Noted	No further response required.
Paragraph 5.8	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The Council's response to the Regulation 17 statement states that social and community facilities and a mix of uses are welcomed. The brief should therefore reflect this view and refer to a variety of different uses including D1, small offices (B1), restaurants, community uses and residential uses being active frontage uses along	Noted	<p>The concern regarding the provision of small office accommodation in the draft brief has already been explained.</p> <p>Whilst there is no objection in principle to the creation of small scale offices this is not a priority for these sites. Retail and active ground floor uses including social and community uses are more important. On this basis the inclusion of small offices may mean the exclusion of other uses which are considered to provide a more beneficial role in this location.</p>

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		Warwick Road.		
Paragraph 5.8	Councillor Gardner	Why is the provision of small retail units linked to food with a large Tesco nearby ?	Noted	The reference to convenience shops does not automatically imply only food shopping. Despite Tescos being in relatively close proximity there may be scope for a small multipurpose retail unit.
Paragraph 5.8	Kensington Society	Delete "retail" from line 3.	Agreed	The word "retail" is not necessarily required.
Paragraph 5.10	Councillor Gardner	Why do we have to refer to a "private fitness club/ cannot it just be a, "fitness club"?	Noted	It has been established that the developers are not willing to fund and operate a public facility. Therefore reference to a private facility is appropriate.
Paragraph 5.11	Councillor Gardner	Are we talking about the fitness club or the building in relation to the Radnor Arms?	Noted	This point has now been clarified.
Paragraph 5.11	Bernard Selwyn	The Radnor Arms is recommended for retention although it is closed and boarded up. The stronger recommendation for demolition is preferred. Widening the pavement and opening up the sightlines would be a significant planning benefit. I hope the Council put forward a definitive proposal for a primary school here and after the site has been formally designated, the brief is reconsidered.	Noted	The precise location of the school is yet to be agreed and is the subject of continuing discussions.
Paragraph 5.14	Earls Courtiers	A consolidated open space/park would be preferable to 13 small restrictive islands in the indicative masterplan because older children would play more willingly. A	Not Agreed	Part of the open space as laid out in the indicative masterplan is considered to be capable of being used as play space. A consolidated space is provided in the central portion of the site.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		consolidated open space would receive more daylight/sunlight. The northwest corner may be preferred. The open space must be open to surveillance.		
Paragraph 5.14	Councillor Gardner	Why do children's play facilities just have to be provided in the linear park? What about the other public space?	Noted	The linear park provides the public open space, but there is provision for play facilities linked with the private open space. This matter of whether the linear park is appropriate for play space can be addressed as part of the assessment of the merits of an individual planning application.
Paragraph 5.14	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	Children's play facilities might be provided elsewhere rather than the Linear Park. The last sentence should be amended to say that the Park "could" include children's play facilities.	Agreed	The reference to "could" has now been included.
Paragraph 5.15	Councillor Gardner	The use of too much glass in a development can also look a mess. Ground floor amenity space can be provided in addition to balconies.	Noted	The brief refers to ground floor amenity space being preferred for family sized dwellings.
Paragraph 5.15	Gerald Eve on behalf of PRUPIM	This paragraph now seeks garden space and play facilities of 10sq m per child as a minimum. It is important that the brief recognises the quality of the spaces and gives due recognition to this factor as well. In this respect an arbitrary figure of 10sq m should be seen as a target rather than a minimum. The landowners have worked	Agreed	The Mayor's draft guidance on the provision of play space stipulates a target of 10 sq m. The change is therefore agreed. It is also recognised that the quality of the space is also important and this will be taken into account in the determination of any planning application on an individual site.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		towards an integrated solution which maximises a comprehensive response to garden space and play facilities. This is more meaningful than arbitrary floorspace figures.		
Paragraph 5.15	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	As above	Agreed	As above
Paragraph 5.15	Landowners of sites (St Edward Homes Ltd, PRUPIM and Northacre)	As above	Agreed	As above
Paragraph 5.15	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	This paragraph introduces a new standard in the brief, 10sq m per child including on site play space for the under 5 age group. PPS 12 states that Supplementary Planning Documents which should be included in a development plan document and subject to close scrutiny should not be set out in supplementary planning documents. It is therefore inappropriate to introduce this new standard in an SPD without independent scrutiny. If the Brief's aspirations for a high proportion of family sized units is achieved, we consider it impossible to reach this	Not Agreed	<p>The Mayor's draft guidance on the provision of play space stipulates a target of 10 sq m. The suggested change is therefore agreed. It is also recognised that the quality of the space is also important and this will be taken into account in the determination of any planning application on an individual site.</p> <p>The London Plan forms part of the development plan for the borough and draft Supplementary Planning Documents issued in connection with the London Plan must therefore carry weight as a material planning consideration. The omission of this paragraph is not agreed.</p>

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		standard and it should be removed.		
Paragraph 5.15	London Planning Practice on behalf of Northacre	The additional minimum requirement is noted of 10sq m per child. A numerical based standard is generally discouraged by central government planning guidance and more emphasis should be placed on the desire to achieve masterplan aims in terms of integrating space.	Agreed	<p>The Mayor's draft guidance on the provision of play space stipulates a target of 10 sq m. The suggested change is therefore agreed. It is also recognised that the quality of the space is also important and this will be taken into account in the determination of any planning application on an individual site.</p> <p>The London Plan forms part of the development plan for the borough and draft Supplementary Planning Documents issued in connection with the London Plan must therefore carry weight as a material planning consideration.</p>
Paragraph 5.15	Kensington Society	Line 5 Ground floor amenity space is needed as well as balconies	Agreed	The need for ground floor amenity space is made within the draft brief. However, there should be some flexibility with regard to how amenity space is provided.
Paragraph 5.16	Gerald Eve on behalf of PRUPIM	It is important that the Royal Borough recognises all opportunities to incorporate private garden space within a scheme and roof top gardens should also be mentioned.	Agreed	A reference to roof terraces is already made in this paragraph which would cover roof top gardens.
Paragraph 5.16	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	As above.	Agreed	As above
Paragraph 5.16	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The future regimes for service charges will affect the potential for sharing of external spaces between market and affordable units. Therefore the second sentence should be prefaced, "where appropriate communal open spaces should not be	Not Agreed	The suggested revised wording dilutes the purpose of the brief in this regard. The words "where appropriate" are open to different interpretations.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		segregated....”		
Paragraph 5.17	Kensington Society	Wider footways could be a major contribution to improving the environment	Not Agreed	Wider footways on the Warwick Road frontage would have implications for the road space on Warwick Road itself which is part of the Transport for London Road network. The pavements are not particularly narrow on Warwick Road itself and it is considered that the need for wider footways at this point has not been proven.
