
Examination of the Partial Review of the Kensington and Chelsea Core Strategy:

Basements Publication Planning Policy

HEARINGS PROGRAMME

Start Time Each Day 10am

Lunch Generally 1pm with a Mid. Morning and Afternoon break

Day 1 Tuesday 16th September 2014

Matter 1: Legal Compliance

Issue 1.1: Whether the Plan is legally compliant

1. Is the Plan legally compliant as is indicated by the Council in its ED/1 replies to the Preparatory Questions on this topic (Question 6)?
2. If the Plan is not considered to be legally compliant, please explain in what areas it does not comply and what needs to be done to make it compliant.
3. If it is considered that public consultation requirements were not properly carried out, please explain where the Council has not complied with either the 2012 Regulations or its own Statement of Community Involvement ("Involving People in Planning").
4. Does the final Sustainability Appraisal (SA) at BAS21 deal adequately with all the reasonable alternatives in assessing a policy for this type of development? Was there consideration of an impact assessment led policy approach alternative?

Note: paragraph 4.2 of the final SA (BAS21) says: "*Alternative policy options were specifically considered in the December 2012 SA/SEA. As these were dismissed at that time, it is not considered appropriate to address them again in this document.*" However, legally the final SA must clearly set out the reasons for the selection of the Plan's proposals and the outline reasons why the other reasonable alternatives were not chosen during preparation. These choices may not have been made within the SA process (e.g. at a committee), but the final SA should set out those reasons. It should also state whether these reasons are still valid at submission. If this has not been done, I will consider asking the Council to prepare a correcting addition to the final SA. These legal principles have been set out in various court cases, e.g. see *Heard v Broadland District Council & Ors* [2012] EWHC 344 (Admin) (24 February 2012) at: <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2012/344.html>.

Issue 1.2: Whether there is a "need" for the Policy

5. Is there a requirement in law for there to be a proven "need" for a particular policy in a local plan before a LPA can include it? I have been unable to find such a requirement in the 2004 Act, the 2012 Regulations, the Framework, or the PPG. I am aware of the soundness criteria in the Framework (elaborated upon in the PPG) for a Plan to meet the requirements (or "need") for particular types of development (e.g. housing, if housing policies are included) and for it to be justified by proportionate evidence. It is also possible for a policy to be unnecessary (see below).

6. Is policy CL7 unnecessary because the issue can be dealt with through other local or national policies or legislation? Does other legislation primarily deal with the aftermath and/or the resulting impacts of basement development permissions?

Issue 1.3: What policies will be superseded by the Plan?

7. The Council has confirmed in its Question 17 response in ED/1 that policy CL7 “*will supersede Policy CL2: New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings criteria (g) (Chapter 34 of the Core Strategy (RBKC 1)) and CE1: Climate Change criteria (c) (Chapter 36 of the Core Strategy (RBKC 1)).*” Unfortunately, the Plan does not state this as required by Regulation 8(5). The **Council** should prepare a suggested main modification to correct this for my consideration and for discussion at the hearings.

Issue 1.4: Legally, can a supplementary planning document (SPD) be used for the purposes proposed by the Council, and is its use and purposes clearly and effectively set out in the Plan?

8. Regulations 5 and 6 of the Local Planning Regulations 2012 set out what should be in a local plan and therefore what should not be in a SPD. In the light of this [particularly Regulation 5(1)(a)(iv)], should the information proposed to be in the Basements SPD (paragraph 34.3.70) be in a local plan?
9. The Council’s responses to the representations in BAS04 say that the Basements SPD will include the details of the Demolition and Construction Management Plans (DCMPs) and the Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMPs) which will be required with planning applications for this type of development. However, the Plan does not actually say this. Should it, in order to be effective? And should such Management Plans apply to all basement development applications or just to certain ones?

Attendees:

010 – Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)
040 – Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS *
084 – Earl’s Court Society *
091 – Onslow Neighbourhood Association
118 – Markham Square Association
171 – Eardley Crescent Residents
182 – Savills for ‘Client Consortium’
183 – Austin Mackie for Waltonwagner
184 – Jones Lang LaSalle
192 – Friends of Portobello
193 – Victoria Road Residents Association
195 – Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC
206 – Montagu Evans for Dr Chris Meile
217 – Norland Conservation Society
242 – The Chelsea Society
244 – The Kensington Society
278 – Thurloe Residents Association
282 – Dr Victoria McNeile
283 – Brompton Association
310 – Oakley Street Residents
314 – The Vanguard Group
325 – Ladbroke Association
334 – Bell Cornwell for Cranbrook Basements

