

# Response Form – New Local Plan Review: Publication Policies: Soundness Consultation (Regulation 19)

**Eight-week consultation from 27 October to 22 December 2022**

---

The Council is undertaking a New Local Plan Review (NLPR), the document which will help shape the nature of development across the Borough over the next 20 years. It will include our vision for future development and the planning policies needed to achieve this vision. It will also include sites suitable for development as well as those areas where conservation is of particular importance.

## How to respond

**Online:** This response form is designed to follow the structure of the NLPR - Publication Policies and also asks you to respond to the accompanying Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA). **The most efficient way of responding to the consultation is to do so online following this link:** <https://planningconsult.rbkc.gov.uk/NLPRReg19/consultationHome>

**Email:** Complete the response form available on the link above and email it to [planningpolicy@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@rbkc.gov.uk). Please ensure you state 'NLPR Publication Policies Consultation' in the subject line.

**Post:** Complete this response form and post it to:

NLPR Publication Policies Consultation  
Planning Policy Team  
Planning and Place  
Kensington Town Hall  
Hornton Street  
London W8 7NX

## Personal/Contact Details

**Please note that if you respond to this consultation your response will be publicly available. This will include your name, who you represent and the company/organisation but not personal contact details such as address or email.**

*All comments will be passed to the planning inspectorate who will consider them at the forthcoming examination in public.*

<b>Your Name</b>	<b>HENRY PETERSON</b>
<b>Address</b>	95 HIGHLEVER ROAD
<b>Company/Organisation</b>	ST QUINTIN AND WOODLANDS NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM AND ST HELENS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
<b>Representing</b> <b>(e.g. - Self/ client name or organisation)</b>	THE ABOVE TWO ORGANISATIONS WHICH SHARE THE SAME MEMBERSHIP OF 370 MEMBERS IN ST HELENS AND DALGARNO WARDS
<b>Email:</b>	Henrypeterson@aol.com

If you no longer wish to receive communications about planning policy consultations, please let us know by emailing [planningpolicy@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@rbkc.gov.uk) and we will remove your details from our database.

## Examination hearing and notifications

**Qu i: If your representation is seeking a modification of any of the policies, would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, the examination hearing?**

Yes **Answer is Yes**

No

Please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

We participated in the hearings on the 2019 RBKC Local Plan and are familiar with the process. We will ensure that our input is brief and to the point. Local knowledge is an

important element of the Local Plan process. As a neighbourhood forum with a ‘made’ neighbourhood plan, we feel that the Forum should be entitled to be heard at an EIP.

Please note it is the Inspector who will decide who he wishes to attend the hearing.

**Qu ii: Please confirm whether you wish to be notified of any of the following:**

	Yes	No
That the policies have been submitted for the independent examination <b>Answer Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
if/when the planning inspector issues and recommendations to change the submitted Local Plan <b>Answer Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
when the Local Plan is adopted? <b>Answer Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*(The version of this Word document which we have used did not allow for any typed input to the response boxes. Having raised this with RBKC we understand that this problem has now been fixed but do not wish to undertake the task of transposing all our comments onto a new version of the form)*

## Advice on the ‘tests of soundness’

This “publication policies” stage of the NLPR is largely concerned with whether the policies satisfy the tests of soundness as set out in paragraph 35 of the [National Planning Policy Framework](#).

Plans are sound if they are:

**Positively prepared** – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs<sup>1</sup>; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;

**Justified** – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;

**Effective** – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Footnote 21 of the NPPF - Where this relates to housing, such needs should be assessed using a clear and justified method, as set out in paragraph 61 of this Framework.

**Consistent with national policy** – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.

The Plan must also be **legally compliant** which means that it must have been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements.

**At this stage in the process, we are asking you to tell us whether you consider the policy meets these tests.**

## Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter explains what a Local Plan is, the nature of the policies within it and the timescale for the production of the plan. It also sets out the overall vision for the new Local Plan.

### Policy V1: Vision for the Borough

The vision supports good growth and requires future development in the Borough to be green, inclusive and liveable.

#### Qu 1: Do you consider this vision to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?		X
Consistent with national policy?	X	
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Wording '*ensure that we provide the truly affordable homes*' is over aspirational and cannot possibly be realised by RBKC within the Borough - given its property and land values. Suggest '***maximise availability of affordable homes within our powers and resources***' to help avoid criticism that RBKC is out of touch with the reality of the lives of many in the Borough.

## Chapter 2: Green-blue Future

This Chapter is concerned with the environment in its widest sense. It is concerned with retrofitting existing buildings, energy and net zero carbon; improving air quality, light pollution, odour, noise and vibration; managing flood risk; protection and enhancement of green infrastructure, biodiversity and trees; as well as waste and contaminated land.

### Policy GB1: Sustainable Retrofitting

This policy sets out how buildings can be retrofitted to be more energy efficient and use cleaner energy.

#### Qu 2: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

The StQW Forum supports new flexibilities on retrofitting existing homes within a conservation area.

### GB2: Circular Economy

The policy considers how development should minimise waste during the building process.

#### Qu 3: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Add sentence to supporting text (or footnote) to say that ‘major development’ is defined in the glossary**, in case householders worry that they will need to meet this further requirement on minor applications.

**Policy GB3: Whole Life-cycle Carbon**

This policy is intended to ensure that the carbon generated over the life-time of a building is reduced.

**Qu 4: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy

**Policy GB4: Energy and Net Zero Carbon**

This policy is intended to ensure that new development reduces energy demand and that major development is net zero carbon.

**Qu 5: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		

Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Policy GB5: Overheating**

This policy is concerned with how best to ensure that major development minimises overheating risk and reduces reliance on air conditioning.

**Qu 6: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Policy GB6: Air Quality**

This policy is concerned with how to ensure that development is undertaken in a way which minimises its impact on air quality.

**Qu 7: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Para 2.73 reads *Given the ongoing exceedances of air pollutants throughout the Borough, every opportunity must be taken to improve air quality. Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plans (DCEMPs) and Dust Management Plans (DMPs) play a key role in controlling emissions during the demolition and construction phases of development.*

Policy GB 6 F states *All major development and smaller scale development that involves potentially 'dusty works', such as basement excavation, soil removal or import, are required to produce a Dust Risk Assessment to identify potential impacts and appropriate corresponding mitigation measures to protect local sensitive receptors from the impact of dust.*

Will it be clear to householders what is a 'smaller scale development' (if this does not involve a basement?). Removal of the majority of internal walls is a form of refurbishment now becoming more common in the StQW neighbourhood. **A footnote needed to refer applicants to the relevant source of information.**

**Policy GB7: Construction Management**

This policy is concerned with how to ensure that developments minimise construction impacts.

