

Notting Hill Gate Draft SPD – consultation comments [1 – Introduction]

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
1 Introduction	laure ghouila-Houri		I am totally backing the Council plan to transform and regenerate Notting Hill Gate which is currently a no man land in central London. The issue here is to get it right and not end up with something worse that what we currently have.	Support for regenerating Notting Hill Gate. No comment to make.	No Change.
1 Introduction	Kensington Heights Property Company Limited (Tim Tinker)	Kensington Heights Property Company Limited	* Statement of the Problem The draft SPD seems to state with some clarity the complex planning issues posed by Notting Hill Gate.	No comment to make.	No Change.
1 Introduction	Irving		<p>1.7 says there are 8 weeks available for consultation but this period was in practice much less because of the Christmas/New Year break</p> <p>1.17 says more people were in favour of the "Rethink" proposals, but the only category where there were significantly more people in favour of Rethink rather than Refurbish or Refresh was the streets and public spaces category. It is important to note that most people were NOT in favour of a Rethink of the buildings and architecture. The clear majority was AGAINST a Rethink of the</p>	<p>The Council normally gives 6 weeks for consultation. However, the consultation was extended to 8 weeks to take account of it running over the Christmas period.</p> <p>Responses to the short questionnaire sent out in the September consultation were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To strengthen the town centre's identity, which option is your preferred approach: 32% Refurbish 19% Refresh 48% Rethink 	No Change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			buildings and architecture.	<p>2. To improve the streets and public spaces, which option is your preferred approach: 19% Refurbish 21% Refresh 60% Rethink</p> <p>3. To improve the buildings and architecture, which option is your preferred approach: 31% Refurbish 31% Refresh 38% Rethink</p> <p>Which is why the draft SPD states that more people were in favour of the 'Rethink' options. The Council acknowledges that the result for buildings and architecture in particular is close to an equal split and that there was notable support for Refurbish and Refresh options.</p> <p>The SPD no longer refers to the consultation results.</p>	
1 Introduction	Benedict Whyte		I support the Kensington Society's views and position regarding this planned development.	Support for Kensington Society response noted. There is overlap between the Kensington Society's submission and the draft SPD therefore the comments from the Kensington Society will be considered on their merit and changes may be made to the draft SPD where necessary.	No Change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
1 Introduction	Bezoari		<p>I was very impressed with this comprehensive document and attention to detail. My concern is that the development of NHG will push or increase traffic on the tributary streets namely Kensington Church Street; Campden Hill Road/Hornton Street. These link NHG to the South i.e. Kensington High Street .With more "flow" to and from a developed NHG, buses, bicycles, pedestrians, and other vehicles will increase on the above streets. These streets (and Hornton Street for example) are already heavily used as "cut-throughs" by such traffic, and the impact on houses from rubbish being discarded along these streets by pedestrians (from the rapidly expanding "take-away" outlets; by car alarms set off by the heavy lorries and buses; by cyclists on the pavements; noise pollution and so on is already very visible. Attracting even more by the development of NHG (even if such a development as you propose looks very interesting) is something that will negatively affect local homeowners who already pay the highest rates of Council tax in the Borough. I am not sure that I can propose any solution, as NHG cannot stay as is. However, I would ask that</p>	<p>Feed-back appreciated.</p> <p>The public realm proposals in the draft SPD are a preliminary scheme that has undergone preliminary testing. Full traffic modelling will need to be carried out when a detailed design is developed. Individual planning applications will be required to include a Transport Assessment (where they are expected to have an impact on the local road network).</p>	<p>Need for a traffic assessment as part of a planning application reflected in the SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			the Council review carefully the impact of NHG development on the wider circle of tributary streets as described above with a view to taking steps to protect the above streets from further deterioration in their living environment.		
1 Introduction	G. Keating		Para 1.17 states "...overall findings showed more people were in favour of the 're-think' options". This appears factually incorrect. More people were in favour only in respect of the streets/public spaces aspect of the plan, not other aspects of the plan. This factual inaccuracy should be corrected since it is misleading and if not corrected, it could cast doubt on the impartiality of the consultation process	<p>Responses to the short questionnaire sent out in the September consultation were as follows:</p> <p>4. To strengthen the town centre's identity, which option is your preferred approach: 32% Refurbish 19% Refresh 48% Rethink</p> <p>5. To improve the streets and public spaces, which option is your preferred approach: 19% Refurbish 21% Refresh 60% Rethink</p> <p>6. To improve the buildings and architecture, which option is your preferred approach: 31% Refurbish 31% Refresh 38% Rethink</p> <p>Which is why the draft SPD states that more people were in favour of the 'Re-think' options. The Council</p>	No Change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
				<p>acknowledges that the result for buildings and architecture in particular is close to an equal split and that there was support for Refurbish and Refresh options.</p> <p>The SPD no longer refers to the consultation results.</p>	
1 Introduction	Michele Hillgarth		Yes - the document pack supplied was very useful and clearly laid out. It was also useful to attend the sessions that were at Waterstones for further clarification and information.	Feed-back appreciated.	No Change.