Paragraph 5.17	Councillor Gardner	Why does street planting not refer to side roads as well as the Warwick Road frontage?	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 5.18	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	Competing requirements for public open space, private amenity space and maximising the residential capacity of the site will not allow for extensive new ecology zones. Therefore the first sentence should be prefaced, “At the Charles Hose site the Council will expect....”	Not Agreed	Whilst it is acknowledged that there may be little space available for an ecology zone, the need for such space should not be confined to the Charles House site. The developer/landowner should demonstrate why this may not be possible on an individual site.
Paragraph 5.18	Open Spaces Society	Although the draft brief has now included reference to the Green Corridor this has not been reflected in the indicative layout which shows blocks immediately abutting the railway cutting. More thought needs to be given about how this link will be achieved. Tree planting requires consideration of species and spacing.	Noted	It is acknowledged that residential blocks to the rear of the site are in relatively close proximity to the site boundary. However, there may be limited opportunities to augment the Corridor, perhaps with consideration to suitable tree planting in certain areas.
Paragraph 5.19	Bernard Selwyn	The proposed primary school cannot be dealt with so vaguely as part of a brief covering a wider area. Its designation	Not Agreed	Discussions are continuing with the developers/landowners of the Charles House site regarding the most appropriate location for a school on the site.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		must be considered formally within the Framework and a brief must follow later taking into account a firm designation. How can developers act on this when the siting of the school is yet to be agreed?		
Paragraph 5.19	Councillor Gardner	Refer to “additional further” primary school capacity	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 5.19	Bernard Selwyn	The brief seems schizophrenic on the subject of a school, also requesting a high density residential development on all four sites.	Not Agreed	The draft brief is very clear for the need for a school given the proposed residential use of the sites.
Paragraph 5.19	Kensington Society	Line 5 The amount of outdoor playspace for the school should be specified –“some” is too unspecific.	Not Agreed	There must be some flexibility with regard to the form and amount of play space. To stipulate a minimum requirement is unhelpful in these circumstances.
Paragraph 5.21	Landowners of sites (St Edward Homes Ltd, PRUPIM and Northacre)	Welcome the removal of the draft education formula from the brief.	Noted	No further response required.
Paragraph 5.21	Councillor Gardner	Refer to “the” rather than “a” standard education formula.	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 5.21	Landowners of sites (St Edward Homes Ltd, PRUPIM and Northacre)	Reference is made to the education contributions formula. In the context that the formula was removed from the brief and has not been scrutinised, reference to the formula should be deleted.	Not Agreed	The formula, whilst yet to be adopted, provides a useful basis for a consistent approach towards education contributions.
Paragraph 5.21	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The proposed formula for education is not agreed and	Not Agreed	The formula has been removed from the brief. The formula, whilst yet to be adopted, provides a useful

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		given the lack of independent scrutiny and should not form part of this SPD. The last sentence should be amended to say that “education funding towards the cost of this facility would be sought from the other sites.”		basis for a consistent approach towards education contributions.
Paragraph 5.21	Kensington Society	The standard education formula should not be omitted. It should be a transparent and open process, with the requirements set out in the planning brief.	Not Agreed	It is accepted that the draft brief is not the most appropriate document in which to scrutinise the education formula. Therefore it has been removed from the draft brief. However, reference to the formula has been retained because it provides a useful basis for a consistent approach towards education contributions.
Paragraph 5.22	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	Were a school to be provided on the site St Edward Homes support the need for contributions towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements to be assessed on the basis of the provision of a school. Not only the direct costs, but the loss of the developable area of land should be taken into account.	Noted	The full costs of providing a school will be taken into account with regard to viability.
Paragraph 5.22	Councillor Gardner	The wording is unclear, if the school is not provided, does this mean the proposal will be turned down or assessed as if the developers were providing it?	Agreed	The paragraph has been re-worded taking the delivery of a school into account.
Paragraph 5.23	Earls Courtiers	Dual use of the school playground by older children is welcome if the area is of	Noted	No further explanation required.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		sufficient size e.g a 5 a side pitch.		
Paragraph 5.23	George Wightman	The primary school buildings could have a dual use facility and be used out of school hours.	Noted	This is an objective in the draft brief
Paragraph 5.23	Earl's Court Residents Associations	We welcome the use of the school outside normal school hours for such uses as adult education classes and activities for senior citizens. However, it will not tempt the 10 – 18 year olds off the street. Would the school playground be large enough? Would there may suitable facilities to fund structured outdoor activities? A large proportion of family housing will generate many children and what will they do when they get older to occupy them?	Noted	Discussions are continuing with the developers to provide a playground of sufficient size that it can be used for structured outdoor activities.
Section 6.0 Design Opportunities				
General	Greater London Authority	The GLA raised concern regarding the prescriptive nature of the design section, in particular, that the brief should be flexible to allow additional height or density in certain areas (particular those with higher levels of accessibility) in order to maximise development	Noted	The heights given on the indicative plan are indeed indicative only and must be read in conjunction with the text regarding scale in the draft brief. Sufficient flexibility has been included to respond to required variations in height.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		opportunity. In this respect the GLA would expect the heights indicated in the indicative layout to be, as suggested, indicative.		
General	Transport for London (TfL)	In the streetscape part of the document, mention should be made of TfL's <i>Streetscape Guidance (2006)</i> particularly in relation to the interface with the Transport for London Road Network.	Agreed	Mention has been made of this document within the draft brief.
Paragraph 6.2	Kensington Society	Charles House could take a taller building, but it would need to be reduced in bulk accordingly. In general the height should not be higher than Charles House.	Agreed	These aims are reflected in the draft brief. However, the question of how much taller (if any) a replacement building could be in relation to Charles House will have to be subject of close scrutiny
Paragraph 6.2	Bernard Selwyn	I agree with the positive view taken of Charles House. If the site is eventually confirmed for housing, there should be a preference for conversion and refurbishment. This would be more satisfactory than the re-use of demolition materials. There is no possibility of "outstanding contemporary architecture" or anything better than exists.	Not Agreed	Whilst Charles House is considered not to be unattractive, a replacement building on the site could provide outstanding contemporary architecture. The statement that there is no possibility of anything better than exists is not accepted.
Paragraph 6.4	London Planning Practice on behalf of	The setback for the Telephone Exchange was only required for a long abandoned road widening scheme and it is not	Not Agreed	The setback and how it actually reduces enclosure to Warwick Road is an important design principle. It is made clear in the brief that this was for road widening purposes and not for design reasons.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	Northacre	considered that the current position should dictate any future proposals. We submit that paragraph 6.4 be amended in line with the previous wording submitted by the landowners.		