**Qu 8: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		



Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

The StQW Neighbourhood Forum/SHRA continues to support the RBKC Construction Code'.

**Policy GB8: Noise and Vibration**

This policy is concerned with how to ensure that the impact of noise and vibration generating sources are minimised during both the construction and operational phases of development.

**Qu 9: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

No further comment

**Policy GB9: Odour**

This policy is concerned with how to ensure that odour is properly taken into account in the planning process.

**Qu 10: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

The StQW Neighbourhood Forum/SHRA supports this new policy. It is relevant to a location such as Latimer Road where 'dark kitchens' in an EZ on one side of the street abut housing in a conservation area on the other side of the same street.

**Policy GB10: Light Pollution**

This policy is concerned with how to ensure that light pollution is properly taken into account in the planning process.

**Qu 11: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

While StQW/SHRA supports this policy it does not address the issue of light pollution and spillage from structures not deemed to constitute 'development' (e.g. areas with awnings in rear gardens). **Does this need explaining in the supporting text or a footnote to avoid enforcement reports on which RBKC cannot act?**

**Policy GB11: Flood Risk**

This policy requires flooding, flood risk and safety to be considered for any relevant planning application.

**Qu 12: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

We note that this draft policy has been varied from that in the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan. Given the extent of surface water flooding in the north of the Borough in recent years we think there needs to be an EIP session which takes evidence on whether further strengthening is needed on Policy GB11C

The Reg 18 version read *C. Sleeping accommodation below the breach level will not be allowed.*

This has been amended to *C. Sleeping accommodation will not be permitted below ground floor level in Flood Zone 3.*

We consider **that there may be a case for extending this limitation to Critical Drainage Areas** until such time as the inadequacy of the Counter Creek sewer is addressed via a replacement scheme (as referred to at para 2.106).

**Policy GB12: Sustainable drainage**

This policy is concerned with surface water flooding and Sustainable Drainage Systems.

**Qu 13: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Policy GB12 E states Impermeable surfaces in gardens and landscaped areas will not be permitted as part of a development.

While a similar policy is included in the 2019 RBKC Local Plan it has proved wholly ineffective. Householders in the StQW/SHRA area do not understand (or claim not to understand) that paving or concreting over a front garden constitutes ‘development’ and requires planning consent. There is no enforcement of breaches of planning control.

**We suggest that the wording of GB12 E needs an additional sentence saying ‘Installing impermeable surfaces in front gardens (other than existing**

**footpaths) constitutes development and requires planning consent, which will not normally be granted.**

This would allow for e.g. ramped areas in front gardens where occupants have disabilities.

**Policy GB13: Water and Wastewater Infrastructure**

This policy is concerned with the provision of water and sewage infrastructure, waterways and residential moorings.

**Qu 14: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

No further comment

**Policy GB14: Waterways**

This policy is concerned with how development must protect and enhance the borough's waterways.

**Qu 15: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Policy GB15: Green Infrastructure**

This policy is concerned with the provision of green infrastructure, or parks, grassed areas, street trees and physical greening. It is also concerned with the quality of the green infrastructure being provided.

**Qu 16: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

No further comment

**Policy GB16: Parks, Gardens and Open Spaces**

This policy is concerned with the provision of new and protection of existing parks, gardens and open spaces.

**Qu 17: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

StQW/SHRA continues to support strongly this policy and particularly the reference in GB16 4 to *Local Green Spaces where these are designated in a neighbourhood plan or other development plan document* and the related map at Figure 2.3..

**For clarity the term 'adopted/made' neighbourhood plan could be added to the above part of GB16 4.**

### Policy GB17: Biodiversity

This policy is concerned with the protection of existing, and provision/ enhancement of new features to support biodiversity.

#### Qu 18: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

No further comment

### Policy GB18: Trees and Landscape

This policy is concerned with the protection and provision of trees and landscape design.

**Qu 19: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**NB 'complements' spelled incorrectly at G18 G.**

**Policy GB19: Waste Management**

This policy is concerned with the Borough's strategic waste targets and local site specific waste management principles.

**Qu 20: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Policy GB20: Contaminated Land**

This policy is concerned with how new development must address the issue of contaminated land and water pollution.

**Qu 21: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
--	--------------	----------------

Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

## Chapter 3: Homes

This chapter is concerned with how the Council can use the planning process to provide the diverse range of homes to meet our current and future housing needs.

### Policy HO1: Delivery and protection of homes

This policy is concerned with how the Council will support the delivery of new homes, protect the homes that we have, but also set out those circumstances where the loss of a home may be appropriate.

The Council is seeking to confirm that it has a five year housing land supply through the forthcoming Local Plan examination.

### Qu 22: Do you agree that we have a five year housing land supply and/or consider this policy to be...

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.



As set out in our response to the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan we consider that **a new Local Plan for RBKC needs a specific policy on Housing Density**. As we stated previously:

This policy should

- Provide more clarity and guidance to developers and landowners at a very early stage as to the likely acceptability of proposals.
- Help to avoid situations in which developer expectations continue through the stage of extensive pre-application advice and PPAs, only for the outcome to arouse such strong opposition from local residents that schemes are refused by the Council’s Planning Committee.
- Help the public to understand, from looking at the Local Plan, what sort of building typology and building heights are likely to emerge in different parts of the Borough.

It is difficult at this time to predict the direction of national policy and we accept that this new Local Plan is likely to be examined against the current version of the NPPF. But there are clear signals that the concept of ‘gentle density’ will feature in an updated NPPF.

On short-lets, the StQW neighbourhood suffers from this problem. On HO1 E there is a need to add after HO1E **by adding after “HMOs” in line 1: “, as permanent residential accommodation,” along with “and will resist their loss to short-lets and tourist accommodation”**

**Policy HO2: Small Sites**

This policy is concerned with how the Council will support the delivery of new homes on small sites.

**Qu 23: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

HO2 B provides for *Well-designed upward extensions creating new homes that respond sensitively to the surrounding context*. While an extra section of supporting text has been added at 3.20 this refers to allowing *upwards extensions in and out of conservation areas*.

Our experience is that niche developers are pursuing ‘airspace development’ in the Borough and that RBKC Policy CD 11 (referred to at 3.20) has proved insufficient to address the impact of ‘rooftop’ developments on existing occupiers within small blocks of flats. This could be addressed with a minor modification to HO2 B stating **‘and which do not have harmful impacts on the occupants of existing dwellings’**.