1 Introduction	Estelle Beverley Hilton		<p>Notting Hill Gate is at the heart of a large residential area, and RBKC should consider the residents first and foremost in its plans for NHG. NHG is my local village where I shop on foot most days. I love the big airy space and big sky over the centre. Most residents I've spoken to don't want NHG to be turned into a soulless business centre, overshadowed by higher buildings along the south side, filled with buy-to-leave apartments, and even more crowded with visitors on Saturdays. We love the quirky spirit of the place. We should preserve as much of the existing mix of use, character, styles and periods as possible, introduce sympathetic modern buildings, and keep it all to a</p>	<p>Concern about development homogenising / having a detrimental impact on the character of the area noted.</p> <p>In relation to tall buildings the Council has looked at a variety of options for the scale and massing of buildings, as set out in Section 4 of the draft SPD. It notes the public concern about tall buildings (although not everyone does object to them) and following further townscape analysis and design development with landowners has decided to remove the 'renew' and 'rethink' taller building options.</p> <p>The proposed remit of the suggested town centre manager is outlined in</p>	<p>Changes to the SPD to reflect human scale mentioned.</p> <p>Town Centre Manager reference removed.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>human scale. Would Parisians dream of allowing a skyscraper to be built in the heart of their city? Please don't let the 4 or 5 developers overwhelm and homogenize the whole area or turn into a dreary wind tunnel.</p> <p>RBKC proposes a town centre manager for 3 years - will he/she have any powers or just hope to persuade the developers to consider the locals and other users. What will the brief be?</p>	<p>section 5.50 of the draft SPD. However, this has been removed from the SPD because the Council could not require developers to appoint a Town Centre Manager.</p>	
1 Introduction	Highways Agency (David Hussey)	Highways Agency	<p>The HA is an executive agency of the Department for Transport (DfT). We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving England's strategic road network (SRN) on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. The HA will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. We have reviewed the consultations and do not have any comment at this time.</p>	<p>Noted. The public realm proposals in the draft SPD are a sketch scheme and have undergone preliminary testing. Full traffic modelling will need to be carried out when a detailed design is developed. Individual planning applications will be required to include a Transport Assessment (where they are expected to have an impact on the local road network).</p>	<p>Need for a traffic assessment as part of a planning application reflected in the SPD.</p>
1 Introduction	A P Associates (Philip Mercer)	A P Associates	<p>NHG needs improving. Consultation was not properly advertised, public should be re-consulted.</p>	<p>The Council uses a variety of communication channels to publicise public consultations.</p> <p>Public consultation on the issues and options was carried out in September 2013. 12, 178 leaflets were sent out within 800m of the centre of Notting Hill</p>	<p>No Change.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>The proposals are tinkering with the situation. A more radical plan is needed.</p>	<p>Gate. 578 responses were received to the leaflet questionnaire. Around 275 people attended the exhibition.</p> <p>Formal consultation on the draft SPD ran for 8 weeks from 28 November 2013 – 23 January 2014. In addition to electronic communication, 12,178 letters were sent out to residents and businesses within 800m of the centre of Notting Hill Gate during the consultation period. Three drop-in sessions were held in January for people to ask questions and clarify anything before submitting written comments. Over 100 responses</p> <p>To keep up to date with all Planning consultations, residents can sign up to Planning Bulletin on the Council website.</p> <p>The Council considers that adequate consultation has been carried out and is satisfied that it has received a good response and has a clear idea of the issues. Summary of consultation can be found at www.rbkc.gov.uk/nottinghillgate</p> <p>The purpose of this document is to set the context to judge planning applications that may come forward</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
				from individual landowners. The options that have been considered are realistic and based on initial viability assessment. It would not be appropriate for the Council to develop a more radical plan that did not reflect the development that is likely to come forward.	No Change.
1 Introduction	Bulmer Mews Management Limited (J Gardner)	Bulmer Mews Management Limited	All the plans need to be redrawn so as to EXCLUDE Bulmer Mews. At the moment the boundary includes our residential forecourt, whereas it should in fact run along the rear house lines of Ladbroke Road.	The SPD boundary is set to include the retail areas of Notting Hill Gate including the frontage onto Kensington Park Road. The inclusion of part of Bulmer Mews would not have any impact as there is no suggestion that it is coming forward for development.	No Change.
1 Introduction	English Heritage (Richard Parish)	English Heritage	English Heritage supports the SPD and its intention to provide greater certainty within the planning system and promote high quality development and public realm works. In general we consider that the SPD will provide a useful tool to deliver these aims. We do however have a number of observations and concerns set out below. The proposed SPD boundary incorporates sections, or is adjacent to, the Kensington and Chelsea, Ladbroke, Pembridge, and Kensington Palace conservation areas and a number of listed buildings, including the Gate and Coronet Cinemas. As such, the	Support noted. The Council recognises that development in Notting Hill Gate could have significant implications for designated heritage assets and their settings. The SPD is supplemented by a Views Study which identifies these in detail and planning applications that come forward in the area will be required to provide verified views.	Comments noted and changes to the SPD to reflect the importance of heritage assets and their settings.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			guidance has significant implications for designated heritage assets and their settings.		
1 Introduction	Hickman		What a golden opportunity to see the back of the cluster of ghastly post war 1960s buildings, and substitute them with landmark buildings of distinction appropriate to the World's most popular city! Let's make it a place to aim for, not one to avoid! There cannot be any reason for the towers to be built even higher, whatever their use, but substantial and extravagant and tasteful cladding and turn these monsters into something attractive. And let's have trees at street level everywhere!	Support for getting rid of 1960s buildings and replacing them with landmark buildings and trees noted. The SPD has been amended to remove tall building options.	SPD revised to remove a tall building option at Newcombe House.