Paragraph 6.8	Landowners of sites (St Edward Homes Ltd, PRUPIM and Northacre)	Welcome the removal of the reference to a north- south service road.	Noted	No further response required.
Paragraph 6.8	Councillor Gardner	With reference to the orthogonal grid, please use words the public can understand or explain briefly.	Not Agreed	Whilst it is accepted that this is a design term it will be readily understood by the developers/landowners of the site. To give further explanation would add unnecessarily to the length of the brief.
Paragraph 6.8	Earls Courtiers	In order to reduce lighting and heating bills, the ideal site layout would allow south facing windows priority by orientation of blocks. There should be more east – west access points.	Noted	An ideal site layout would have many south facing windows. However, the orientation of the sites may not allow for this.
Paragraph 6.13	Landowners of sites (St Edward Homes Ltd, PRUPIM and Northacre)	The landowners fully support the heights proposed on the northern and southern blocks. However, one key issue repeated in the text of the brief is to seek a lower height of development in the central section with the scale stepping up to greater heights in the north and south ends of the masterplan area. As a group	Agreed	Indicative heights have been adjusted on the brief to reflect these comments and to enable some flexibility with regard to building heights.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		we do not agree with this as a rational urban design requirement.		
Paragraph 6.13	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	<p>An introductory paragraph should be added to this section which addresses the scale of the opportunity. The wording is supplied but includes reference to limited opportunities for coordinated regeneration without the immediate constraints of conservation area and historic building considerations. The creation of a high quality urban environment and the opportunity to optimise density through high quality urban design.</p> <p>It is noted that the new masterplan proposes buildings which are closer to the boundaries of individual sites than was the case in August. The potential for overshadowing and other amenity considerations will need to be tested and taken into account. Adequate separation will be required.</p>	Not Agreed	The brief is long enough without adding extra wording regarding coordinated regeneration opportunities. The distance between buildings is an important point and will have to be tested taking amenity considerations into account.
Paragraph 6.13	Kensington Society	Line 1. What is a high building in this context?	Noted	A high building would normally be taken as a building significantly in excess of 30m in height, but it depends on the surrounding townscape context. The draft brief refers to a very tall building.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Paragraph 6.14	Councillor Gardner	LB should read the London Borough of...	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 6.14	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	The brief states that the replacement building on the Charles House site is not expected to exceed the current building height. However, the indicative masterplan shows 12 indicative storeys being measured from the same height as Kensington High Street. There is a contradiction between these two statements and it is requested that the first statement is deleted.	Not Agreed	The requirement for a replacement building not to be expected to exceed the current building height will take precedence over the indicative storey height. The draft brief has been amended to provide greater clarity to the approach to indicative storey heights.
Paragraph 6.15	Kensington Society	We support a variety of heights along the Warwick Road frontage.	Noted	No further explanation is required.
Paragraph 6.15	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	We object to the reference that the development height to the front blocks must be limited to 6 principal storeys. A planning application has been submitted for the territorial army (TA) site and the documents submitted in support of the application demonstrate that 7 storeys is appropriate reflecting the unconstrained nature of the site; the height of surrounding properties; the lack of impact on sunlight and daylight; the 41.20 m gap between the TA site and Durrells House.	Not Agreed	The indicative storey heights show 6 principal storeys with the possibility of an inset roof storey. This respects the townscape context of Warwick road.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Paragraphs 6.15/6.16	Earls Courtiers	The height above 6 storeys is unwelcome, there will be serious problems with wind disturbances and overshadowing to open spaces. Tall high density blocks are proven to be unsuitable for families. The loss of light in the neighbourhood would be minimised if there was a uniform height.	Not Agreed	The indicative heights in the brief state 6 principal storeys to Warwick Road with the possibility of an inset roof storey. It is not accepted that this would cause wind disturbance or significant overshadowing. A uniform height is not desirable for townscape reasons.
Paragraph 6.16	Councillor Gardner	Add the word "current" to the Homebase frontage site. Why have the heights increased to 12 storeys at Charles House? There is no justification for such a high point. Also state what is meant by the "northern end" for clarity to the reader.	Agreed	The principal storey heights in relation to Charles House have now been clarified with 10 principal storeys. The word "current" has been added and the Charles House site will be referred to for clarity.
Paragraph 6.17	Councillor Gardner	These heights appear to have increased in the latest draft. I support lower buildings. I am horrified to see two 14 storey towers and do not understand the reference to the sightline from Kensington High Street. This feels like the brief being changed to suite the developers.	Noted	Principal storey heights have now been added to the indicative masterplan. The 14 storey towers have only been added with the proviso that they remain very slim and terminate the views from Warwick Road. They are not a justification for taller buildings to be provided elsewhere on the site.
Paragraph 6.17	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	It is agreed that 11 storeys is appropriate on the sites. The reference to 6 storeys should be omitted. There should not	Not Agreed	The Local Planning Authority has not agreed that 11 storeys are necessarily appropriate. The developers must demonstrate why such a height is acceptable in relation to the adjoining open space, residential

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		<p>be lower heights in the middle of the site. This is not a robust or justifiable position. The minimal differences in building height will barely be legible. The open space in the middle of the masterplan is the largest open area and there is a strong justification for an equal if not higher storey.</p>		<p>amenity and townscape terms. It is understood that they will make a submission to support their assertion as part of their current planning application which will be treated on its own merits..</p>
Paragraph 6.17	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	<p>The indicative masterplan omits the proposed terrace of three townhouses on the TA site. If the townhouses are removed any additional accommodation should be provided elsewhere on the site and this suggests that a building height will need to be 11 storeys on at least part of the site.</p>	Not Agreed	<p>The Local Planning Authority has not agreed that 11 storeys are appropriate. The developers must demonstrate why such a height is acceptable in relation to the adjoining open space, residential amenity and townscape terms. It is understood that they will make a submission to support their assertion as part of their current planning application which will be treated on its own merits.</p>
Paragraph 6.17	London Planning Practice on behalf of Northacre	<p>The masterplan has been heavily amended in relation to the TE site to change the block dimensions, remove the bridging accommodation and reduce the building heights. A masterplan approach requires a level of equalisation across the different sites. The TE site is clearly the most constrained yet it seems to be restricted more than any other site. There is little justification to seek a</p>	Noted	<p>The indicative storey heights have been adjusted to differentiate between principal storeys and the possibility of inset storeys where the onus will be on the developer to demonstrate that that will not cause harm in townscape or amenity terms.</p>

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		<p>lower building height on the TE and TA sites compared to the Charles House and Homebase sites. The open space between the two developments is the largest open area and therefore there is a strong justification that the height of the development should be as high, if not higher, than the buildings elsewhere which have less openness.</p>		
Paragraph 6.17	London Planning Practice on behalf of Northacre	<p>In the interests of maximising the potential on each site, the amended heights on the TE site are considered overly restrictive. The buildings along Warwick Road can sustain a height of 7 principal storeys. There is no urban design rationale for restricting the rear block height from 11 to 9 storeys to make a consistent height across the back when variations in height and roof form are required by the brief</p>	Noted	<p>The indicative storey heights have been adjusted to differentiate between principal storeys and the possibility of inset storeys where the onus will be on the developer to demonstrate that that will not cause harm in townscape or amenity terms.</p>
Paragraph 6.18	Councillor Gardner	<p>We ought to explain why setbacks are expected.</p>	Noted	<p>The draft brief explains that setback roof additions are expected to help reduce the apparent scale of buildings.</p>
Paragraph 6.19	Kensington Society	<p>Line 5. The local vernacular – does this include gardens?</p>	Noted	<p>The local vernacular in this context is not referring to gardens.</p>
Paragraph 6.19	George Wightman	<p>Whilst it is noted that the development should provide a model template for exemplar architecture, at the frontiers of</p>	Noted.	<p>No response is required.</p>

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		design it is more difficult to distinguish the banal from the brilliant.		