### Policy HO3: Community Housing

This policy is concerned with the nature and quantum of community (affordable) housing which will be required on relevant sites. It also sets out the tenure of community homes that we will seek.

#### Qu 24: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?		X
Effective?		X
Consistent with national policy?		X
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

In our Regulation 18 response, we questioned whether the 650 sq m threshold in HO3 A has had the effect of slowing some small potential development sites coming forward for housing. We think that Latimer Road, with a 75 new home target is an example (see site allocation SA9 below). Only one of 14 light industrial units has been redeveloped in the street, in the period since 2016 when the StQW Neighbourhood Plan introduced the potential for mixed use.

A suggested minor modification of HO3 A would be *Require community housing from development (including extensions) creating new residential floorspace of 650 sq. m GIA or more, **except at locations where viability evidence demonstrates that development would not otherwise come forward.***

#### Policy HO4: Housing Size and Standards

This policy is concerned with the mix of types and sizes of homes which will be required on a site both for market and community homes. It sets out accessibility and space standards for homes.

#### Qu 25: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

No additional comment

#### Policy HO5: Specialist Housing

This policy is concerned with how the Council will protect and support the delivery of homes for older people and other forms of supported housing.

#### Qu 26: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

No additional comment

## Policy HO6: Other Housing Products

This policy sets out how the Council will consider proposals which include “build to rent” and “co-living” forms of housing as well as how we will protect existing student accommodation/ will consider applications for the provision of new.

### Qu 27: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

As per our response to the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan, we support Policy H06 and its resistance to the Build to Rent model. On co-living schemes, we think that there can be a place for this model (including inter-generational co-living) but that this requires some rethinking of the recent wave of developments in the light of the poor experience of occupants in pandemic lockdown.

## Policy HO7: Estate Renewal

This policy sets out how the Council will consider proposals which involve the renewal of existing housing estates. This relates to estates owned by registered providers rather than the Council, as the Council has made a commitment not to carry out any wholesale estate regeneration on Council owned estates.

### Qu 28: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

We repeat our Regulation 19 comment that it is important that the wording of the policy and the supporting text does not give the impression that the Council has given up on all forms of investment in its estates, in terms of their refurbishment, maintenance, and improvement in the quality of the homes, and retrofitting for climate change.

**Policy HO8: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation**

This policy sets out how the Council to seek to protect, improve and if possible, increase Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the Borough.

**Qu 29: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

As per our Regulation 19 response, we support the policy but see no sign of identification of an alternative site being identified to that beneath the Westway.

**Chapter 4: Conservation and Design**

This chapter is concerned with design policies, or how we ensure that new development, of any scale, will maintain and enhance the Borough’s character and distinctiveness.

**Policy CD1: Context and character**

This policy sets out how the Council requires new development to respect the existing context, character and appearance of an area.

**Qu 30: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	

Justified?		<b>X</b>
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?		<b>X</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Policy CD1 C reads *Require the density of development to be optimised using a design-led approach in a manner sensitive to context.*

Supporting text at 4.11 reads *The density of the development should be the outcome of this design process, rather than the starting point, using the design-led approach as set out in Policy HO1 A (4). Where appropriate, the Council will consider utilising co-design processes to guide development.*

Policy Ho1 A (4) reads *Optimising the homes delivered on all sites using a design led approach and benchmarking against the nationally described housing standards.*

We do not consider that this combination of policies gives adequate guidance on density to developers of major schemes in the Borough, given the lack of any overall policy on Housing Density in the Local Plan (see above).

As a minimum we suggest an addition to CD1 C to read '*in a manner sensitive to context **and benchmarked against typologies and densities for street forms and urban buildings in the National Model Design Code***'.

Given the importance of development in Opportunity Areas in the 5 year life of the new Local Plan, we repeat our previous view that the wording of Policy CD1 J is not clear – particularly the last part. Current wording is *For strategic development sites, such as the Borough's Opportunity Areas, require development to relate positively to existing context, **even where development is at a scale that it can set a new character in itself*** (our emphasis). This last part of the sentence is not clearly expressed, or suggests a 'developer-led' approach in OAs.

Through its Local Plan and related SPDs and other material, we think that the Council in conjunction with local people should be setting the 'new character' for OAs, rather than leaving this to developers.

We suggest that the last part of J should be deleted and replaced with '***require development to relate to the aspirations of the National Model Design Code and Local Plan material in for the form of SPDs and placemaking frameworks***'.

### Policy CD2: Design quality, character and growth

This policy sets out how the Council is concerned with the quality of the design of new development.

#### Qu 31: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?		X
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Suggested addition to CD2 C1. *The context of the site, including in terms of scale, height, mass and bulk* **and guidance set out in the National Model Design Code.**

### Policy CD3: Heritage Assets – Conservation Area

This policy sets out how the Council will ensure that development will preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas.

#### Qu 32: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Policy CD4: Designated Heritage Assets – Listed buildings**

This policy sets out how the Council will ensure that development will protect the heritage significance of listed buildings and their setting.

**Qu 33: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

N/A as the StQW neighbourhood does not include Listed Buildings

**Policy CD5: Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology**

This policy sets out how the Council will ensure that development in the setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument will protect its heritage significance.

**Qu 34: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.



## Policy CD6: Registered Parks and Gardens

This policy sets out how the Council will consider planning applications within, or in the setting of a Registered Park and Garden.

### Qu 35: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?		X
Justified?		X
Effective?		X
Consistent with national policy?		X
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

As commented on at Regulation 18 stage, this policy is very unbalanced in paying no heed to **the need for refurbished or redeveloped buildings in parks to be functional, safe, and user-friendly**. (Part C currently reads *Developments within a Registered Park or Garden should sustain the significance of the heritage asset and be carried out in a correct, scholarly manner informed by appropriate specialists*). **Issues such the location of new/refurbished buildings and their level of oversight of young children, shelter from weather, and internal design should be given much more recognition.**

## Policy CD7: Tall Buildings

This policy defines what the Council considers to be a tall building, suitable locations for such buildings and the way any applications for tall buildings will be assessed.

### Qu 36: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?		X
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

To be fully effective, we suggest a minor rewording of Criterion B to read *Proposals that meet or exceed the definition of a tall building in criterion A will be assessed in accordance with **all parts of** London Plan Policy D9.*

Since December 2020 when this important policy was added to the 2021 London Plan via a Direction of the Secretary of State, GLA officers (and some Borough planning departments) have chosen to focus on Part C of London Plan Policy D9 and to treat very flexibly the clearly worded requirements in Part B. The Hillingdon judgment by Mrs Justice Lang (and her view that Part B should not be treated as a ‘gateway’) has reinforced this trend. Developers need to understand that RBKC will not be using this ‘flexible’ approach (we trust).