1 Introduction	Sonia Davies		Whilst I feel that redevelopment of the Notting Hill Gate area is much needed and is likely to be an overall benefit I am concerned at the "massing" of the buildings in an area now very open to the sky. Sitting as it does as the top of the hill the skyline forms an important part of the character of the area. The only current exceptions to this are Newcombe House, which is too high, and the flats which are also far too high. I believe that Newcombe House should be reduced in height but not just have its square footage squashed out along Notting Hill Gate and Kensington Church Street. I am	Concern about the massing of the buildings and effect on skyline and Hillgate Village noted. The Council has undertaken further work and concurs with this view. The SPD has been amended to remove references to tall buildings. The proposal detailed in Chapter 6 Option 2: Comprehensive Approach 6.13 – 6.21 to open a new tube entrance and to provide pedestrian only access to Jameson Street is now considered unlikely to come forward and has been removed from the SPD.	SPD revised to remove a tall building option at Newcombe House. The comprehensive approach outlined has been removed.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>particularly concerned, given that I live in Hillgate Village, of the potential overbearing effect of higher buildings surrounding the "village". This area is characterised by small domestic dwellings and to have a backdrop of larger and higher buildings along Notting Hill Gate and Kensington Church Street could make it feel like an enclave. Any opening up of access to Notting Hill Gate from Jameson Street, or of opening a new entrance to the tube station in the existing substation, would have a substantial effect on the peace and quiet of Jameson Street, a wholly residential area, as it would increase footfall. There is insufficient road space already for any increase in vehicle use in Hillgate Village which would inevitably follow any opening up of the area. Every day, as I am sure you are aware, there are traffic problems as lorries get stuck between parked cars. Any increase in people dropping people off at a tube station would make Uxbridge Street and Jameson Street almost impassable. Thank you for the excellent consultation document which has made the situation as clear as possible. I hope that going forward we will continue to be able to affect the council's proposals for this important historical area of London.</p>	<p>Feed-back on the consultation process is appreciated. Following adoption of this document the next stage will be deciding planning applications from landowners. You can be kept informed of planning applications in Notting Hill Gate by signing up to My RBKC on the Council's website and setting an area on which you would like to be notified of all planning applications.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
1 Introduction	Chooi Pearson		<p>I have lived in the borough since 1988, first in Brunswick Gardens and now in Bedford Gardens. My windows look onto the two towers currently in NHG. I do not support the current proposals in the draft supplementary planning document for the further development of the area. I fear that these proposals would result in NHG losing its leafy residential character. It would become another characterless high density development, e.g. like the area around Upper Street, Islington which has become a very busy and unattractive area. I object particularly to the proposals to raise the height of the existing tower blocks and to add more tower blocks. I fear these new buildings would not be in keeping with the other buildings in the area. The current glass curtain wall design of Jamie Oliver's Recipes' is an example of unsympathetic development.</p> <p>I support the alternative approaches put forward by the Kensington Society.</p>	<p>Concern about characterless high density development leading to loss of the area's leafy residential character noted.</p> <p>Building height is discussed in more detail in Section 4 of the draft SPD and this has been amended to remove references to tall buildings. The architectural style and quality of individual developments will be the subject of planning applications and will be assessed against the SPD and the impact on the views set out in the Views Study that accompanies the SPD.</p> <p>Support for Kensington Society submission noted. There is overlap between the Kensington Society's submission and the draft SPD therefore the comments from the Kensington Society will be considered on their merit and changes may be made to the draft SPD where necessary.</p>	SPD revised to remove option of tall buildings at Newcombe House.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
1 Introduction	Peter Lewis		<p>My name is Peter Lewis and I have lived in this community since 1991. I am delighted that you, RBKC, have taken this initiative to improve NHG, as I think it would benefit substantially from modernisation and enhance our area, whilst retaining its undoubted character and charm. I attended one of your consultation workshops in autumn 2013, and also dropped in to your consultation in Waterstones in January 2014. I strongly favour the "Rethink" option, because I think it is more practical to do as much as possible in one go, as we probably won't get this opportunity again for a very long time, rather than the "refurbish" or "renewal" options as they would be more of a compromise, a nip and tuck. I would therefore favour the following:- Rebuild the Newcombe House sites and the other blocks as far as possible. Also I think it would be a great enhancement to NHG if we can have a square public area / garden, as at the moment we only have pavement sites with benches. Ideally I would like to see this at street level underneath Newcombe House (if rebuilt on stilts), extending forward on the pavement area in front of Waterstones, and if possible to the rear as well. - I would also be very happy for all rebuilds to go higher than at present, which</p>	<p>Support for: rethink and a public space either underneath or to the rear of Newcombe House; the farmers' market; and step free access to the underground noted.</p>	<p>Revised SPD reflects the need for public open space and step free access.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			seems practical in order to maximise space, and would not in my opinion be aesthetically displeasing. - I would strongly favour keeping the Farmers' Market around NHG, rather than the Kensington High street area, as although that is not far away to get to, it would be 'outside' our immediate neighbourhood and therefore not retain the benefits it currently brings to the community, including sellers, buyers and NHG residents alike.- I think it should be a high priority to find a lift solution for the NHG Underground station for disabled people. Thank you very much in advance for your consideration.		