Matter 2: Definitions and use of terminology

Issue 2.1: Whether the Plan is effective and consistent with national policy in its definitions and use of terminology

10. Is the term 'basement' adequately defined in the reasoned justification at 34.3.46? If not, how should it be defined?
11. In paragraph 34.3.47, should the word 'principles' (or 'guidelines' or other similar term) be substituted for the word 'rules'? The word 'rules' implies the application of inflexible, immutable laws which is contrary to the Framework, the PPG, the law as it relates to Local Plans, and to planning practice.
12. In paragraph 34.3.50 should the word 'management' be substituted for the word 'control'? The Framework and the PPG no longer uses the term 'control'.
13. Is the term 'large site' adequately defined in the reasoned justification at 34.3.57? If not, how should it be defined?
14. In clause I. of CL7 should the word 'significantly' be inserted before the word 'harm' as otherwise any harm, no matter how small, would be unacceptable?
15. In clause e. of CL7 should the word 'substantial' be inserted before 'harm' to reflect the advice in paragraph 133 of the Framework?

Attendees:

010 – Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)
040 – Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS *
084 – Earl's Court Society *
087 – Edwardes Square Scarsdale Abingdon Association (ESSA)
091 – Onslow Neighbourhood Association
118 – Markham Square Association
171 – Eardley Crescent Residents
183 – Austin Mackie for Waltonwagner
184 – Jones Lang LaSalle
192 – Friends of Portobello
193 – Victoria Road Residents Association
195 – Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC
206 – Montagu Evans
217 – Norland Conservation Society
226 – Knight Build Ltd for Robert Ward-Booth
242 – The Chelsea Society
244 – The Kensington Society
278 – Thurloe Residents Association
310 – Oakley Street Residents
314 – The Vanguard Group
325 – Ladbroke Association
334 – Bell Cornwell for Cranbrook Basements

Matter 3: The order of the reasoned justifications for the Policy

16. From my reading of the Plan's reasoned justification, paragraph 3.14 of BAS02 and other documentation, I understand that the Council has a priority order for the reasons justifying the Policy. These are, in order: the increasing number of basement planning applications; that these developments are primarily under existing dwellings and gardens within established residential areas; that the Royal Borough is very densely developed and populated; the adverse impact on residential amenity, primarily on residents' health, well-being and living conditions due to factors such as noise and disturbance, vibration, dust and heavy vehicles over prolonged time periods, together with the loss of rear gardens

and structural stability concerns; the desire to limit carbon emissions; the need to retain natural gardens and trees to maintain the character and appearance of the Royal Borough, along with sustainable drainage and biodiversity requirements; the adverse impact on the large number of listed buildings and conservation areas in the Royal Borough; and, lastly, the adverse visual impact of certain externally visible aspects of these developments. Is this correct? If so, should it be more clearly stated in the Plan? If the above is not correct, please explain.

Attendees:

010 – Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)
040 – Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS *
084 – Earl's Court Society *
091 – Onslow Neighbourhood Association
118 – Markham Square Association
171 – Eardley Crescent Residents
182 – Savills for 'Client Consortium'
183 – Austin Mackie for Waltonwagner
184 – Jones Lang LaSalle
192 – Friends of Portobello
193 – Victoria Road Residents Association
195 – Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC
206 – Montagu Evans
217 – Norland Conservation Society
242 – The Chelsea Society
244 – The Kensington Society
278 – Thurloe Residents Association
283 – Brompton Association
314 – The Vanguard Group
325 – Ladbroke Association
334 – Bell Cornwell for Cranbrook Basements

Day 2 Wednesday 17th September 2014.

Matter 4: Restriction on the use of garden/open area

Issue 4.1: Whether CL7 a. is justified by the evidence, consistent with national policy, and effective

17. What are key reasons for criterion CL7 a. not to exceed a maximum of 50% of each garden or open part of the site? Is it paragraphs 6.11 and 6.12 in BAS18?
18. Are each of the reasons for the criterion justified by the evidence? Please be brief and refer to previously submitted evidence without repeating it in full.
19. I note that one of Council's reasons for limiting the size of basement extensions is to reduce carbon footprint/emissions. **Council:** is this a (or even the) reason and justification for the restrictive CL7 policy? If it were found to be unreliable and not robust would the policy be inadequately justified and thus unsound? If not, why not?
20. Could the aims/reasons be achieved or satisfied in another way? If so, please suggest an alternative wording.
21. Why is CL2 g. iii. in the adopted Core Strategy not adequate to deal with the issues proposed to be addressed by CL7 a.?
22. Should the criterion contain an exception clause to cater for differing circumstances? (I am aware of the representations about small and/or paved over garden/open areas).