The precise wording of Criterion D in the RBKC Policy CD7, with its reference to Figure 4.4. and specified heights is welcomed.

Supporting text: An extra sentence should be added to paragraph 4.53 stating ***In accordance with London Plan Policy D9(B) proposals for tall buildings should come forward only in locations identified as suitable in the Local Plan.***

Reason: For additional clarity/effectiveness as above (this paragraph of supporting text currently refers to Parts C and D of London Plan D, but not to Part B).

### Policy CD11: Existing Buildings – Roof Alterations/Additional Storeys

This policy sets out what the Council will consider when assessing applications for roof additions and additional storeys.

#### Qu 37: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?		X
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**In terms of effectiveness Part C.7 of this policy states *Resist additional storeys (7) Mansion blocks of flats where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition***

**Suggested rewording *‘Resist development proposals for additional storeys on existing blocks of flats where this would add significant bulk or height when***

***viewed from neighbouring streets and/or where this would alter or disrupt internal access to existing dwellings, means of escape, or introduce terraces or roof gardens involving a harmful reduction in privacy for neighbouring properties or gardens.***

**Reason for change:** For additional clarity/effectiveness and consistency with RBKC policies. ‘Mansion’ flats as used in the present wording is an imprecise term. The present wording of CD11 does not seem to cater for the current scenario of specialist ‘airspace developers seeking out small blocks of flats on which to add storeys. Such development can impact on existing properties in more serious respects than ‘*unbalancing architectural composition*’. See e.g. at Coronation Court, Brewster Gardens W10 within the StQW neighbourhood area.

Supporting text: add at 4.71 ***Addition of an extra storey at roof level in existing blocks of flats can also disrupt existing stair and access arrangements, means of escape and other features of dwellings within the building.***

### **Policy CD14: Views**

This policy sets out how the Council will protect and enhance views, vistas and gaps in the skyline that contribute to the character and quality of the area.

#### **Qu 38: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

No added comments

### **Policy CD15: Fire Safety**

This policy is concerned with fire safety and when a Planning Fire Safety Strategy document must be submitted.

#### **Qu 39: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?		X?
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

<p>The draft policy is carefully worded and aims to reflect the latest position on national legislation and London Plan guidance. <b>We think that Borough residents will expect to see a reference to the need for secondary staircases in all buildings defined as ‘tall’.</b></p> <p>Our experience is that London developers have in the past year been revising plans and proposals to incorporate a second staircase as a means of escape. This has resulted from LFB views at pre-application stage, and DLUHC guidance on likely changes to Building Regulations. It is essential that the RBKC new Local Plan is ahead of the curve on this subject.</p>
---

## Chapter 5: Town Centres

This chapter is concerned with our town centres and how to ensure they remain vibrant areas which our residents, workers and visitors from further afield choose to visit.

### Policy TC1: Location of town centre uses

This policy is concerned with where new town centre uses should generally be directed to, and the tests which must be satisfied when new large scale commercial uses are proposed. It also supports new town centres in the Opportunity Areas.

#### Qu 40: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?		X
Justified?		X
Effective?		X
Consistent with national policy?		X
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

We commented at some length on this chapter at Regulation 18 stage and are disappointed that few of our suggestions have been picked up (one has, with the addition at 5.22 of the sentence *In the case of the Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area we do recognise, and support, the wider catchment of the existing supermarket*)..

Overall, we see this chapter as restrictive and question whether its policies meet the required standard of ‘positively prepared’ and ‘justified’ for a 2023 Local Plan? We do not have expertise in the changing pattern of retailing, beyond that of ordinary residents, but continue to feel that this chapter clings to some conventional planning orthodoxies such as a ‘heirarchy’ of town centres.

This only becomes problematic if and when Local Plan policies inhibit the evolution of retailing and entertainment, thereby add to the impact of a likely recession in the early period of a new Local Plan.

**We do not have specific wording modifications to propose, but suggest that this chapter is one worthy of discussion at an EIP hearing.** There may be scope for the simple deletion of Policies TC1 and TC2 as dating from a former era of town planning.

**Policy TC2: Nature of Development within Town Centres**

This policy is concerned with the scale and nature of new development within town centres.

**Qu 41: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		<b>X</b>
Justified?		<b>X</b>
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

TC2 A reads *Require the scale and nature of development to relate to the size, role and function of that town centre, to reflect the position of the centre within the town centre network and to assist in the implementation of the strategy for that centre*; We see wording such as ‘reflect the position of the centre within the town

centre network' as overly restrictive and having diminishing meaning in the London of the 2020s.

We are not clear what public good Policy TC2 aims to achieve? Given the E1 use class, the LPA no longer has significant planning powers to 'implement a strategy' for different 'centres'. We are not convinced by the history to date of RBKC efforts at 'town centre management' that the Council would be pursuing a strategy that achieved the best outcomes for all Londoners and global visitors – even if it had such powers. **We suggest deletion of this policy unless its recent effective use can be demonstrated, or it is strongly supported by the business community in the Borough.**

### Policy TC3: Diversity of uses within Town Centres

This policy is concerned with the range of uses within our town centres.

#### Qu 42: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

This policy is more specific than TC1 and TC2 and covers matters which remain in most cases subject to planning controls. We support the policy, including Part H on New Homes in Town Centres.

### Policy TC4: The evening economy

This policy is concerned with the uses which contribute to the evening economy.

#### Qu 43: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

The StQW/SHRA neighbourhood has very little 'evening economy' to speak of, the last pub having closed in 2021 and there being only 2 small restaurants. Our membership is generally supportive of new borough-wide policies on e.g alfresco eating.

We strongly support the Playground Theatre in Latimer Road and welcome the flexibility on use classed offered by the new E class (the StQW Neighbourhood Plan previously allowed for a wide range of use classed in local shopping parades, without the need to apply for change of use. This has helped to reduce number of vacant units.

**Policy TC5: Local Shopping and other facilities which support day-to-day needs**

This policy is concerned with the protection of the commercial uses which meet the day-to-day needs of our residents.

**Qu 44: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

We support Policy TC5 and in particular the protection for pubs offered by London Plan Policy HC7 and this Local Plan policy.

**Policy TC8: Hotels and other forms of tourist accommodation**

This policy is concerned with the hotels, where they should be protected and where new hotels/ expansion of existing will be supported.

**Qu 45: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

No additional comment

## Chapter 6: Business

This chapter is concerned with business uses, including offices and industrial uses.