1 Introduction	White		Very clear	Feed-back appreciated	No Change.
1 Introduction	C Pinder		RBK&C should be aware that submitting responses to the Draft SPD Consultation was an overly time-consuming process and many of my friends and neighbours have declined to comment as a result. There is no place in the response template online for members of the public to make 'overall' summary comments about this document regarding development of Notting Hill Gate. Instead, we are asked to comment piecemeal on each 'site' or section of the document separately. I am therefore making my	We are sorry you found submitting responses time-consuming, it is possible to comment via email or post as an alternative to the online system. However, in submitting your comments by chapter and site there is no confusion about precisely to which part of the text your comment relates. The benefit of doing this is that we can see clearly if any changes to the text are needed.	No Change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>summary comments on the Draft SPD document here, in the 'Introduction' section.</p> <p>This document and proposal is actually about 'development', not 'improvement' of Notting Hill Gate, even though respondents to the first public consultation had asked that (page numbered 7 section 2.5) any changes "should be about improving the existing neighbourhood and its attractiveness". In reality, the document and proposals have been driven by the desire to make money by building owners and developers, not by the needs of the local residents and visitors to the area. This is clear on the page numbered 1, section 1:1 which admits that the project has been initiated and driven by landowners' proposals to develop their properties.</p> <p>It is also revealed in the document (e.g. page numbered 55 "Developer Contributions") that any improvements at Notting Hill Gate have to be funded by payments by the owners/developers of the existing buildings (£3 million needed for 'improvements to the public realm' is mentioned). In other word, the landowners are being solicited for what can only be seen as monetary</p>	<p>The SPD is a planning document and planning law controls development. The sites referred to in the SPD are privately owned, therefore redevelopment of these sites will inevitably be instigated by the land owners. The Council has opted to produce an SPD to guide that development and ensure that the needs of the local community are considered.</p> <p>The term developer contribution refers to planning obligations. This is an agreement attached to a planning application requiring developers to make a contribution to public infrastructure to help mitigate the impact of development. This typically includes public realm improvements.</p>	<p>Revised SPD guides development public realm improvements are included as part of possible planning contributions.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>'bribes' in return for being allowed to develop and make further profit from their properties.</p> <p>Thus, the document concentrates on how the properties will be developed – mainly by adding extra storeys onto almost ALL of the buildings at Notting Hill Gate: Newcombe House, Campden Hill Towers, David Game House, United House, West block. There is an attempt throughout the document to justify this proposal for increased height of the buildings by suggesting that the extra space generated may meet a requirement for housing (e.g. for the elderly) or that extra business property will bring more footfall and prosperity to the area. None of this has been proven. In my view, any move to “add height” to the existing buildings will just exacerbate the unattractive, cold and impersonal streetscape of Notting Hill Gate. Any such proposal is in direct contradiction to the admission on page numbered 7 of the document that the 1950s buildings create a “poor quality street environment”, are “unattractive”, have “dominance” over the area, and (page 25, section 4.23) are an “eyesore”. Having identified that it is the monolithic blocks of concrete, wrongly authorised in the 1950s, which make the place</p>	<p>The Council has tested a range of options for the scale of redevelopment. The SPD has now been amended to remove references to tall buildings.</p>	<p>SPD revised to remove option of tall building at Newcombe House.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>unattractive, it is now simply illogical to say that an 'improvement' will be achieved by making the blocks larger and taller!</p> <p>There are no concrete proposals in this document for any real visual 'improvements' to the streetscape of Notting Hill Gate. Lip service is paid in the document to a few extra trees/planters, but there are no specific plans included.</p> <p>There is some mention of beautification of the facades of the existing ugly buildings, but again no plans are presented. The promise of "embedding public art" is controversial – the existing "artworks" are not appreciated by some of the local residents – and so it is a moot point whether this represents "improvement".</p> <p>The suggestion of an enclosed "winter garden" (is this a giant greenhouse conservatory?) outside Newcombe House simply sounds bizarre.</p> <p>It is noted that this development</p>	<p>Section 4 Development Proposals sets out a plan for potential public realm improvements which includes a range of measures and goes on to explain that the Council may carry out further work to develop more radical proposals for the streetscape.</p> <p>The design of facades is something that can only be considered when detailed planning applications have been submitted.</p> <p>Concern about embedding Public art noted, but the Council considers that encouraging each landowner to seek advice from a public art advisor is the best way to deliver art that is appropriate for the area and its setting.</p> <p>Concern about the suggestion of a winter garden noted. This suggestion is one solution to providing publicly accessible space that would be comfortable to linger in within Notting Hill Gate.</p> <p>Comment that the organisers of the Farmers' Market have said that the area behind Tesco is unsuitable, noted. This was suggested as a possible solution to the lack of public space and how it could be provided within development.</p>	<p>Changes to SPD as described in Council response.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>almost certainly involves the removal of the Farmer's market in the car park behind Newcombe House, which would be a terrible blow for the local residents. It is a 'meeting place' for local people as well as being a real public amenity. The Manager of the Farmer's market has confirmed to me that the relocation plans (e.g. to the area behind Tesco's) mentioned in this document will not, in fact, be considered by them for the market. It appears that we will lose this valuable amenity altogether.</p> <p>It is also proposed that a "Town Centre Manager" be hired at a cost of £100,000 per year – a phenomenal sum. This person is presumably also going to be paid for by the developers – which is in their interest and surely also a conflict of interest. The role of the Town Centre Manager is to be the promotion of Notting Hill Gate. We do not need to promote this area – we are already full!</p> <p>The congestion of traffic on streets and overflowing pavements needs to be reduced, not increased.