

Response Form

Partial Review of the Core Strategy for the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea with a focus on North Kensington

Development Plan Document policies

All representations **must** express a view regarding the soundness or legal compliance of a planning policy. If the representation does not comment on soundness or legal compliance, or deal with how a policy can be altered to make it sound the representation will **not** be valid.

Name: Dr Margaret Thompson

Address:

Company/Organisation: Phisic Triangle Residents Association

Please complete the form and email it or send it to:

The Executive Director of Planning and Borough Development
f.a.o The Policy Team
The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
The Town Hall,
Hornton Street,
London W8 7NX

Email address: planningpolicy@rbkc.gov.uk

Publication Stage Representation Form

To be **“sound”** the contents of a local plan should be POSITIVELY PREPARED, JUSTIFIED, EFFECTIVE and consistent with NATIONAL POLICY.

“Positively prepared” means that the planning policy needs to:

- be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to objectively assess development and infrastructure requirements, including those of neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so.
- It must also be consistent with achieving sustainable development.

“Justified” means that the planning policy must be:

- founded on a proportional evidence base
- the most appropriate strategy has been selected when considered against the reasonable alternatives.

“Effective” means that the planning policy must be:

- deliverable over its period
- based on effective joint working on cross – boundary strategic priorities.

“Consistent with National Policy” means that the planning policy should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

It must also be **legally compliant** which means that the planning policies have been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements.

State planning policy or paragraph number to which you are referring

Policy as a whole

Do you consider the planning policy to be sound?

Yes

No

Please tick box as appropriate

If you have selected YES and you wish to support the soundness of the planning policy, please give your reasons below. Please be as precise as possible. Please make it clear which paragraph number or Policy box number you are commenting on.

I have attended meetings at the RBKC Town Hall as well as residents meetings about basement construction in both RBKC and neighbouring Westminster.

I note that the officers and councillors in Westminster are every bit as aware as their counterparts in RBKC as to the high levels of anxiety and distress from residents about the basement problems. RBKC have communicated with their neighbouring colleagues in the development of these new proposals. I believe that have considered 'soundness' in relation to existing laws and they are compliant. It is thus positively prepared and can be effectively implemented.

They have given the opportunity for architects and developers (who benefit financially and thus have most to gain from resisting restrictions on such developments) to make their positions and points only too clear.

At these public meetings they were present in copious numbers and were very vocal.

I have observed meetings at Chelsea Town Hall on the basement problems which have been so well attended by local residents that the hall was full to overflowing and newcomers were turned away due to health and safety considerations. I have observed these facts in my position as secretary for three amenity groups

Physic Triangle RA (9 streets in the south of the borough with many basement applications.

KRACR (the 32 RAs federated around concerns in the Kings rd. area

FOSS the Friends of Sloane Square .

I am thus in a good position to take the temperature of local residents feelings and know the level of worry and concern and indeed anger about developers' self-interest and behaviour about this matter.

It is particularly galling lately to get uninvited printed matter from basement developers stuck through doors (which advertise NO junk mail) which ask the householder to build a basement quickly now before the council can bring in new safeguard. This is self-interest on which money is being spent which cannot be matched by residents.

please attach additional pages as required

If you have selected NO to the planning policy being sound do you consider the planning policy to be unsound because it is not:

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with national policy

Please give details of why you consider the planning policy to be unsound and / or suggest changes as to how it could be made sound. Please make it clear which paragraph number or Policy box number you are commenting on.

Please attach additional pages as required

	Yes	No
Do you consider the Planning Policy Document to be legally compliant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please give the reasons for your choice below and be as precise as possible. Please make it clear which paragraph number or Policy box number you are commenting on.

Whole policy

I defer to legal opinion, but as an observer but I believe that the debate, which is to protect the residents who suffer from this matter rather than to support developers who currently have the right to do more or less what they like and how they like, has been more than fair to the developers. It is also clear that residents' objections are well founded and not selfish or emotional.

please attach additional pages as required

Yes

No

Do you wish to appear at the Examination on any of these matters?

Please specify on what matter