### Policy BC1: Business uses

This policy is concerned with the offices, industrial and warehouse uses, where these will be protected and where new uses will be supported.

#### Qu 46: Do you consider this policy to be...

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Following its referendum in February 2016, the StQW Neighbourhood Plan brought into force a new set of policies for the Latimer Road sections of the Freston/Latimer Employment Zone. These allowed (with limitations) for an element of mixed use to be introduced in the street.

Progress in ensuring the continued vitality of this single street, cut off by the Westway from the larger Freston Road part of the EZ has been slow. We therefore strongly welcome the new draft Policy B1 K. This removes a requirement proposed to continue to apply in other EZs in the Borough, of



requiring a ‘significant uplift in both the quantity and quality of businesses uses on site’ in respect of the 4 separate sections of Latimer Road designated as an EZ,

A requirement to retain the existing quantum of business floorspace will remain, along with a required ‘uplift in quality’. This will help to improve what has been very marginal viability for any form for redevelopment in the street, which for many years has lacked investment in outdated office floorspace.

RBKC has adopted a Design Code for any redevelopment of Units 1-14 in Latimer Road. The new wording of B1 K should also help to ensure any redevelopments can achieve the parameters of height and massing set out in this Code.

We have suggested in previous Local Plan responses that the Council should review the boundaries of its 3 Employment Zones. That for Latimer Road has remained unchanged since the 1990s. One side if the street remans an EZ while the other is made up of 19<sup>th</sup> c housing and was added to the Oxford Gardens Conservation Area in 2021.

We continue to question whether the continued EZ designation of separate sections of Latimer Road has a justification, in a borough where streets combining commercial and residential uses are widespread. See also response below on Site Allocation SA9.

### Policy BC3: Affordable workspace

This policy is concerned with how large commercial developments should provide affordable workspaces.

#### Qu 47: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Demand for affordable workspace remains high in North Kensington and many of our members are involved in the creative industries.

## Chapter 7: Social infrastructure

This chapter is concerned with those social and community use which allow the Borough to function properly.

### Policy SI1: Social infrastructure and facilities

This policy is concerned with the protection of existing, and support for the provision of new, social and community facilities.

#### Qu 48: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

This policy, with its sequential approach, is important to the neighbourhood and is reinforced by policies on health facilities in the StQW Neighbourhood Plan.

## Chapter 8: Streets and Transport

This chapter sets out our approach to promote active travel whilst managing motorised traffic as effectively as possible. It also sets out how we would maintain and improve the quality and vibrancy of our streets.

### Policy T1: Street Network

This policy is concerned with the provision of well-connected, inclusive and legible streets.

#### Qu 49: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

No additional comment

**Policy T3: Living Streets and outdoor life**

This policy is concerned with the use of our streets, to create places which support outdoor life. This includes places for outdoor hospitality, for markets and for special events.

**Qu 50: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

No additional comment

**Policy T4: Streetscape**

This policy is concerned with streetscape, or the nature of signs, street furniture and other structures and features on our streets.

**Qu 51: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Policy T4 7 reads *Resist the construction of high garden walls and fences along street boundaries*

Supporting text at 8.20 reads *Front gardens offer a valuable contribution to the streetscape. The loss of front gardens to off-street parking has long had harmful effects upon visual amenity and townscape quality. It can also reduce public safety. The introduction of high opaque garden walls that give a closed feel to the streetscape has also had harmful effects.*

As with impermeable surfaces, there are increasing numbers of example of high front boundary fences and walls in the streets of the StQW neighbourhood. Many house owners do not understand that permitted development allows for 1m front boundary walls but greater heights require planning consent. **For T4 7 to be 'effective' this needs explaining in the text of via a footnote.**

### Policy T5: Land use and Transport

This policy is concerned with where new development should be located, in terms of sustainable modes of travel.

#### Qu 52: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?		X
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Policy T5 A reads *Require development to be located in suitable areas where the transport requirements can be met in a sustainable manner, and which actively encourages travel by sustainable modes.*

While the StQW Forum supports this policy, the RBKC SPD on Kensal Canalside (adopted 2021) provides for a minimum provision of 3,500 new homes in the Opportunity Area. Pre-application advice to major developers appears to have confirmed that such aspirations can be met.

This figure is the same as the London Plan 'indicative' target set in 2016 with the assumption of an Elizabeth Line station at the centre of the Opportunity Area.

At present there is no evidence that T5 A will be implemented when it comes to development in the Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area. **Effectiveness is therefore questionable and unless this can be assured we suggest that T5 A is deleted.** Other draft Local Plan policies address the same set of issues.

**Policy T6: Active Travel**

This policy is concerned with supporting active travel, or improving the walking and cycling environment.

**Qu 53: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

No additional comments

**Policy T7: Public Transport**

This policy is concerned with supporting improvements to public transport/public transport infrastructure.

**Qu 54: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?		<b>X</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Paragraph 8.23 of the text explains PTAL but is not accompanied by PTAL maps of the Borough as at 2021 and as forecast by 2031 (as available via the GLA/TfL WebCAT tool). This is basic information which the public expect to find in a Local Plan for a London planning authority.

Policy T7 C reads *Support improvements to West London Line services and enhancements to facilities that improve access to the services*. Paragraph 8.34 rehearses proposals from the West London Line Group and the StQW Forum for an additional Overground station at ‘Western Circus’.

We have noted that the TfL response to the Reg 18 Draft Local Plan commented that there was no sufficient business case for such an extra station. The last such study was undertaken by RBKC in 2008.

We see no evidence that such a case has been re-examined by TfL or others in the light of the following events:

- The acknowledgment that an Elizabeth line station at Kensal Canalside will not happen in the plan period for the new RBKC Local Plan
- The abandonment of plans for a new Overground on the WLL at Hythe Road (previously part of the OPDC Regulation 18 Local Plan)
- High density housing consented and/or under construction on 3 sites at Mitre Bridge on Scrubs Lane in LBHF (OPDC area) and the near completed development of Imperial College’s White City campus on Wood Lane.
- Proposals for high density housing at the western end of the Kensal Canalside OA
- The delayed target date from 2026 to 2030-32 for the opening of the Old Oak Common HS2/Elizabeth line interchange in the OPDC part of North Hammersmith.

The current 2019 Local Plan includes a policy CT2 B which reads *‘the Council will: support the creation of a new station on the West London line at Westway Circus, as proposed by the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Plan.*

The OPDC Local Plan (adopted in 2021) includes no funded proposals to create alternative public transport options in areas of low PTAL at Mitre Bridge, Scrubs Lane NW10. The same applies to the western end of the Kensal Canalside OA, which fails to achieve the lowest PTAL levels of 1a or 1b (even by 2031 according to the TfL WebCAT planning tool). High density developments at both these locations are therefore reliant on a ‘bus strategy’ operating on already congested routes.