</p> <p>I would like to see this money instead</p>	<p>The farmers' market is run by London Farmers' Markets and currently takes place on private land. The Council recognises that retaining the farmers' market is important to residents and has therefore reviewed possible alternative locations given that the private land it currently uses is likely to be redeveloped.</p> <p>The Council has spoken to landowners and the market organisers to discuss possible alternative locations and these discussions continue.</p> <p>The role of Town Centre Manager was set out in paragraph 5.50 of the SPD, although it covers promoting the area to residents and visitors this is only one element, another was to support independent retailers. The costs identified were to cover salary, on costs, accommodation and a small budget to deliver initiatives. References to a Town Centre Manager have been removed from the SPD because the Council could not require developers to establish this role.</p> <p>The public realm proposals identify the opportunity to widen pavements.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>diverted to the planting and annual maintenance of more greenery on Notting Hill Gate in the central reservation and on the edges of pavements, which seems a far better use of this sum.</p> <p>Finally, it is proposed to build a 'cultural hub' of 2000 square metres floor space somewhere underground without windows or any natural light at Notting Hill Gate. This space is apparently to be used as one of the following according to the document: arts centre, exhibition centre, rehearsal space, museum, gallery. It is unclear why such a proposal is made, since the local residents do not need it and it can only increase visitor footfall to an already overcrowded area.</p> <p>It is puzzling that no mention is made in the document about the future of the historic Coronet cinema, which is surely under threat now that it is apparently to be sold again.</p> <p>There are two positive suggestions in the document. Of course, no-one will disagree with the proposals for step-free access to the Underground at Notting Hill Gate. Nor will anyone disagree with proposals for a new</p>	<p>Preference for allocating planning obligations to more greenery and its maintenance noted.</p> <p>There was support for a cultural facility when the idea was raised at the September Issues and Options consultation. In the second round of consultation, the idea has been met with a mixed response and this proposal is being abandoned. The Coronet Cinema has recently been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a cinema and theatre so the area will have a new cultural anchor.</p> <p>The Coronet is recognised as a heritage asset. Council was not aware it was up for sale when the draft SPD was produced.</p> <p>Support for step free access to underground and health facility noted.</p> <p>Your concern that the draft SPD is</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			NHS/health centre. In net, this is a deeply distressing proposal. I am surprised, disappointed and somewhat ashamed that the normally efficient, sensible and trustworthy council of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea would issue such a document which is transparently designed to be in the interest of developers and landowners at the expense of the attractiveness to, convenience of and enjoyment of local residents and visitors.	designed to be in the interest of developers and landowners is noted. The Council does not believe this to be the case, the SPD deals with the sites that are likely to come forward for development and has integrated feedback from the public consultation into the body of the SPD.	
1 Introduction	The Kensington Society (Amanda Frame)	The Kensington Society	The SPD The Society welcomes the Council's initiative in preparing this draft SPD, although we are concerned that it is in danger of being overtaken by the speed with which the developers, particularly the owner of Newcombe House, are preparing their own plans. Our approach to the draft SPD has been to review the vision, the themes and the priorities in order to be able to deliver change that will better match residents' aspirations. We have used the draft SPD as a starting point for discussion, reviewed the ingredients and priorities and produced a strategy that better meets the needs of the residents of the area who look to Notting Hill Gate as an underperforming district centre, a major public transport interchange and a place that needs to be	Noted. The aim was to adopt the SPD prior to landowners submitting planning applications. This may not be possible now that public consultation on the revised draft is required.	No Change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			transformed without losing what is unusual/special about it.		
1 Introduction	English Heritage (Richard Parish)	English Heritage	We would recommend that an additional page with links to other relevant policies, guidance or evidence is incorporated within the document. It may also be useful to include a diagram showing how the proposed SPD sits within the Council's planning policy framework.	Relevant policies have been referred to throughout the draft SPD. The SPD has been consolidated and a diagram this is not considered appropriate.	No Change.
1 Introduction	Eileen Strathnaver		I have read the SPD with care and, as a resident of some 4 years, may I say that at the outset that I appreciate the sensitivity to local character and needs with which much of it is written. Yes, it is a unique area in so many ways and that is its strength. We do not want to become just another high street.	Feed-back appreciated.	No Change.
1 Introduction	W. M. and D. L. Gabitass		As long time residents of Kensington Place, we are vitally interested in any plans for the redevelopment of Notting Hill Gate, and especially any relating to Newcombe House and its surrounding buildings. Our view is that (i) any planning should have as its objective the enhancement of the amenities of residents and the built environment in which they live: in that context (ii) Notting Hill Gate badly requires improvement but not much more and any "redevelopment" should therefore be limited (iii)	Your view that redevelopment should be limited and not at the expense of residents is noted. The SPD has been revised to remove references to taller buildings.	SPD revised to remove option of tall building at NHG.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			developers should be permitted to create value for themselves only where at minimum they do not do so at the expense of residents (and preferably where they create value for them). In that light while we appreciate the care the Council has evidently taken to incorporate residents' opinions in its Supplementary Planning document, we do have comments/concerns about what we understand to be the Council's thinking.		
1 Introduction	Elizabeth Clarke		I have lived here for 26 years, one hundred yards from Notting Hill Gate, and have therefore a keen and informed interest in any proposed changes to this largely residential area. The Council's comprehensive and well presented document on planning and redevelopment options is welcomed. As is the admission that mistakes have been made in the past.	Support for the SPD noted.	No Change.
1 Introduction	Elizabeth Clarke		Thank you for all your hard work and serious thinking. I hope I have been able to make a small contribution to this very important development, and look forward to delightful improvements.	Feed-back appreciated	No Change.