Paragraph 6.23	Earls Courtiers	The future adaptability of the buildings should be considered to extend their long term life.	Noted	This is a very hard concept to include in the brief. It is agreed that the space devoted to social and community facilities should be flexible enough to enable it to respond to changing needs.
Paragraph 6.23/4	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	No planning policy justification is given in relation to the preference for frequent street entrances to service the limited number of flats. Rather, if residents are focused on a single entrance this is more likely to achieve the desired outcome of high levels of activity. The sentence suggesting "breaks" on elevations allowing visual and solar penetration is not readily understandable and should be omitted.	Not Agreed	It is considered that frequent street entrances support an active frontage which is one of the objectives of the draft brief. The sentence referring to breaks in the building form has been re-written.
Paragraph 6.25	Kensington Society	With regard to Homebase, if this is redeveloped, replacement by a large format retail development other than DIY and/or a garden centre should not be allowed. Another supermarket would be in direct conflict with national, London and local planning policy.	Agreed	The position regarding a replacement to Homebase is included at paragraph 5.13 of the draft brief which states that any replacement will only be permitted if it is a similar retail operation to that existing ie a retail warehouse or the sale of bulky goods.
Paragraph 6.26	Councillor Gardner	Should we say why we do not wish to have left over space or unobserved recessed areas?	Noted	The reason for this is covered in the crime and security section of the brief.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Paragraph 6.28	Councillor Gardner	Add “in addition to Warwick Road “ with reference to the footpaths going through the sites	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 6.30	Earls Courtiers	The new bicycle route would be more effective at the rear of the site and run continuously behind other developments in Warwick Road	Not Agreed	The rear of the site will be utilised for other purposes. However, it is agreed that a link to adjoining sites to avoid the Warwick Road should be developed.
Paragraph 6.31	Councillor Gardner	Add “or such higher standards as they are introduced” with reference to energy saving standards.	Not Agreed	In the absence of what higher standards may be required this would impose an unrealistic burden on developers/ landowners. Higher standards as they are adopted, will be a material consideration in the determination of any planning
Paragraph 6.31	Home Builders Federation	We would question whether the use of photovoltaics and solar panels are effective in high density development of this nature. The degree of overshadowing can render these technologies ineffective. Wind turbines are more suited to a site of this nature.	Not Agreed	The use of solar panels and their siting will be treated on their own merits as would the introduction of wind turbines.
Paragraph 6.31	Gerald Eve on behalf of PRUPIM	This paragraph introduces a new significant and onerous requirement to meet Eco-homes “Excellent” rating or Code for Sustainable Homes 4* or above and BREEAM “Excellent” in the case of non residential uses. Based on a current indication of Policy it could be assumed that achieving Code Level 3* will	Not Agreed	It will be up to the developer to demonstrate why meeting this requirement is not possible. Some development in London is now meeting Code Level 4* and setting a high benchmark is considered appropriate in these circumstances.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		meet Part L of the Building Regulations in 2010, advancing to Code Level 4* in 2013. The principal cause for concern is a mandatory reduction of 44% CO2 reductions with Level 4*. A CHP system would be unlikely to give size of reduction.		
Paragraph 6.31	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	<p>This paragraph introduces a new significant and onerous requirement to meet Eco-homes “Excellent” rating or Code for Sustainable Homes 4* or above and BREEAM “Excellent” in the case of non residential uses.</p> <p>St Edwards have pledged all applications after 01/01/08 will reach Code for Sustainable Homes 3*. This is already ahead of current Building Regulation Part L requirements. . The principal cause for concern is a mandatory reduction of 44% CO2 reductions with Level 4*. A CHP system would be unlikely to give size of reduction.</p>		It will be up to the developer to demonstrate why meeting this requirement is not possible. Some development in London is now meeting Code Level 4* and setting a high benchmark is considered appropriate in these circumstances.
Paragraph 6.31	Landowners of sites (St Edward Homes Ltd, PRUPIM and Northacre)	As above		As above
Paragraph 6.31	DP9 on behalf	The requirement to meet	Not Agreed	It will be up to the developer to demonstrate why

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	of Nalex Ltd	EcoHomes Excellent or Code for Sustainable Home Excellent or 4* is an onerous requirement and should be set as a target at most. There is no development plan policy that supports such a high level requirement.		meeting this requirement is not possible. Some development in London is now meeting Code Level 4* and setting a high benchmark is considered appropriate in these circumstances.
Paragraph 6.31	Earls Courtiers	The sustainable standard is not high enough. The Council should require 6*	Not Agreed	This in effect requires carbon neutral homes. Given the current state of technology this would impose an unrealistic burden on developers.
Paragraph 6.34	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	Although a 20% reduction in CO2 emissions is included in the draft Further Alterations to the London Plan it is acknowledged in the Panel report and there is a need for a reasonable degree of flexibility. With this in mind the percentage should be expressed as a target. For this site there is only one possible technical solution, biomass boilers. The delivery of biomass by lorry may not be desirable.	Agreed	It is agreed that a 20% reduction in CO2 emissions should be expressed as a target. However, developers should address why it is not possible to meet this target in a prospective planning application if they consider it too onerous.