Attendees:

010 – Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)
040 – Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS *
084 – Earl's Court Society *
091 – Onslow Neighbourhood Association
118 – Markham Square Association
171 – Eardley Crescent Residents
182 – Savills for 'Client Consortium'
183 – Austin Mackie for Waltonwagner
184 – Jones Lang LaSalle
192 – Friends of Portobello
193 – Victoria Road Residents Association
195 – Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC
198 – Boltons Association
217 – Norland Conservation Society
226 – Knight Build Ltd for Robert Ward-Booth
242 – The Chelsea Society
244 – The Kensington Society
274 – Timothy Rutter
278 – Thurloe Residents Association
307 – Yvonne Wurtzburg
314 – The Vanguard Group
325 – Ladbrooke Association
327 – Alan Marchant
334 – Bell Cornwell for Cranbrook Basements

Matter 5: One storey restriction

Issue 5.1: Whether CL7 b. and c. are justified by the evidence, consistent with national policy, and effective

23. What are key reasons for criterion CL7 b. and c. which restrict basement development to one storey?
24. Is each of the reasons for the criteria justified by the evidence? Please be brief and refer to previously submitted evidence without repeating it in full.
25. Is the restriction too limiting? Please explain briefly (referring to previous evidence).
26. Is the restriction too lax? Please explain briefly (referring to previous evidence).
27. Could the aims/reasons be achieved or satisfied in another way? If so, please suggest an alternative wording for the criteria.
28. Should the criteria contain an exception clause to cater for differing circumstances?

Attendees:

010 – Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)
040 – Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS *
084 – Earl's Court Society *
091 – Onslow Neighbourhood Association
118 – Markham Square Association
171 – Eardley Crescent Residents
182 – Savills for 'Client Consortium'
183 – Austin Mackie for Waltonwagner
184 – Jones Lang LaSalle
192 – Friends of Portobello
193 – Victoria Road Residents Association

195 – Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC
198 – Boltons Association
217 – Norland Conservation Society
226 – Knight Build Ltd for Robert Ward-Booth
242 – The Chelsea Society
243 – Chris Hunt
244 – The Kensington Society
274 – Timothy Rutter
278 – Thurloe Residents Association
283 – Brompton Association
307 – Yvonne Wurtzburg
310 – Oakley Street Residents
314 – The Vanguard Group
325 – Ladbroke Association
334 – Bell Cornwell for Cranbrook Basements

Day 3 Thursday 18th September 2014.

Matter 6: Restriction on excavation under a listed building

Issue 6.1: Whether CL7 f. is justified by the evidence, consistent with national policy, and effective

29. What are key reasons for criterion CL7 f. restricting excavation under a listed building?
30. Are each of the reasons for the criterion justified by the evidence? Please be brief and refer to previously submitted evidence without repeating it in full.
31. Is the restriction too limiting? Please explain briefly (referring to previous evidence).
32. How is this criterion different in principle from that in the adopted Core Strategy in policy CL2 g. i. (apart from the inclusion of pavement vaults)?
33. If it is not substantially different, what has changed that I should now, unlike my colleague at the Core Strategy examination, find it to be unsound?
34. Why have pavement vaults been included?
35. Could the aims/reasons be achieved or satisfied in another way? If so, please suggest an alternative wording for the criterion.
36. Should the criterion contain an exception clause to cater for differing circumstances, such as where there is no special interest in the foundations and the original floor hierarchy can be respected?

Attendees:

010 – Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)
040 – Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS *
084 – Earl's Court Society *
087 – Edwardes Square Scarsdale Abingdon Association (ESSA)
091 – Onslow Neighbourhood Association
118 – Markham Square Association
171 – Eardley Crescent Residents
182 – Savills for 'Client Consortium'
184 – Jones Lang LaSalle
192 – Friends of Portobello
193 – Victoria Road Residents Association
195 – Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC

206 – *Montagu Evans for Dr Chris Meile*
217 – *Norland Conservation Society*
226 – *Knight Build Ltd for Robert Ward-Booth*
242 – *The Chelsea Society*
244 – *The Kensington Society*
278 – *Thurloe Residents Association*
307 – *Yvonne Wurtzburg*
325 – *Ladbroke Association*
334 – *Bell Cornwell for Cranbrook Basements*