1 Introduction	Transport for London (Beth Havelock)	Transport for London	Thank you for consulting Transport for London on the Notting Hill Gate Supplementary Planning Document. The following comments represent	No comment to make.	No Change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>the views of Transport for London officers and are made on a "without prejudice" basis. These comments also do not necessarily represent the views of the Greater London Authority. Area Boundary and Site Description The Notting Hill Gate Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has been prepared to provide additional guidance for assessing planning applications in the area. 'Public realm', 'buildings' and 'identity' are three key themes of the document and it also includes guidance for specific development sites. Notting Hill Gate road runs east to west through the middle of the area, with the boundary running from Ladbrooke Terrace on the west to Ossington Street on the east. The boundary also covers part of Pembridge Road, Kensington Park Road and Kensington Church Street, six potential development sites have been identified within the SPD area. The A402, Notting Hill Gate makes up part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), the nearest section of Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) is the A3320, Holland Road located approximately 1km to the west. TfL is concerned about any proposals which may affect the performance and/or safety of the TLRN and SRN. Notting Hill Gate</p>		

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			London Underground Station is located in the middle of the development area providing access to the Circle, District and Central lines and numerous bus routes can be accessed from the 12 bus stops within the boundary as well as others in close proximity. A total of three cycle hire docking stations are situated in the SPD area, with several stations in the surrounding area.		
1 Introduction	The Cherry Tree Residents' Amenities Association (Thomas Blomberg)	The Cherry Tree Residents' Amenities Association	Regarding the Notting Hill Gate draft SPD, the Cherry Trees Residents' Amenities Association fully backs the views put forward by the Kensington Society and the report by Malcolm Reading Consultants (MRC).	Support for Kensington Society submission noted. There is overlap between the Kensington Society's submission and the draft SPD therefore the comments from the Kensington Society will be considered on their merit and changes may be made to the draft SPD where necessary.	Noted.
1 Introduction	St Helens Residents Association (Henry Peterson)	St Helens Residents Association	Importance of the SPD We welcome the preparation of the SPD albeit there is a real risk that this document will emerge too late in the day to have sufficient influence on the determination of imminent planning applications from developers of the key sites in the area. The consultation period for the draft SPD has taken place over Christmas and New Year, a difficult time for residents groups to get together and develop a collective	Support for the SPD noted. The aim is to consult on the SPD prior to landowners submitting planning applications. The Council normally gives 6 weeks for consultation. However, the consultation was extended to 8 weeks to take account of it running over the	No change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>view. The current draft includes proposals for use of S106 funding which involve clear choices and trade-offs - particularly for the Newcombe House site. Funding for the proposed cultural hub has to be weighed against acceptance of increased building height, or the alternative of an attractive public square and reconfigured public realm within this development as suggested by the Kensington Society. A short second phase of consultation, with the costs and viability of these alternatives established more precisely, would be invaluable.</p> <p>We support the suggestion of the Kensington Society that the final SPD should frame redevelopment of Notting Hill Gate as an exercise in two phases, the first to cover the development sites on which planning applications are imminent (Newcombe House and the Book Warehouse) and the second to cover the remaining area. We also see merit in a master plan exercise which would set the context for further development, while recognising the constraints of the landholdings being in several different ownerships. Through a more extended SPD process, every effort should be made to ensure that developers work to an agreed set of objectives, and that the</p>	<p>Christmas period.</p> <p>Request for a further phase of consultation noted this is taking place. The Coronet Cinema has recently been taken over by a new owner who intends to re-open it as a theatre and cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor. References to the opportunity to establish a new cultural anchor have been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>The table in chapter 7 has been removed.</p> <p>. The SPD has been amended to remove provision of a new cultural attraction has been limited and this idea has been removed from the SPD as shown in the next column.</p>	<p>Reference to cultural attraction removed from SPD.</p>

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			allocation of S106 contributions reflects a set of priorities and trade-offs which gains widespread support. We do not feel that this is yet the case with the content of the present draft SPD.	Support the Kensington Society idea of a masterplan exercise noted. The Council does not consider there would be any merit in a two phase exercise as this would increase uncertainty for developers and there is no point in masterplanning sites that are not likely to come forward. The details of developer contributions will be resolved through planning applications, this is not the role of an SPD. The table in chapter 7 has been removed.	The developer contributions table removed.
1 Introduction	Elizabeth Pencavel		We are pleased to have the opportunity to respond to the Notting Hill Gate SPD. In particular we wish to emphasise opportunities for collaboration and joined up cooperation with Westway Development Trust. Westway Development Trust is the leading provider of regeneration services in the north of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. We are a major landowner, holding 23 acres of land in and around the Westway in trust for the benefit of the local	Westway Development Trust's emphasis on opportunities for collaboration is noted, but it is not clear how this relates to Notting Hill Gate.	No change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			community. We have a significant reach within the Borough, with an estimated one million visits to our services every year. We deliver a portfolio of creative, education, leisure and health programmes and have a significant track record in building partnerships and creative collaborations. Our vision is to transform Westway into a leading London destination offering cultural, creative, leisure, retail and sports excellence. We want to build on the unique character and heritage of the area. Our recently completed SPD provides the framework for us to begin work on our development ambition, and we intend to make significant investments in facilities, programmes and the public realm over the next 10 years, and beyond.		
1 Introduction	Harriet Stevens		I am writing to OPPOSE the plans that have been submitted for the re-development of Notting Hill Gate and SUPPORT the views of The Kensington Society.	Opposition to SPD and support for Kensington Society submission noted. There is overlap between the Kensington Society's submission and the draft SPD therefore the comments from the Kensington Society will be considered on their merit and changes may be made to the draft SPD where necessary.	Noted.