Paragraph 6.34	Landowners of sites (St Edward Homes Ltd, PRUPIM and Northacre)	Although a 20% reduction in CO2 emissions is included in the draft Further Alterations to the London Plan it is acknowledged in the Panel report and there is a need for a reasonable degree of flexibility. With this in mind the percentage should be expressed as a target.	Agreed	It is agreed that a 20% reduction in CO2 emissions should be expressed as a target. However, developers should address why it is not possible to meet this target in a prospective planning application if they consider it too onerous.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Paragraph 6.34	DP9 for Nalex Ltd	The 20% reduction in CO2 emissions should be expressed as a target and subject to viability testing. The recent examination in public of the proposed alterations to the London Plan requested that “where feasible” is to be added to the policy expectation for 20%. The wording of the paragraph should be amended accordingly.	Agreed	It is agreed that a 20% reduction in CO2 emissions should be expressed as a target. However, developers should address why it is not possible to meet this target in a prospective planning application if they consider it too onerous. The question of viability testing may be one of the aspects that developers wish to consider.
Paragraph 6.34	London Planning Practice for Northacre	The landowners are committed to sustainability but the target of 20% goes beyond current policy requirements and those set out in the London Plan. As such the brief should be adopted on the basis of current development plan policy. Any change would be a material planning consideration for future applications.	Not Agreed	A 20% reduction in CO2 emissions has been included in the further alterations to the London Plan and expressed as a target this figure is up to date and considered entirely appropriate.
Paragraph 6.34	Earls Courtiers	The use of wind power as an energy resource should be explored.	Noted	Any proposals for wind power in association with development on the sites will be treated on its own merits.
Paragraph 6.35	Gerald Eve on behalf of PRUPIM	This paragraph states that the sites lend themselves to the development of a centralised energy centre. The landowners have discussed the practicalities and logistics of being able to bring forward a coordinated approach to all four	Noted	It will be up to the individual site owners to demonstrate why it is not possible to provide a centralised energy centre. However, this aspect must be addressed in future planning applications for the sites.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		sites. The four different land ownerships and differing development timescales make delivering a centralised energy centre difficult for a number of practical reasons. Rapid advances in energy technology may improve efficiency in the longer term.		
Paragraph 6.35	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	As above	Noted	As above
Paragraph 6.35	Landowners of sites (St Edward Homes Ltd, PRUPIM and Northacre)	As above	Noted	As above
Paragraph 6.35	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The differing requirements for bringing forward development of the four separate sites is likely to impose serious constraints on the potential for a central energy centre. It will be important not to impose unreasonable costs or blight on the first sites coming forward for development. The paragraph should be amended to read " <i>The opportunities for a centralised energy centre to provide all heating and cooling, in effect creating a small scale district heating system for the sites, should be explored.</i> "	Not Agreed	It will be up to the individual site owners to demonstrate why it is not possible to provide a centralised energy centre. However, this aspect must be addressed in future planning applications for the sites. Diluting the requirements of the brief to only "explore" the provision of a centralised energy centre is not robust enough.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Paragraph 6.35	Home Builders Federation	For combined energy systems the SPD needs to be more explicit about whom it expects will provide, operate and service any neighbourhood energy system. Presumably the expectation is that the developers will provide the infrastructure and it will be paid for by the uplift in land values? The SPD should include an estimation of the likely costs and a calculation of the long term maintenance and servicing costs so developers can assess the viability.	Not Agreed	These aspects will be discussed with individual developers as part of any prospective scheme. The question of viability will have to be demonstrated by the developers if it forms part of their case that a centralised energy centre cannot be provided.
Paragraph 6.37	Earls Courtiers	Green external facing walls could also be encouraged.	Not Agreed	Careful thought would have to be given to green external facing walls because of the possible affect on the external appearance of buildings.
Paragraph 6.38	Earls Courtiers	Provision for rainwater harvesting should be incorporated.	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly
Paragraph 6.41	Kensington Society	Line 2. Delete "expected" and replace with "required"	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 6.43	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The suggestion that levels of car parking should be significantly below the Council's maximum standards is not explained or justified. This paragraph should be omitted.	Not Agreed	The reason for lower levels of off street parking than UDP standards has been explained elsewhere in the brief.
Paragraph 6.44	Councillor Gardner	Explain what is meant by Permit Free development.	Not Agreed	A definition is provided in other Council documents and it is considered inappropriate to include a definition within the brief.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Paragraph 6.44	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	There is no UDP policy background to require permit free development. This paragraph should be omitted.	Not Agreed	The reasoned justification to Policy TR42 supports the need for Permit Free development.
Paragraph 6.45	Earls Courtiers	Access is best arranged in a "Core Access" allowing flats to be dual aspect. No more than 25 dwellings should share each single core.	Not Agreed	Whilst the objectives of this comment are supported it is not considered appropriate to stipulate the maximum number of dwellings that can be served by a single core.
Paragraph 6.46	Councillor Gardner	In relation to crime and security separate entrances for different users could be seen as condoning separate entrances for affordable/market housing. Can affordable housing units have concierge services? Do we need to explain what active streets are?	Noted	In reality there will be separate entrances for affordable and market housing units although the design should remain the same. The question of the provision of concierge services will be a matter to be addressed by a Registered Social Landlord for the housing. The definition of active streets is hopefully self explanatory.
Paragraph 6.46	Earls Courtiers	Some sort of part time concierge is necessary to achieve security	Noted	Concierge services are mentioned in the draft brief.
Paragraph 6.47	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The requirement for high quality should not be confined to the public realm but extended to private areas. The first sentence should be amended as follows, " <i>a high quality streetscape and landscape is required...</i> ". In this and subsequent paragraphs the draft brief refers to "public" spaces. Careful consideration will be required where new spaces available for use by the	Noted	The references to "public" open space have been omitted from the draft brief where it has been considered appropriate. However, the question of the public realm and what may be appropriate for adoption will be the subject of further discussion with the developers/landowners of the sites.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		public are created on land currently privately owned. In particular, no rights of way can be created We recommend that he brief avoids referring to such areas as “public” spaces		
Paragraph 6.49	Councillor Gardner	Refer to Transport for London not TfL	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 6.49	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	High quality paving materials need not be confined to natural stone and the expectation for it should be omitted.	Not Agreed	It will be up to the developers to demonstrate that other high quality materials can be a suitable substitute for natural stone.
Paragraph 6.51	Councillor Gardner	Could we not add that our preference is “not gated”, but “where gated”?	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 6.52	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The fourth sentence implies the provision for maintenance of public open space should be made by the developer. The extent to which the Council wishes to secure new spaces and is prepared to take responsibility for future maintenance of such spaces will require discussion. The fifth sentence suggests a soil depth of 3m above basement level for tree planting. This is overly onerous and should be looked at on a site by site basis. Tree pits to a lesser depth could provide adequate soil depth.	Agreed	Public open spaces would normally be adopted by the Council. Private spaces are the responsibility of the developer/landowner. The question of adoption needs further discussion. The brief has been amended in relation to soil depth requirements.