We suggest that policy T7C should be amended to read ***Support improvements to West London Line services including 10 year temporary platforms and a halt at either North Pole Road or at ‘Westway Circus’ beneath the Westway elevated roundabout.***

‘Westway Circus’ is the obvious location, given that platforms could be located on undeveloped land on the site of the planned underpass between Wood Lane and Latimer Road, thereby eliminating the need for a bridge across the tracks. North Pole Road was the site of a previous station on the WLL, not replaced after WW2 fire damage.

Since 1999 three new stations have been added to the West London Line including the simple platforms at Imperial Wharf at a cost of only £10m in 2009 (the others being West Brompton and Shepherds Bush). Four stations were added to the East London Line as part of the relaunch of the London Overground.

The ‘intensification’ of housing densities in the OPDC area and at the Kensal Canalside OA is not being accompanied by additional rail, Overground, or Underground options in a part of Inner London poorly served at present. Even when completed in the 2030s, there will be no Overground link to the eastern end of Old Oak Common station. TfL’s detailed feasibility study for a new station at Hythe Road has a forecast budget of £100m, ten times the station cost at Imperial Wharf. This may have affected their view on a business case for Westway Circus.

Proposed densities at Kensal Canalside are not supportable in terms of London Plan policies D2 and D3 without improved public transport access and options.

**Policy T8: Car Parking**

This policy is concerned with supporting improvements to public transport/public transport infrastructure.

**Qu 55: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

The StQW Forum continues to support RBKC’s policy of a Borough-wide zone for residents parking and for ‘car-free’ policies to be applied to new developments.

## Policy T9: Servicing

This policy is concerned with the servicing of new developments.

### Qu 56: Do you consider this policy to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

## Chapter 9: Places

This chapter sets out the many distinctive places within the Borough with varying levels of expected growth and sets out the strategy for change. These Places are grouped into four broad types:

- The Opportunity Areas
- Other areas with potential for some change, including the Employment Zones
- Our larger town centres
- Our local centres and neighbourhoods

<u>Places</u>	<u>Town Centres</u>
<b>PLV1: Kensal Canalside</b>	<b>PLV8: Kensington High Street</b>
<b>PLV2: Earl's Court</b>	<b>PLV9: Portobello Road</b>
<b>PLV3: Lancaster West Estate and Notting Dale</b>	<b>PLV10: Notting Hill Gate</b>
<b>PLV4: The Westway</b>	<b>PLV11: South Kensington</b>
<b>PLV5: Kensal Employment Zone</b>	<b>PLV12: Kings Road (East)</b>
<b>PLV6: Freston/ Latimer Road Employment Zone</b>	<b>PLV13: King's Road (West)</b>
<b>PLV7: Lots Road Employment Zone</b>	<b>PLV14: Earl's Court Town Centre</b>
	<b>PLV15: Brompton Cross</b>
	<b>PLV16: Westbourne Grove</b>



	<b>PLV17: Knightsbridge</b> <b>PLV18: Fulham Road (West)</b> <b>PLV19: Walkable Neighbourhoods</b>
--	--

**Qu 57: PLV1: Do you consider the vision for Kensal Canalside to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?		<b>X</b>
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?		<b>X</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

The text at 9.4 introduces the principles behind Opportunity Areas and states *Opportunity Areas are London’s principal opportunities for accommodating large scale development to provide significant new employment and housing, with a mixed and intensive use of land and assisted by good public transport accessibility*. Kensal Canalside is a landlocked area lacking the necessary public transport accessibility for major intensification. The up to date transport context, and lack of ‘connectivity’ needs to be signalled from the start of this important *Growth and Change* chapter of the Local Plan

Suggested additional sentence at 9.7 : ***For Kensal Canalside, provision of improved public transport infrastructure remains a major challenge given the acknowledgement in this Local Plan that no Elizabeth Line station will be provided within the plan period.***

On **PLV1** Parts A and B of this ‘vision’ include the term ‘well-connected’. Kensal Canalside OA now has no realistic prospect of becoming ‘well-connected’ as compared with the position assumed in the 2016 London Plan. **We suggest that this term is deleted in both parts of draft Policy PLV1.**

NPPF para 16(b) requires that *Local Plans should (b) be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable. The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence* (our emphasis). See comments above on T7C on changes in recent years which have significantly reduced potential connectivity at Kensal Canalside.

**Qu 58: PLV2: Do you consider the vision for the Earl’s Court Opportunity Area to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Qu 59: PLV3: Do you consider the vision for Lancaster West Estate and Notting Dale to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?		<b>X</b>
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

The RBKC adopted Local Plan at paragraph 7.1.1 includes a section on a ‘place’ termed as ‘Latimer’. The content refers largely to the Silchester Estate (which we understand to be the second largest in the Borough).

The paragraph explains why estate renewal proposals for this estate, which had been far advanced, had been dropped by RBKC following the Grenfell fire. It is stated that: *As a result the whole place vision for the Latimer area has also been withdrawn from the Plan, to enable it to be reviewed in the light of any new proposals for the Silchester estate. The Council commits to an early review of the Local Plan, at least in part, to consider issues related to North Kensington, the Latimer ‘Place’, estate renewal and housing supply, to be adopted within three years of this Local Plan’s adoption.*

In the Regulation 19 Draft, there is no mention of a Latimer ‘Place’. We do not object to this, as this title caused confusion with the separate site allocation for

Latimer Road (long since divided from the Silchester Estate by the building of the Westway,

There is also only very brief mention of the Silchester Estate, included under the section on PVL3 ‘Lancaster West Estate and Notting Barns’.

We are aware that the Silchester Estate RA are making representations that what remains of content on the Silchester Estate in the Reg 19 version of the Local Plan is inadequate and in some cases is inaccurate. We support their view that residents on the Estate are entitled to more precise information on what is now planned (and **not** planned) for this estate and for any inaccuracies to be corrected.

.