1 Introduction	John Learmonth		This draft SPD is most definitely not satisfactory. It contains proposals	Opposition to the draft SPD and the view that content of the SPD is	No change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>which, if adopted, could very seriously adversely affect the environment where we live and the enjoyment of our home for the past 20 years. The document also contains much which is unclear and contradictory in addition to lack of clear Council commitment on key issues. If adopted in its current format it will have an extremely negative impact on our homes and deliver a dog's dinner of a new Notting Hill Gate which will not meet the needs and desires of interested parties, most importantly residents. The decision making process to date regarding this whole matter must also be called into question. Consultation with residents has been little and haphazard (the meeting at Waterstones we attended last week can best be described as chaotic, despite the best efforts of Council planning staff). Visible leadership and involvement by elected councillors has until recently been very thin. Too many questions about the process remain outstanding and/or unclear: who's on the Notting Hill Gate Liaison Group? Why is this draft SPD, when finalised, being ratified by one person (see section 1.8, p1)? Who set the deadlines? Why do we have to work to these? Getting decisions right is more important than timing. The SPD does</p>	<p>contradictory is noted. The consultation has been staged as described in 1.9-1.17 of the document which demonstrates that a good level of engagement with the public was achieved. Unfortunately the first meeting at Waterstone's was difficult because far more people attended than had been anticipated, the subsequent two meetings were orderly. This was not a consultation meeting it was an opportunity for Planning Officers to advise people on how to respond to the consultation because responses needed to be made in writing.</p> <p>Production of the all planning documents is non-political and led by officers.</p> <p>The Notting Hill Gate Liaison Group is a dedicated group made up of representatives from local residents' groups, businesses, Ward Councillors and landowners.</p> <p>The Council's process for adopting any Supplementary Planning Document is via a Key Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Planning Policy. Details of the Council's Key decision</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>contain some positive proposals, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Improvements for pedestrians. · Improved signage for Portobello Road. · New primary care/GP surgery. · New housing for elderly. <p>Acknowledgement that residents want useful, local, independent retailers and public lavatories but do not want luxury housing and large amounts of money spent on relocating the tube entrances. However, these parts of the draft SPD do not outweigh its lack of clarity and consistency and the fact that it contains proposals which will severely damage the area rather than enhance it. Key examples are set out below.</p>	<p>procedure can be seen on the Council's website http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/councilanddemocracy/howthecouncilworks/howwemakedecisions/keydecisions.aspx</p> <p>Adoption of the SPD has been delayed to allow further consultation.</p> <p>Support for improvements for pedestrians, improved signage for Portobello Road, a new primary care/GP surgery, new housing for elderly, independent retailers, public lavatories but not luxury housing or tube station modifications noted.</p>	
1 Introduction	John Learmonth		<p>Core Strategy. Reference has already been made to The RBKC Core Strategy, adopted 8th December 2010. Section 2.1, p5, of the draft SPD says: "A vision for Notting Hill Gate is set out in Chapter 16 of Council's Core Strategy, 2010 (see Policies CV16 and CP16). This, along with other policies in the Core Strategy, is the starting point for deciding planning applications." As this is the case it is worth reminding ourselves of some of the undertakings contained in this document, comparing them with those in the draft SPD, and seeing how successful the Council has been in delivering</p>	<p>Concern about whether the Core Strategy vision has been achieved noted. The planning system can only control development. Change will be delivered following planning applications put forward by developers, the Council expects a number of applications to come forward in the foreseeable future and this SPD is intended to provide further detail to allow them to be judged.</p> <p>The text in chapter 4 has been amended as shown in the next column.</p>	No change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>these undertakings since the Core Strategy was adopted in 2010 so giving us a good indication whether some objectives in the draft SPD are achievable in practical terms. For example (all references to the RBKC Core Strategy document):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “The height and orientation of Newcombe House overshadows these spaces and causes wind funnelling that makes them uncomfortable “ (16.1.18, p200). “Exceptional architectural and design quality will complement a significantly strengthened revitalised retail offer, drawing on innovative and modern approaches to create ‘iconic’ buildings and open space. Iconic does not necessarily mean tall, as Barkers in Kensington High Street demonstrates. Building heights will need to respect the character and appearance of adjoining conservation areas. The Council will work closely with land owners to bring this about” (16.3.8, p204). In other words no new tall buildings and new buildings must fit in with their surroundings. o “Provision of a new food store” (16.3.16, p205). No mention of this in the draft SPD. o “The Council will generally discourage applications for new hot-food takeaways, estate agents and bureaux de change, as these are already oversubscribed within the centre and do not cater for 	<p>The strategy to discourage takeaways, estate agents, bureaux de change haven’t been successful because the Government was not minded to provide additional planning controls that the Council was seeking see http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/businessandenterprise/towncentresneighbourhoods/supportforindependentretail/lobbyingforplanningchanges.aspx for details.</p> <p>Similarly the SPD does not mention provision of a new food store as it is not possible for the Council to control what type of business occupies a shop unit, this is a decision for the landowner.</p> <p>Residents have been involved throughout the process of developing this SPD, and changes have been made as a result of concerns residents have raised. The Council has also decided to consult on the revised SPD before it is adopted.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>the local catchment" (16.3.3, p16 – other sections discuss this issue as well). Clearly this strategy has not been successful. Some examples since 2010: expanded Prêt a Manger, new tatty tourist shop on north of NHG, Recipease, and, just this month, a Boots sandwich shop (next door to an Eat, which is next door to a Prêt, which is next door to a Pain Quotidien etc etc). Living close by Newcombe House we know we're in for many years of construction dirt and disturbance. This will be endurable if we know we're going to end up with a useful, refurbished, attractive NHG. It will not be endurable if we end up with the vision outlined in this draft SPD. We acknowledge the hard work and diligence of the Council planning staff, who have always been helpful and courteous to us – dealing with angry and confused local residents must certainly be challenging. However, we feel very strongly it is now up to our elected Councillors to tear-up the current schedule, go back to basics and draft a new draft SPD which will deliver the NHG we, the residents and users, rather than the developers want.</p>		
1 Introduction	Morven Hutchison		As I was away in the autumn and missed the original information about	Support for drop-in sessions noted.	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			the proposals for transforming part of Notting Hill Gate, I was very pleased to go to one of the pop-in sessions at Waterstones.		