Paragraph 6.54	Councillor Gardner	Private communal open space should have access for all	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		residents of that site.		
Paragraph 6.55	Councillor Gardner	Artists in plural, not necessarily an artist.	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Section 7.0 Planning Obligations				
General	Greater London Authority	This section does not recognise Mayoral priorities for transport infrastructure, ahead of education. As above, the GLA would wish to meet to discuss this aspect.	Noted	Officers will discuss this aspect of the brief prior to its adoption.
General	London Planning Practice on behalf of Northacre	It is fully accepted that necessary planning obligations may arise out of development and that these should be judged in accordance with the terms of Circular 05/05. We note the agreement that the formulae for calculating education contributions will be subject to a separate process to scrutinise its form and application.	Noted	No further response required.
General	Kensington Society	There is a need for greater clarity about what social infrastructure should be integral to the scheme and what are optional extras. It appears that the school is built into section 5 whereas other items listed in section 7 appear to have a different status – a shopping	Noted	The provision of a school is a priority for the sites so the division is intentional.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		list. Is this intentional? If not should some of the items referred to in section7 be transferred to section 5 or would it be better to break down the distinction.		
General	Earls Courtiers	Residents should be given an opportunity to manage and maintain communal facilities through a funded arrangement. The Planning brief should specify management and maintenance requirements.	Not Agreed	The funding of communal facilities goes beyond what can normally be stipulated in the planning brief.
General	George Wightman	What is plain in the brief is the absence of a sports centre for youth between 10 and 19 which could also offer facilities for the elderly at scheduled times. The self evident needs of residents are ignored. The youth will spill out onto the streets and cause trouble. It is regrettable that discussions about the proposal for a swimming pool have been dropped. An indoor sports centre should be incorporated in the brief.	Noted	Provision is made for a dual use sports facility as part of the primary school proposal. A community hall is also being sought. On this basis the brief is considered to address these concerns.
General	Earls Courtiers	A public lavatory is needed. There is demand for an advice centre. At the moment there are no post boxes on the south west side of Warwick Road. In view of local unemployment a skills training centre should be	Noted	The suggested requirements are not a priority for the Warwick Road sites. The location is not suitable for a skills training centre, although this aspect has been explored. Given the increase in residential population the Post Office will decide about the provision of further post boxes. Seats will be expected as part of the linear park and a clear demarcation of a children's play area

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		considered. Plenty of seats should be provided in the open space. Clear demarcation of the children's play area is required.		will be required, although this is more likely on private amenity space associated with residential units on the site.
General	The Home Builders Federation	The list of planning obligations is lengthy and it is not altogether clear which obligations will be sought on which parts of the overall site, despite what the draft SPD states. The Council is likely to have to consider compromise in the achievement of some policy objectives if it is to receive any benefits at all, otherwise resources may be spread too thinly. The Council should give some consideration as to where affordable housing sits in relation to other corporate objectives.	Noted	Overall infrastructure requirements and how they are allocated to sites is the subject of individual discussions with the developers of the sites. The provision of a new school is a priority. Other infrastructure contributions will be assessed as part of a viability test taking into account the need for affordable housing.
Paragraph 7.1	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	For clarity the wording "public" should be omitted or replaced with "new" in the third bullet point. The words "any required" should be added to preface the sixth bullet point. The last two bullet points are new and in the absence of any justification and explanation should be omitted.	Not Agreed	The word "public" will be omitted. However, the other points are not agreed. Justification has been provided for the other infrastructure requirements.
Paragraph 7.1	Earls Courtiers	A community centre should be included as essential social infrastructure.	Agreed	The need for a community centre has been included within the draft brief

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Paragraph 7.2	Kensington and Chelsea Primary Healthcare Trust	A surgery is required in Earl's Court rather than in this location and the sites are too far to the north for space to be most beneficially used.	Agreed	Reference to space for a new surgery has been deleted from the brief. However, the opportunity for healthcare contributions has been retained.
Paragraph 7.2	Councillor Gardner	Make reference to changing medical needs. Should we refer to a medical practice rather than a polyclinic? Insert "minimum of" rather than "up to"	Noted	This comment has been superseded in the light of the latest comments from the Primary Healthcare Trust.
Paragraph 7.2	George Wightman	A healthcare facility is not necessary because others exist in walking distance in Olympia and Abingdon ward.	Noted	This comment has been superseded in the light of the latest comments from the Primary Healthcare Trust.
Paragraph 7.2	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The requirement of the PCT are less than clear. It would be unreasonable to delay the development or require the allocation of space which is not actually needed for healthcare.	Noted	This comment has been superseded in the light of the latest comments from the Primary Healthcare Trust.
Paragraph 7.2	Earl's Court Neighbourhood Associations	We question the wisdom of the PCT using its restricted funds in the provision of yet another health facility north of the Cromwell Road. The critical need is in the Earl's Court area.	Noted	This comment has been superseded in the light of the latest comments from the Primary Healthcare Trust.
Paragraph 7.3	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The proposed contributions to the cost of health facilities is not justified and not founded upon any adopted local policy. The second sentence of 7.3 and all of 7.4 should therefore be omitted.	Not Agreed	The need for healthcare contributions based on an additional number of residential units is a legitimate developer contribution under Circular 05/05. Adopted policy justification is included in the adopted UDP and the London Plan.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
Paragraph 7.3	Greater London Authority	The deletion of the affordable housing reference in paragraph 7.3 is welcomed. The reference to other infrastructure requirements in this paragraph should, however, be removed, as the delivery of healthcare facilities should not be prioritised ahead of other infrastructure requirements, in particular transport infrastructure.	Noted	The draft brief will be suitably reworded to reflect this concern.
Paragraph 7.3	Greater London Authority	The reference to the use of the HUDU model in negotiating contributions needs further discussion. The GLA acknowledge that the model is one way to calculate contributions for health but the GLA would only expect this as a starting point for negotiations. The Council should decide how these priorities are determined in line with the London Plan. The GLA would like to discuss this matter.	Noted	Officers will discuss health contributions with the GLA before the brief is adopted.
Paragraph 7.4	Councillor Gardner	Refer to polyclinic/medical practice rather than surgery.	Noted	This comment has been superseded in the light of the latest comments from the Primary Healthcare Trust.
Paragraph 7.5	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The brief refers to a youth/employment facility requiring 186 sq m floorspace. It is not clear who would run this facility or if there is any funding. In the absence of any	Not Agreed	The paragraph has been reworded to reflect the need for a community hall. Youth activities could take place in the hall if required.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		firm proposals by the Council this paragraph should be omitted.		