Matter 7: Light wells and railings

Issue 7.1: Whether CL7 h. is effective

37. Is the criterion for light wells and railings in clause h. of CL7 too limiting? Please explain briefly (referring to previous evidence).
38. Is the criterion too lax? Please explain briefly (referring to previous evidence).
39. Could the aims of the criterion be achieved or satisfied in another way? If so, please suggest an alternative wording.
40. Should the criterion contain an exception clause to cater for differing circumstances? For instance, where light wells and railings could be made acceptable by blending into the surroundings and/or hidden or disguised from public view?

Attendees:

010 – *Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)*
040 – *Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS **
084 – *Earl's Court Society **
091 – *Onslow Neighbourhood Association*
118 – *Markham Square Association*
171 – *Eardley Crescent Residents*
182 – *Savills for 'Client Consortium'*
184 – *Jones Lang LaSalle*
192 – *Friends of Portobello*
193 – *Victoria Road Residents Association*
195 – *Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC*
217 – *Norland Conservation Society*
242 – *The Chelsea Society*
244 – *The Kensington Society*
278 – *Thurloe Residents Association*
283 – *Brompton Association*
307 – *Yvonne Wurtzburg*
325 – *Ladbroke Association*
334 – *Bell Cornwell for Cranbrook Basements*

Matter 8: Requirement for one metre of permeable soil

Issue 8.1: Whether CL7 j. is justified by the evidence, consistent with national policy, and effective

41. What are key reasons for criterion CL7 j. to have one metre of permeable soil above any part of a basement?
42. Is each of the reasons for the criterion justified by the evidence? Please be brief and refer to previously submitted evidence without repeating it in full.

43. Could the aims/reasons be achieved or satisfied in another way? If so, please suggest an alternative wording.
44. Why is CL2 g. iii. and iv. in the adopted Core Strategy not adequate to deal with this issue?
45. Has the one metre soil requirement in the May 2009 Subterranean Development SPD (BAS93) proven to be effective such that it should continue in this Plan?
46. Should the criterion contain an exception clause to cater for differing circumstances? (I am aware of the representations about small and/or paved over garden/open areas).

Attendees:

010 – Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)
 040 – Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS *
 084 – Earl's Court Society *
 091 – Onslow Neighbourhood Association
 118 – Markham Square Association
 171 – Eardley Crescent Residents
 184 – Jones Lang LaSalle
 192 – Friends of Portobello
 193 – Victoria Road Residents Association
 195 – Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC
 217 – Norland Conservation Society
 242 – The Chelsea Society
 244 – The Kensington Society
 278 – Thurloe Residents Association
 307 – Yvonne Wurtzburg
 325 – Ladbrooke Association
 334 – Bell Cornwell for Cranbrook Basements

Day 4 Tuesday 23rd September 2014.

Matter 9: Energy, waste and water conservation

Issue 9.1: Whether CL7 k. is justified by the evidence, consistent with national policy, and effective

47. What are key reasons for criterion CL7 k. requiring a high level of performance in dealing with energy, waste and water?
48. Is each of the reasons for the criterion justified by the evidence? Please be brief and refer to previously submitted evidence without repeating it in full.
49. Is the restriction too limiting? Please explain briefly (referring to previous evidence).
50. Is the Plan consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy as required by paragraph 95 of the Framework? In particular, should paragraph 34.3.68 refer to BREEAM targets given that most basement development will be to homes? Does the paragraph take account of the May 2014 BREEAM UK New Construction advice?
51. Could the aims/reasons be achieved or satisfied in another way? If so, please suggest an alternative wording.
52. Should the criterion contain an exception clause to cater for differing circumstances?

Attendees:

010 – Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)
040 – Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS *
084 – Earl's Court Society *
091 – Onslow Neighbourhood Association
118 – Markham Square Association
171 – Eardley Crescent Residents
182 – Savills for 'Client Consortium'
183 – Austin Mackie for Waltonwagner
192 – Friends of Portobello
193 – Victoria Road Residents Association
195 – Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC
217 – Norland Conservation Society
242 – The Chelsea Society
244 – The Kensington Society
278 – Thurloe Residents Association
314 – The Vanguard Group
325 – Ladbrooke Association
334 – Bell Cornwell for Cranbrook Basements

Matter 10: Structural stability

Issue 10.1: Whether CL7 n. is justified by the evidence, consistent with national policy, and effective

