

**Notting Hill Gate Draft SPD – consultation comments
[Site 6 - 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)]**

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Site 6. 1: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Yashmin and Alex Jeffries		Site 6: Book Warehouse Site It is not clear what is being proposed here. I would oppose any raising of height of these buildings. I would support all attempts to 'beautify' them with more attractive materials	Objection to raising the height of buildings noted but some increase would be needed to make redevelopment viable.	No change
Site 6. 2: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Joan Granger		Important to protect the Victorian terraces alongside Book Warehouse site	Support for terraces alongside Book Warehouse site noted.	No change
Site 6. 3: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Irving		I agree with the Council's proposal that any redevelopment of this site should be no higher than the elegant RBS building on the other side of Pembridge Gardens	Support noted.	No change
Site 6. 4: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	G. Keating		The proposals suggest aligning height with the RBS building. I strongly disagree since this would further increase the height discrepancy with the buildings on Notting Hill Gate to the East, and in particular, with the buildings within the Conservation Area to the North.	Lack of support for increasing height of building noted.	No change
Site 6. 5: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Dickson		This is so totally ugly it can only get better through redevelopment	Support for redevelopment to approve appearance noted.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Site 6. 7: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Estelle Beverley Hilton		Do not allow this to be any higher than Pembridge Gardens, with the top floor set back as in Pembridge Gardens (unfortunately your photo on page 53 doesn't show the RBS building you refer to).	View that the building should be no higher than Pembridge Gardens noted.	No change
Site 6. 8: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Bulmer Mews Management Limited (J Gardner)	Bulmer Mews Management Limited	Whilst the SPD deals with some of Notting Hill Gate, it does seem to miss out on the stretch of low build shops along NHG next to the Book Warehouse. Even if these are not up for development in the near future, they ought to still be covered in the SPD. I am content with a maximum of 5 storeys on 66-74 NHG, as this is in keeping with Pembridge Gardens and will not over dominate NHG.	These buildings are identified for shop front improvements in the Core Strategy, they are part of the Pembridge Conservation Area, and they are not expected to come forward for development, although they are included in the SPD area. Support for a maximum of 5 storeys on 66-74 Notting Hill Gate noted.	No change
Site 6. 9: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	English Heritage (Richard Parish)	English Heritage	Site 6 66-74 Notting Hill Gate. We would consider that there is potential justification for redeveloping the corner site; however, the properties which fall within the Pembridge Conservation Area (Nos 66-70) make a strong positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. We therefore consider that the same considerations set out for Site 3 above should be applied. As such, any proposals for redevelopment should retain those buildings which	Support for retention of properties within the Pembridge Conservation Area (No.s 66-70) noted.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			are considered to contribute positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area.		
Site 6. 10: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Shala Kaussari-Dick		I oppose any raising of height of these buildings. I would support all attempts to 'beautify' them with more attractive materials	Objection to raising the height of buildings noted but some increase would be needed to make redevelopment viable	No change
Site 6. 11: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Sebastian Millett		I strongly object to the possible destruction of the Victorian buildings next to the book warehouse which also have the old Marmalade advertisement on the side. Buildings such as this are what give Notting Hill Gate its character. They are very attractive and are full of history. Please do not allow them to be destroyed no matter what benefits this may bring in other ways. I have lived in Notting Hill Gate for 45 years and feel very strongly about this.	Objection noted the text has been reworded.	Text reworded
Site 6. 12: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Eileen Strathnaver		PLEASE look again very carefully at any proposals for the development of 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site).	Any proposals will be carefully considered and consulted upon before officers make a decision to recommend or refuse planning permission and if the decision was to recommend this decision would almost certainly be reviewed by the Planning Committee.	No change