Paragraph 7.5	Earl's Court Neighbourhood Associations	We are deeply concerned at the lack of provision for youth diversion and other community provision for young people. The greatest infrastructure need is not addressed. ECNA is of the view that a flexible, custom built facility for youth diversion and health is the overriding need in the centre of the borough. This must be spacious enough to accommodate structured physical exercise, drama etc. We regret the absence of reference to a publicly accessible swimming pool and hope there will be required provision in the private health and fitness centre.	Noted	Provision is made for a dual use sports facility as part of the primary school proposal. A community hall is also being sought. On this basis the brief is considered to address these concerns.
Paragraph 7.6	Councillor Gardner	The fitness centre could not just serve all the sites, but the local community and integrate with it.	Not Agreed	This will require funding to what will essentially be a public facility. It is proposed that a fitness centre may offer a discounted rate to all residents on the sites.
Paragraph 7.7	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	With regard to the requirement for a Safer Neighbourhood Police Base to be located at ground floor level a commitment from the Metropolitan Police for the funding of this facility should be provided if it is to appear in the	Not Agreed	The funding of this facility by the Metropolitan Police will be the subject of further discussion.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		brief.		
Paragraph 7.8	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	The formula referred to has proved unworkable and so the third sentence of 7.8 and all of 7.9 and 7.10 should be omitted.	Not Agreed	The formula is workable.
Paragraph 7.9	Councillor Gardner	Developers should provide a minimum of £2,500 in relation to construction training.	Not Agreed	The requirements of the Construction training SPG are as reflected in the draft brief.
Paragraph 7.11	Earls Courtiers	There should be enforcement conditions requiring the employment of local labour as a condition of planning permission.	Not Agreed	This goes beyond what can reasonably be expected although it is encouraged.
Section 8.0 Residential Amenity and Public Utility Considerations				
Paragraph 8.1	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	In order to reflect local conditions the words <i>“and the conditions expected for a central London high density urban development”</i> should be added to the second sentence. The fourth sentence should be amended to refer to <i>“reasonable light conditions including appropriate levels of sunlight.”</i>	Not Agreed	The sunlight/daylight requirements are as set out in the adopted Unitary Development Plan and there is no reason to depart from this. Each planning application will continue to be treated on its own merits subject to the particular circumstances.
Paragraph 8.1	London Planning Practice on behalf of Northacre	Regard should be had to both guidelines in “Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to Good Practice” published by the BRE	Not Agreed	The sunlight/daylight requirements are as set out in the adopted Unitary Development Plan and there is no reason to depart from this. Each planning application will continue to be treated on its own merits subject to the particular circumstances.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		and the conditions expected for a central London high density urban environment.		
Paragraph 8.1	Earls Courtiers	Generous window sizes enable more light to enter homes	Not Agreed	This goes beyond what should be stipulated in a planning brief.
Paragraph 8.2	Councillor Gardner	Delete "be" from the third line.	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 8.2	Earls Courtiers	Noise transmission between homes is an important privacy issue. The best noise insulation should be sought.	Noted	This aspect is addressed by Building Regulations.
Paragraph 8.3	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	Given the Central London conditions it is likely that some buildings will be located in closer proximity than 18m. The second and third sentence should therefore be omitted.	Not Agreed	The 18m space provides a useful guideline for development. However, each application will continue to be treated on its own merits taking into account the position of windows and the use of particular rooms.
Paragraph 8.3	Earls Courtiers	The least distance between opposite habitable rooms should be 22 metres. Outdoor spaces in the form of balconies of at least 3sq m are important.	Not Agreed	These requirements go beyond those specified in the Unitary Development Plan and are considered unduly onerous.
Paragraph 8.6	Councillor Gardner	Refer to Thames Water Developer services or replacement body	Not Agreed	These stipulations relate specifically to Thames Water. A replacement body may have different requirements.
Paragraph 8.6	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	A new second sentence should be added, <i>"This will be a matter to be addressed through a planning condition."</i>	Not Agreed	It may be the case that the matter could be addressed by planning condition. However, it may be subject to a legal agreement. On this basis the revised wording is not accepted.
Paragraph 8.8	Councillor Gardner	Refer to SUDs in full	Agreed	Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) will be incorporated into the text.
Paragraph 8.8	Kensington Society	The issue of surface water run off needs to be considerably revised to reassess the flood	Not Agreed	Environment Agency advice will be followed on the subject.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		risk following the 20 th July to take a more cautionary approach, but in any case to achieve no off site run off. There is no reason why this cannot be achieved.		
Paragraph 8.11	English Heritage	Possible archaeological remains need to be taken into account on the sites, especially the Charles House site. English Heritage generally welcomes the Supplementary Planning Document's approach to the development of the area, particularly attention that has been paid to matters of design and height. English Heritage concurs with the borough's view that new development should not exceed existing building heights.	Agreed	A new paragraph on archaeological remains has been included in the draft brief. The comments in relation to height and design have been noted.
Section 9.0 Air Quality, Servicing, Access and Parking				
General	Transport for London (TfL)	TfL confirms that it generally supports the aspirations for increased permeability, improved pedestrian and cyclist access and facilities and high quality public realm for the sites to be redeveloped.	Noted	No further response required
Paragraph 9.1	Earls Courtiers	There should be agreements to	Not Agreed	This goes beyond what could reasonably be expected

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		reduce light spillage, by distinguishing between necessary energy efficient design and the right spectrum of light could be specified in agreements.		in a planning brief.
Paragraph 9.1	Bernard Selwyn	This paragraph draws attention to the poor air quality in the borough, particularly at busy roadside locations. This is something which will have to be taken into particular account with the siting of the school at the junction of Warwick Road and the High Street.	Noted	The siting of the school will take air quality into account. However, this concern may be able to be addressed through the design process.
Paragraph 9.3	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	For the reasons outlined in paragraph 6.43, this paragraph should be deleted.	Not Agreed	The reason for lower levels of off street parking than UDP standards are clearly explained.
Paragraph 9.4	Transport for London (TfL)	TfL strongly supports the requirement for servicing management plans aimed at ensuring that servicing takes place off Warwick Road.	Noted	No further response required.
Paragraph 9.5	Councillor Gardner	Explain what "designated" means in relation to servicing bays so the public can understand. I am concerned that we are not addressing the delivery hours in the brief. Tesco's has restrictions.	Not Agreed	Designated parking bays are defined in other Council documents. In view of the fact that delivery is likely to take place from basement level and none of the retail units are anything approaching Tesco's in terms of floorspace, restrictions on delivery hours are not considered appropriate at this stage.
