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

Policies relating to Conservation and Design

Matters, Issues and Questions for Examination

Introduction

The Inspector invites succinct responses to the following specific questions that relate to the matters and issues that are central to his examination of the partial review. Comments unrelated to these questions should not be submitted. All existing representations will be taken into account and should not be expanded or repeated, although may be cross-referenced where relevant.

Respondents should only answer those questions relating to the subject of their original representation(s), but the Council should answer all the questions.

The questions reflect, and should be answered with reference to, the soundness criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 ("the Framework") ie that plans should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Further information about the Examination, Hearings and the format of Written Statements to be submitted in response to these questions is set out in a separate Guidance Note.

Matter 1: Purpose and nature of the revisions to the conservation and design sections of the core strategy

Issue 1.1: Whether the revisions are consistent with national policy and guidance relating to the form and content of local plans

1. Are revised chapters 33 and 34 of the core strategy consistent with the Framework and national Planning Practice Guidance in terms of the range of topics covered and the structure of the policies and reasoned justification, having regard to the particular nature of the Royal Borough?

2. Do the policies contain an appropriate level of detail such that they will be effective in delivering their objectives?

3. Are there essential elements of current development plan policies relating to conservation and design that the partial review fails to carry forward?

4. Are all policies accompanied by appropriate reasoned justification?

Issue 1.2: Do the policies set out an approach that is consistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development?

5. Do the policies relating to conservation and design, when read in the context of the core strategy as a whole, reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the Framework?

6. Will the policies, when applied with other relevant core strategy policies, allow development needs to be met, an appropriate density of development, and innovation,

and optimise development opportunities in a way that is appropriate to the specific character of the Royal Borough?

Matter 2: Character of the Borough and Design of Development

Issue 2.1: Policies CL1 and CL2 – Context, Character and Design

7. Is the overall approach to development set out in policies CL1 and CL2 justified and based on a proper understanding of the character and architectural qualities of the Borough?

8. Will policy CL1(g) provide an effective framework for considering the development of backland sites, including private gardens?

9. Is the importance of mews development to the Borough properly reflected in the revised core strategy, and will policy CL1(h), along with other relevant policies, provide an effective framework for considering proposals affecting such areas?

10. To be effective, do policies CL1 and CL2 need to be more explicit about the effects of the change of use of buildings on the character and appearance of an area?

11. Is the approach to the redevelopment of "eyesores" consistent with other policies in the core strategy, and will it be effective in delivering the vision and strategic objectives?

Issue 2.2: Policies CL6, CL8 and CL9 – Alterations, Additions and Extensions to Existing Buildings

12. Do policies CL6, CL8 and CL9 contain an appropriate level of detail to provide an effective framework for considering proposals for all forms of alterations, additions and extensions (including conservatories and awnings) to existing buildings?

13. Are policies CL6, CL8 and CL9 sufficiently flexible to effectively deal with proposals affecting the front, sides and rear of existing buildings, or are different approaches needed for these different locations?

14. Are all aspects of policy CL8 supported by appropriate reasoned justification in paragraphs 34.3.74 to 34.3.76 (or elsewhere in the core strategy)?

Issue 2.4: Policy CL11 - Views

15. Is the requirement for all development throughout the Borough to "protect and enhance" views and the skyline that contribute to the character and quality of the area justified and consistent with the London Plan?

16. To be effective, should policy CL11 refer to specific views rather than leave such detail to a Supplementary Planning Document?

Issue 2.5: Policy CL12 – Building Heights

17. Is the approach to the height of new buildings set out in policy CL12 justified and consistent with the London Plan, or is it unduly restrictive?

Matter 3: Heritage Assets

Issue 3.1: Policy CL3 – Conservation Areas and Historic Spaces

18. Is policy CL3 consistent with the Framework in terms of the approach to weighing harm and public benefits, and does it set out an effective approach to assessing all types of proposals affecting conservation areas and historic spaces?

19. To be effective, should policy CL3 or the reasoned justification refer to conservation area appraisals and to the type of information and drawings required to support planning applications?

Issue 3.2: Policy CL4 – Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology

20. Is policy CL4 consistent with the Framework (paragraphs 129 to 133) in terms of the approach to assessing the particular significance of, and giving appropriate protection to, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and sites of archaeological interest?

21. Does policy CL4 contain sufficient detail to be effective, or should it contain reference to specific features such as advertisements, post boxes, railings, walls, and trees?

22. Are parts (d) and (f) of policy CL4 sufficiently clear to be effective, or is it necessary to make the changes recommended by the Council based on the advice of English Heritage?

Matter 4: Living Conditions

Issue 4.1: Policy CL5 – Living Conditions

23. Upholding the residential quality of life is one of the three components of the core strategy's vision. In this context, is it effective for the issue of living conditions to be addressed in a cross-cutting policy such as CL5, or should it be dealt with explicitly in other policies where necessary?

24. Does policy CL5 contain an appropriate level of detail to provide an effective framework for considering all types of development, including roof terraces, that may affect living conditions, and are all relevant issues that affect living conditions covered?

25. Does policy CL5 provide an effective approach in situations where living conditions are already significantly affected by nearby development? Should a "no worsening" approach with regard to matters such as light and outlook be adopted, or should development be required to lead to positive improvements to living conditions?

Matter 5: Public Realm

Issue 5.1: Policy CR4 - Streetscape

26. Is the approach to assessing proposals for free-standing structures such as telephone kiosks justified, and is it consistent with national policy and regulations relating to the display of advertisements?

27. To be effective, should policy CR4 refer to the protection of traditional street boundaries?

Issue 5.2: Policy CR5 – Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways

28. Will policy CR5 be effective in protecting and enhancing all forms of existing open space?

29. Will policy CR5 be effective in securing the creation of new open spaces where necessary?

30. Will policy CR5, in combination with other relevant core strategy policies including policy CE2 "Flooding", be effective in ensuring development close to the Thames is appropriately located and designed to take account of issues such as ecology, sustainable drainage, and flood management in line with the objectives of the Thames River Basin Management Plan and Thames Estuary 2100 Plan?

31. Is the approach to resisting permanently moored vessels on the Thames (policy CR5 part i) justified, and is it consistent with the London Plan?

Issue 5.3: Trees and Landscape

32. Does policy CR6 contain sufficient detail to be effective in requiring the provision of new trees?

33. What is the reasoned justification for policy CR6?