**Qu 60: PLV4: Do you consider the vision for the Westway...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?		<b>X</b>
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Vision PLV4 states *Greater pedestrian/cycle links will be developed east and west along the Westway with a new underpass under the West London line to ensure greater connectivity and a much improved route.*

As RBKC knows, the construction of this underpass is a S106 commitment by Imperial College dating from 2013. Despite continued pressure from local residents, there remains no firm date for the start of works – with ‘continued legal negotiations’ being given as the excuse for delays. Unless RBKC can extract from LBHF and the College a firm start date, **the wording ‘will be developed’ should be qualified to say ‘subject to the conclusion of negotiations between LBHF, Imperial College and Network Rail’.**

**Reason for change:** A Local Plan should avoid raising expectations on early delivery of a much needed piece on infrastructure, with already an 8 year delay since a planning application was submitted to both LBHF and RBKC in 2014.

**Qu 61: PLV5: Do you consider the vision for Kensal Employment Zone...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		

Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Qu 62: PLV6: Do you consider the vision for Freston/ Latimer Road Employment Zone to be...**

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?	X	
Justified?	X	
Effective?	X	
Consistent with national policy?	X	
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

We welcome the vision statement PVL6, which is consistent with the objectives of the StQW Neighbourhood Plan in relation to the future of Latimer Road.

**'Complimentary' needs to be replaced with 'complementary'.**

**Qu 63: PLV7: Do you consider the vision for Lots Road Employment Zone to be...**

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

--

**Qu 64: PLV8: Do you consider the vision for Kensington High Street to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

--

**Qu 65: PLV9: Do you consider the vision for Portobello Road to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

--

**Qu 66: PLV10: Do you consider the vision for Notting Hill Gate to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

--

**Qu 67: PLV11 Do you consider the vision for South Kensington to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

--

**Qu 68: PLV12: Do you consider the vision for King’s Road (East) to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

--

**Qu 69: PLV13: Do you consider the vision for King’s Road (West) to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		

Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Qu 70: PLV14: Do you consider the vision for Earl's Court Town Centre to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Qu 71: PLV15: Do you consider the vision for Brompton Cross to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Qu 72: PLV16: Do you consider the vision for Westbourne Grove to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Qu 73: PLV17: Do you consider the vision for Knightsbridge to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Qu 74: PLV18: Do you consider the vision for Fulham Road (West) to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.



**Qu 75: PLV19: Do you consider the vision for the Walkable Neighbourhoods to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

We support this vision for walkable neighbourhoods. It is consistent with the overall vision and 11 key objectives developed for the StQW neighbourhood as set out in the adopted neighbourhood plan (particularly Policy KL1.

This reads *To ensure that the StQW neighbourhood remains as a strong and sustainable part of inner London within which families and individuals can flourish and support one another within a safe and attractive physical environment and a successful local economy, with an expectation that housing needs at different stages of life will be met **and with local services, shops and other amenities available within walking distance***).

## **Chapter 10: Site Allocations**

The Council needs to identify sites (site allocations) across the Borough which will allow us to deliver our vision for good growth and provide for the new homes, businesses and social and community uses needed by our residents.

We have divided these allocations into three categories, the Opportunity Areas, large sites and small sites.

### **Opportunity Area Sites**

#### **SA1: Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area**

**Qu 76: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		<b>X</b>
Justified?		<b>X</b>
Effective?		<b>X</b>
Consistent with national policy?		<b>X</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

Our neighbourhood forum has worked closely with the Kensington Society over the past two years, in responding to the RBKC SPD for Kensal Canalside and in meetings with developers Sainsbury's/Ballymore and St William.

Hence our views below are similar to those of the Society. We have also worked since 2016 with the Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum in responding to four iterations of the OPDC Local Plan (adopted June 2021), and to a series of applications for developments in the OPDC area. These include developments at Scrubs Lane, a location adjacent geographically to the Kensal Canalside but divided by the West London Line and with the canalside towpath the sole pedestrian/cycle link.

As a result, we feel that our Forum has as good (if not better) a perspective of the realities of daily life, travel to work, access to amenities, and connectivity at the Kensal Canalside OA than is the case for the policy planning teams at RBKC and at OPDC. We live on the boundary between these LPAs. As is often the case in London, officers and decision-makers tend to focus more on what they view as the 'centre' of their area of responsibility, rather than the 'periphery' of what is not more than an administrative boundary. This is particularly the case in terms of transport, where connections and barriers on the ground are not always obvious from maps and plans.

Our main concern remains that we are not convinced that the Council has genuinely tested the **current** spatial context of the Opportunity Area in terms of:

- Capacity of the sites to accommodate the number of homes and jobs;
- Low public transport accessibility of the land, especially in the western part;
- Lack of transport infrastructure, now and in the future.

The 3,500 target for housing units comes from the 2016 London Plan. The accompanying text from this 2016 document acknowledges *The scope and scale of development as an Opportunity Area is dependent on resolution of a number of challenges and constraints. Improved public transport accessibility will be a major determinant of the final scale of development.* Also that *Linkages with the Park Royal Opportunity Area and the potential strategic public transport infrastructure hub and interchange at Old Oak Common should be addressed.*

Since 2016 the main changes in the transport context for Kensal Canalside have been

- Acknowledgement that a Queen Elizabeth Line Station will not happen at this location within the lifetime of the new RBKC Local Plan
- Acceptance that any significant improvement in PTAL levels is reliant on a Bus Strategy and increased frequencies on routes using an already congested access/exit point to the OA (on Ladbrooke Grove)
- The timescale for the opening of the Old Oak Common rail interchange has been delayed from 2026 to 2030-32 (and likely to be at the latter end of this period)

- OPDC having no firm plans for any vehicular access to the eastern end of Old Oak Common station (off Wood Lane/Lane Scrubs Lane) limiting car, bus and taxi access from Kensal Canalside to the single entrance in Old Oak Common Lane in distant East Acton.
- No firm or funded plans by OPDC or RBKC for any road connections at the western end of the Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area through to Wormwood Scrubs and westward.
- Abandonment by OPDC and TFL of any plans for a new Overground station on the West London line at Hythe Road (which could have been accessed from Kensal Canalside by pedestrians/cyclists using the canal towpath).

Prospects for connectivity envisaged in the 2016 London Plan annexe on Opportunity Areas have disappeared over time. The geography of the site, bounded by rail lines to the south and west and by the canal to the north, reduces the scope for good connectivity even for pedestrians and cyclists, let alone for vehicles.

While it is legitimate for a Local Plan to 'look ahead', in terms of NPPF paragraph 22 and London Plan Policy SD1 on Opportunity Areas, 'effectiveness' requires proposals to be deliverable and to reflect up to date infrastructure prospects that have diminished since a previous local plan review.

As noted in our response to the Transport chapter, the western parts of the OA fail to achieve PTAL levels of 1a or 1b by 2031, according to the TfL WebCAT modelling tool.