Paragraph 9.6	Councillor Gardner	Off street parking should be allowed for the medical practice	Noted	This comment has been superseded in the light of the latest comments from the Primary Healthcare Trust.
Paragraph 9.6	Earls Courtiers	Consideration should be given to the provision of visitor car	Not Agreed	Visitor parking spaces are no longer catered for to reduce traffic generation in the surrounding area.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		parking spaces		
Paragraph 9.7	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	This paragraph requires significantly less off street parking than the maximum standards quoted in the UDP. The current UDP Policy TR42 requires new residential development to provide car parking up to the maximum car parking standards in Chapter 13. There has been no change to this policy and so these must be the standards that developments will be expected to follow. The first sentence should therefore be deleted.	Not Agreed	The current UDP standards are material considerations which will be taken into account. However, the brief is seeking significantly reduced levels of off street parking are sought in the brief to reduce the impact of the developments on air quality and the road network.
Paragraph 9.7	London Planning Practice on behalf of Northacre	Car parking should be provided at a level that balances the needs of the development and its occupants together with the highway impact and air quality implications. Permit free development is supported to prevent any overspill requirements placing pressure on local on street parking provision.	Not Agreed	The current UDP standards are material considerations which will be taken into account. However, the brief is seeking significantly reduced levels of off street parking are sought in the brief to reduce the impact of the developments on air quality and the road network.
Paragraph 9.8	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	For the same reasons as set out above the word " <i>limited</i> " should be omitted.	Not Agreed	The current UDP standards are material considerations which will be taken into account. However, the brief is seeking significantly reduced levels of off street parking are sought in the brief to reduce the impact of the developments on air quality and the road network.
Paragraph 9.9	DP9 on behalf of Nalex Ltd	For similar reasons the third and fourth sentence should be	Not Agreed	The current UDP standards are material considerations which will be taken into account. However, the brief is

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		replaced as follows, <i>“permit free development will be encouraged.”</i>		seeking significantly reduced levels of off street parking and Permit Free Development to reduce the impact of the developments on air quality and the road network.
Paragraph 9.9	Kensington Society	Line 1. Amend first sentence to read, “the public transport accessibility levels (PTALs) vary from site to site, with the Charles House site being “high” (PTAL 4) declining to “medium to high” (PTAL 3/4) for sites to the south of Charles House	Not Agreed	The draft brief already expresses the fact that the sites are within an area which shows medium to high public transport accessibility.
Paragraphs 9.6 to 9.10	Transport for London (TfL)	TfL insists on the fact that all land uses are accompanied by Travel Plans, not just educational uses. Given the relatively high accessibility of the sites, TfL would support a strong restriction of car parking spaces off street altogether with a refusal of eligibility for a parking permit. TfL would support no car parking for non-residential uses.	Agreed	Travel Plans are proposed for all uses as reflected in the wording in paragraph 9.16. The other comments are noted.
Paragraph 9.10	Councillor Gardner	Are we referring to one particular car club, or car clubs?	Agreed	Car clubs are being referred to and the wording will be altered accordingly.
Paragraph 9.11	Councillor Gardner	The standard for bicycle parking seems very high. I am also concerned that only one small stretch of dedicated cycle route is being provided.	Noted	The bicycle parking standards are in line with UDP requirements. It is not possible to provide a dedicated cycle route throughout the site given other constraints. However, this aspect will be examined further.
Paragraphs 9.10 to 9.12	Transport for London (TfL)	Non residential cycle parking should be provided in accordance with the <i>Cycling</i>	Not Agreed	Bicycle parking facilities will be provided as required in the adopted UDP.

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
		<i>Parking Standards TfL Proposed Guidelines</i> . This is important in case further planning applications on the site are referable. TfL would encourage supporting infrastructure.		
Paragraph 9.15	Transport for London (TfL)	TfL is concerned about the number and type of vehicle accesses on Warwick Road and High Street Kensington. The number of accesses should be strictly controlled with a view to overall limiting the number of vehicle accesses to two on the Warwick Road and one on Kensington High Street, all with left in, left out arrangements. In addition to the internal roads should not be linked or designed to provide a rat run.	Noted	These concerns have been addressed in the draft brief.
Paragraph 9.15	Gerald Eve on behalf of St Edward Homes	St Edward Homes fully support the recognition that temporary accesses will be considered on their own merits and that a longer term aim to close or combine access points can be controlled by s106 planning obligation.	Noted	No further response is required.
Paragraph 9.19	Councillor Gardner	Add "routes" in relation to buses, not just frequency and capacity	Agreed	The draft brief has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 9.19	Earl's Court	We would like to see the	Noted	The provision of suitable bus services is a matter for

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	Neighbourhood Associations	provision of a north-south bus route through the length of the sites from Kensington High Street to Fenelon Place. These are matters for RBKC to negotiate with TfL. We would also encourage s106 agreements to enable improvements to passenger facilities at Kensington Olympia station. We regret the absence of a petrol station in the area.		further discussion with TfL. Kensington Olympia station is not really close enough to the developments to justify developer contributions.
Paragraph 9.20	Kensington Society	The brief fails to emphasise the need to integrate these sites with the rest of the borough. The brief must address this by reconfiguring the space between buildings on either side of Warwick Road, creating more pedestrian crossings to encourage greater links to the east. This means using the brief to redesign Warwick Road in line with the Borough's Streetscape Design Guide and insert at least two pedestrian crossings. This will require a more ambitious set of proposals being put forward to Transport for London.	Noted	Paragraph 9.20 has been amended to give more emphasis to integrating these sites with the rest of Kensington. However, TfL is a key player in this process and discussions are continuing in an attempt to get TfL to provide a more robust approach to this concern.
Paragraph 9.21	Earls Courtiers	Natural ventilation from prevailing winds is preferable to air conditioning	Noted	This is supported, but each case will have to be treated on its merits.
Paragraph 9.22	Councillor	Can we ask for the plant	Not Agreed	The plant specification is very stringent and takes into

Consultation Reference	Commentator	Comment	Response	Action
	Gardner	specification in terms of noise to be more stringent at night?		account night time ambient noise levels.
Paragraph 9.25	Earls Courtiers	The contingency for legitimate small scale industrial pyrolysis is welcome as the cost of conventional energy sources is forecast to rise exponentially. Underground anaerobic digestion of waste is a possibility.	Noted	Clearly other methods of waste treatment will be examined on their own merits.
Paragraph 9.25	Councillor Gardner	What does “provision of space for future proofing of new waste technologies” mean?	Noted	This means providing space for future technologies to deal with waste reduction.