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Site 6. 14: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Peter Barnes		6.30 The Victorian buildings on the Notting Hill Gate road side of the Book Warehouse must be retained as they are a small but essential part of the character of the street.	Support for retention of the Victorian buildings on the Notting Hill Gate road side of the Book Warehouse noted.	Text reworded
Site 6. 15: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Roger Hudson		6.30 Nos 66-70. Any plans involving their demolition would have to show a building of real architectural merit, which those displayed by the developers in the old Ryman's a few months ago certainly didn't. 6.31 Book Warehouse site. Glad to hear proposal for an 8-storey building here has been vetoed.	Comments noted	This section of the SPD has been reworded.
Site 6. 16: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Savills (Matt Richards (Representations on NHG SPD on behalf of Stranton Prope...	Savills	Comment: Para 6.30 - We welcome the recognition that the corner site is suitable for redevelopment and note the provision that the redevelopment of 66-70 needs to be considered against public benefits from the proposal. The site has been the subject of pre-application discussions which have been supported by a Heritage Assessment which concludes that the proposed redevelopment would lead to less than substantial harm to the heritage asset and that this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposals. Thus paragraph 134 of the NPPF applies in this case and is considered to be satisfied.	Support for redevelopment of the corner site noted. This section of the SPD has been reworded. The Heritage Assessment referred to would be considered as part of any planning application for the site within the Conservation Area, which is when any judgement about NPPF compliance would be made. Requested changes rejected. The current use of the ground floor of these buildings is A1 retail and there is no justification for the SPD to stipulate a change of use class.	This section of the SPD has been reworded.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>Suggestion: The second bullet point listed under Para 6.31 should be deleted, or amended to read as follows: "permit the residential development of no. 66-74 Notting Hill Gate with an active use retained at the ground floor."</p> <p>Comment: Para 6.31 - The second bullet point is considered overly restrictive. Discussions are taking place with regards to the ground floor use and the building line. To stipulate only retail use at the ground floor along with a building line and height that reflects the arrangement on the opposite side of Pembridge Gardens is overly restrictive and will likely stifle the redevelopment of this site.</p> <p>Suggestion: There should be recognition that the site has potential to accommodate additional height.</p> <p>Comment: There is no recognition of the potential of the site to accommodate additional height, which is shown as a potential option in section 4 of the draft SPD.</p> <p>Comment: Figure 17 – the proposed allocation shows the existing tube entrance retained</p>	<p>The maximum building storey height stipulated has been based on careful townscape analysis of the scale of development that would be acceptable in this location.</p> <p>This discussion has taken place since the Draft SPD was put out to consultation. The Council supports the provision of step free access to the station concourse and the diagram would not preclude the entrance being moved as part of redevelopment of this site.</p> <p>As previously, the maximum building storey height stipulated has been based on careful townscape analysis of the scale of development that would be</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>within the pavement outside no. 66. However, the developer is in discussions with London Underground Ltd for the entrance to be relocated within the building. Suggestion: The allocation of the site within the SPD should not prejudice ongoing discussions with London Underground Ltd and should allow for flexibility in this respect.</p> <p>Comment: the height of the corner building to five storeys. Further, it does not provide for any additional height at no. 66-70. This is an overly restrictive allocation that we consider unjustified from a townscape / heritage perspective. It runs contrary to some of the massing options listed in Section 4 with no commentary to justify the backtrack in the Council's aspirations for the sites development potential. Such an allocation would likely curtail this site coming forward as a development site that could assist in the regeneration of Notting Hill Gate. Suggestion: The SPD should be revised and amendments consulted on to allow for additional height to be considered in excess of 5 storeys at no. 74 Notting Hill Gate, and also for an additional storey to be considered at no. 66-70 Notting Hill Gate.</p>	<p>acceptable in this location.</p> <p>This document is an SPD so this is not an allocation. The building heights identified have come from townscape and visual impact analysis of Notting Hill Gate as a whole.</p> <p>The Council has a duty to preserve and enhance conservation areas so that the fact that this site is within or immediately abuts Pembridge Conservation Area makes view 26 particularly sensitive and the Council does not agree that this site is suitable for a taller landmark building.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>Comment: The allocation fails to make the connection that this site is part of the wider change of the Gate. It makes reference to the immediate setting of the Listed Buildings, but very little reference to its Notting Hill Gate context, which is subject to much greater change. It makes no reference to the likely redevelopment of the buildings that are more prominent in the assessment view such as David Game House and Newcombe House (VIEW 26 Pembridge Gardens). The SPD should be revised and amendments consulted on to allow for additional height to be considered in excess of 5 storeys at no. 74 Notting Hill Gate, and also for an additional storey to be considered at no. 66-70 Notting Hill Gate. recognise that this site should respond to not only the listed buildings but also the commercial architecture of Notting Hill Gate itself, and that view 29 Notting Hill Gate, in which this site also falls has significance in that VIEW 29 page 59 of the Evidence Base, acknowledges 'In this setting the post war architecture does not sit uncomfortably with the street scene.' As set out in discussions with the Council, it is considered that the site is suitable for a local</p>		

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			landmark building with some additional height. It occupies a prominent corner positions adjacent to a tube entrance. Some additional height would help to promote a sense of hierarchy and place making which, it is considered, is a central tenet in achieving the vision for the regeneration of Notting Hill Gate.		
Site 6. 17: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	Way West Press (Tim Burke)	NHIG	Book Warehouse Proposed Tower should be lower, but design ok. Pedestrian and Underground entrances must have spatial priority, any development must not encroach on the current highway.	The SPD is not proposing a tower on the Book Warehouse site the maximum acceptable height is 5 storeys. The Council is prepared to consider a change of the building line in order to accommodate step free access to the tube station concourse within the building.	No change
Site 6. 18: 66-74 Notting Hill Gate (Book Warehouse site)	C Pinder		It is not clear what is being proposed here. I would oppose any raising of height of these buildings. I would support all attempts to 'beautify' them with more attractive materials	Objection to raising the height of buildings noted but some increase would be needed to make redevelopment viable	No change