The StQW Forum therefore supports the Kensington Society view that SA1(B) which currently reads '*A minimum of 3,500 new homes (C3)*' **should be qualified with additional wording '*subject to detailed masterplan proposals coming forward from landowners/developers with evidence that levels of connectivity and public transport access can meet NPPF requirements and London Plan Policies GG2, SD1 (Opportunity Areas), D2 (Infrastructure requirements for sustainable densities) and D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach)***.

### **Safeguarding of site for Queen Elizabeth Line station**

The DfT response to the Reg 18 Draft noted that *There is currently no robust evidence to promote a Safeguarding Direction to support the safeguarding of land for a new station which could undermine the development potential of the KCOA. Thus, no new safeguarding direction can be robustly supported.*

While local people in North Kensington would have very much welcomed a Queen Elizabeth Line station at Kensal Canalside, the Society reluctantly accepts the strength of this DfT response. The unfunded costs of safeguarding, including a pedestrian/cycle bridge over the existing tracks, are a substantial obstacle to financial viability and will continue to encourage excessive site intensification and 'optimisation' of housing densities in the proposals brought forward by developers.

**We therefore consider that 'Principle K' in Site Allocation SA1 should be deleted.**

We welcome the more specific information in SA1 on appropriate heights for tall buildings, while continuing to oppose heights above 20 storeys (as was made clear in our Regulation 18 representations).

We consider Figure 10.1, even combined with a set of sub-paragraphs in Site Allocation Policy SA1(J), to be inadequate and insufficiently specific in meeting Part B of London Plan Policy D9 (*Any such locations and appropriate tall building heights should be identified on maps in Development Plans*). **A set of 'suitable locations' (rather than shaded areas) should be identified in Figure 10.1**

The current Figure 10.1 does not meet the terms of London Plan Policy D9 in identifying 'suitable locations'.

**SA2: Earl's Court Exhibition Centre Opportunity Area**

**Qu 77: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**Large Sites (sites of 0.25 hectares or more)**

**SA3: 100/100A West Cromwell Road**

**Qu 78: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**SA4: Former Territorial Army Site, 245 Warwick Road**

**Qu 79: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**SA5: Wornington Green, Phase 3**

**Qu 80: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**SA6: Lots Road South**

**Qu 81: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**SA7: Edenham Way**

**Qu 82: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**SA8: Chelsea Farmer's Market**

**Qu 83: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

--

**SA9: Units 1-14 Latimer Road Industrial Estate**

**Qu 84: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

We consider that the ‘effectiveness’ of this site allocation has been improved by the adjustment to Policy B1 K (as noted earlier in this response). We still think that a housing trajectory which assumes 75 future new housing units in the airspace above Units 1-14 may prove optimistic, given that only one of these 14 has achieved a redevelopment consent since 2016 (when the StQW Neighbourhood Plan opened up this option via a bespoke NP policy).

Only 5-10 new homes are forecast from this Site Allocation in Years 1-5 of the Plan and this should be achievable (and indeed may already have been achieved at Unit 1). The Forum will remain involved in supporting high quality redevelopment of the remainder of these light industrial/warehouse units, while recognising that these properties are in separate ownerships with owners who may well wish to continue with their present use.

The balance between residential and commercial floorspace values in Latimer Road continues to fluctuate, with recent demand for warehouse space for ‘last-mile’ delivery services. This demand may recede in 2023.

Our evidence amassed over many years continues to show that redevelopment of Units 1-14 is marginal in terms of financial viability. The factors which would most improve viability are:

- Construction of the pedestrian cycle underpass to Wood Lane and access to the Central Line (as referred to under the Transport chapter)

- An additional Overground on the West London Line at ‘Westway Circus’, even if this took the form of temporary platforms pending the opening of the Elizabeth Line at Old Oak Common station.

The background to these two potential interventions is covered in the Transport section of this response.

### SA10: Newcombe House

#### Qu 85: Do you consider the site allocation to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

### Small sites (sites less than 0.25 hectares)

#### SA11: The Plaza, 535 King’s Road

#### Qu 86: Do you consider the site allocation to be...

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.



**SA12: Harrington Road Car Park****Qu 87: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**SA13: Emmanuel Kaye Building****Qu 88: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**SA14: 142A Highlever Road****Qu 89: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?	<b>X</b>	
Justified?	<b>X</b>	
Effective?	<b>X</b>	
Consistent with national policy?	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

This site allocation for small-scale housing use was included in the StQW Neighbourhood Plan and has been in force since 2016. The property has been in the ownership of a family as a motor vehicle garage since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. As yet the owners have not marketed the site for development.

**SA15: Colebrook Court**

**Qu 90: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

**SA16 Holland Road Triangle**

**Qu 91: Do you consider the site allocation to be...**

	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Unsound</b>
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

# Chapter 11: Infrastructure and Planning Contributions

## Policy IP1: Infrastructure and Planning Contributions

This policy is concerned with how new developments address the needs they put upon infrastructure.

**Qu 92: Do you consider this policy to be...**

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		
Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	Yes	No
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view, and if the policy fails any test, whether there are any changes which would address this. Be as precise as possible, with reference to paragraph and policy numbers, and preferably by tracking changes to the policy.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1: Sites within the Housing Trajectory

These are the sites that the Council has identified to deliver the homes required to meet our housing target and demonstrate a five year housing land supply.

**Qu 93: Do you agree with the deliverability/developability of these sites and when they are likely to be built out?**

Sites that are considered deliverable or developable mean are set out in [Annex 2: Glossary of the NPPF](#)

### Appendix 4: Monitoring

**Qu 94: Do you consider the Monitoring section to be...**

	Sound	Unsound
Positively prepared?		
Justified?		

Effective?		
Consistent with national policy?		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally compliant		

Please explain why you take this view. Be as precise as possible.

## Integrated Impact Assessment

The Council is carrying out an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to consider the impact that the NLPR will have on environmental, social and economic objectives (Sustainability Appraisal). It also considers Health Impact Assessment (HIA) and an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA). IIA is an iterative process (with Stages A to E) and the Report published as part of this consultation is Stage C/D in the process.

**Qu 95: Do you have any comments on the IIA with regards the soundness of the Plan?**

## Habitat Regulations Assessment

The Council has undertaken a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening to establish if the NLPR is likely to affect any protected sites. It concluded that it did not, and that a “appropriate assessment” was not necessary. This was a conclusion supported by English Nature, the “appropriate nature conservation agency.”

**Qu 96: Do you have any comments on the HRA?**

## Other comments

**Qu. 97: Do you have any other comments regarding the soundness of the Plan, or whether it has been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements?**