53. What are key reasons for criterion CL7 n. safeguarding the structural stability of the application building, nearby buildings and other infrastructure?
54. Is each of the reasons for the criterion justified by the evidence? Please be brief and refer to previously submitted evidence without repeating it in full.
55. Is the criterion necessary given the existence of other legislation on the subject? Please explain briefly (referring to previous evidence).
56. Is this criterion primarily related to land stability as a material planning consideration as set out in the Framework paragraph 120 and the PPG (ID: 45-001) in order to minimise the risk and effects of land stability on property, infrastructure and the public? If so, should the criterion be reworded to reflect that?
57. Does the requirement to apply this criterion to the existing property comply with the national policy test in the PPG (ID 21a-004) that requirements should be relevant to the development to be permitted and not be used to remedy a pre-existing problem or an issue not created by the proposed development?
58. I note that the wording of this criterion is similar to that existing in adopted policy CL2 g. ii. What has changed that I should now, unlike my colleague at the Core Strategy examination, find it to be unsound?
59. Could the aims/reasons be achieved or satisfied in another way? If so, please suggest an alternative wording for the criterion.

Attendees:

010 – Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)
040 – Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS *
084 – Earl's Court Society *
091 – Onslow Neighbourhood Association
118 – Markham Square Association
171 – Eardley Crescent Residents
183 – Austin Mackie for Waltonwagner

192 – *Friends of Portobello*
193 – *Victoria Road Residents Association*
195 – *Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC*
217 – *Norland Conservation Society*
226 – *Knight Build Ltd for Robert Ward-Booth*
242 – *The Chelsea Society*
243 – *Chris Hunt*
244 – *The Kensington Society*
278 – *Thurloe Residents Association*
283 – *Brompton Association*
314 – *The Vanguard Group*
325 – *Ladbroke Association*
334 – *Bell Cornwell for Cranbrook Basement*

Matter 11: Other CL7 criteria and alternative policy wording

Issue 11.1: Whether the remaining criteria in CL7 are justified by the evidence, consistent with national policy, and effective

60. In criterion i. of CL7, should the need to limit light pollution be mentioned to reflect advice in paragraph 125 of the Framework?
61. In respect of criteria d., g., i., l., m., and o. in policy CL7: are they justified by the evidence, consistent with national policy, and effective?
62. Could the aims/reasons for the criteria be achieved or satisfied in another way? If so, please suggest an alternative wording for the criteria.

Issue 11.2: Whether the Plan and its policy CL7 sets out an approach that is consistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development

63. Does the Plan and policy reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the Framework? If not, why not?
64. When applied, will the Policy allow reasonable development needs to be met in a way that is appropriate to the specific character of the Royal Borough?
65. A number of representors have suggested that the policy should instead be an impact assessment led one (case by case) with an overall exception clause, and some have made suggestions. In the light of the Council's explanations to date, please would representors suggest their final wording for such a policy?

Attendees:

010 – *Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)*
040 – *Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS **
084 – *Earl's Court Society **
091 – *Onslow Neighbourhood Association*
118 – *Markham Square Association*
171 – *Eardley Crescent Residents*
182 – *Savills for 'Client Consortium'*
183 – *Austin Mackie for Waltonwagner*
192 – *Friends of Portobello*
193 – *Victoria Road Residents Association*
195 – *Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC*
217 – *Norland Conservation Society*
226 – *Knight Build Ltd for Robert Ward-Booth*
242 – *The Chelsea Society*
244 – *The Kensington Society*

278 – *Thurloe Residents Association*
283 – *Brompton Association*
314 – *The Vanguard Group*
325 – *Ladbroke Association*
334 – *Bell Cornwell for Cranbrook Basements*

Day 5 Wednesday 24th September 2014.

Reserved for Overrun

010 – *Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (KRACR)*
040 – *Ashburn Courtfield Gardens Residents Association & 84 ECS **
084 – *Earl's Court Society **
091 – *Onslow Neighbourhood Association*
118 – *Markham Square Association*
171 – *Eardley Crescent Residents*
182 – *Savills for 'Client Consortium'*
192 – *Friends of Portobello*
193 – *Victoria Road Residents Association*
195 – *Basement Force (Force Foundations) & 72 - ASUC*
217 – *Norland Conservation Society*
242 – *The Chelsea Society*
244 – *The Kensington Society*
278 – *Thurloe Residents Association*

Site Visits by the Inspector