1 Introduction	Iain Milligan		I would like to congratulate the Council on the clarity and comprehensiveness of the SPD.	Compliment appreciated.	Noted.
1 Introduction	Melvin		<p>I'm not clear whether a new tower is proposed or not to replace Newcombe House (NH). If not, then a (revamped?) Campden Hill Towers would be the most visible landmark. It would still be ghastly. What a nightmare! A taller elegant tower on the NH site (a mini-Shard) would be a much better landmark. With a smaller footprint, this would also free up space at ground floor level for an open air piazza with cafes etc.</p> <p>Re the Coronet, it seems a shame not to use this opportunity to restore the Coronet to the theatre it was, where Edward VII attended, and Sarah Bernhardt trod the boards. This could rival the Royal Court in a way that no Gate Theatre could. and provide a true cultural centre for Notting Hill Gate.</p>	<p>The SPD has been amended to remove reference to tall buildings.</p> <p>The Coronet Cinema has recently been taken over by a new owner who, the Council understands, intends to re-open it as a theatre and cinema so the area will have a new cultural anchor.</p>	<p>SPD amended to remove reference to tall buildings.</p> <p>Need for cultural attraction removed.</p>
1 Introduction	Peter Barnes		I have only just become aware of the SPD and unfortunately now only have time to make the briefest comments. Had the department ever considered	The Council uses a variety of communication channels to publicise public consultations in this case 12,178 letters were sent out to residents and	Noted.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			that it would be more effective to make the public aware of proposals by locating temporary electronic billboards as most council circulars are mistakenly treated as junk mail from estate agents, etc.	businesses within 800m of the centre of Notting Hill Gate during the consultation period, but the suggestion of using temporary electronic billboards is an interesting one that has been noted.	
1 Introduction	Sophie and Peter Windett		Having read the document of proposed ideas submitted by The Kensington Society for the future re-development of Notting Hill Gate we would like, as long standing local residents, to give their document our full support and backing.	Support for Kensington Society submission noted. There is overlap between the Kensington Society's submission and the draft SPD therefore the comments from the Kensington Society will be considered on their merit and changes may be made to the draft SPD where necessary.	Noted.
1 Introduction	Susan Lynn		I would like to give my support as a resident of W11 to the Kensington's Society's objections to the to the present SPD Notting Hill Gate and the future. and to their alternative proposals	Support for Kensington Society submission noted. There is overlap between the Kensington Society's submission and the draft SPD therefore the comments from the Kensington Society will be considered on their merit and changes may be made to the draft SPD where necessary.	Noted.
1 Introduction	Kate Weil		We would like to say that broadly we would not like many of these proposals RBKC have come up with and instead would prefer you to adopt the plans and ideas that have been formulated by the Kensington Society.	Support for Kensington Society submission noted. There is overlap between the Kensington Society's submission and the draft SPD therefore the comments from the Kensington Society will be considered on their merit and changes	Noted.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
				may be made to the draft SPD where necessary.	
1 Introduction	J B Kinsman		I would like to register my rejection of the proposals in the SPD Draft; I am in general agreement with the Kensington Society recommended alternatives with the possible exception to the unnecessary changes to the station entrance and pavement modification, in my experience both operate perfectly well.	Noted. There is overlap between the Kensington Society's submission and the draft SPD therefore the comments from the Kensington Society will be considered on their merit and changes may be made to the draft SPD where necessary.	Noted.
1 Introduction	Mary-Rose Pignatelli		I am emailing to agree with your proposals for the redevelopment of Notting Hill.	Support for SPD noted.	Noted.
1 Introduction	Shala Kaussari-Dick		I wish to confirm that I fully support the proposals made by Amanda Frame of Kensington Society in relation to the above development.	Support for Kensington Society submission noted.	Noted.
1 Introduction	Sally Young		The evening consultation at Waterstones was most helpful.	Feedback appreciated.	Noted.
1 Introduction	N A Simmons		I am a 30 year resident of the Notting Hill Gate area, currently living in what would become the shadow of the proposed new tower at the junction of Kensington Church Street and Notting Hill Gate. I object to the draft developers' proposal for the re-development of central Notting Hill Gate, whilst fully endorsing the proposal outlined by the Kensington	Support for Kensington Society submission noted. There is overlap between the Kensington Society's submission and the draft SPD therefore the comments from the Kensington Society will be considered on their merit and changes may be made to the draft SPD where necessary.	Noted.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			Society.		
1 Introduction	Barbara Campbell		I think the best thing I can say is that I agree with the NHIG's submission c/o David Campion and Cllr Buckmaster	Support for NHIG submission noted.	Noted.
1 Introduction	Way West Press (Tim Burke)	NHIG	'Notting Hill Gate Improvements Group' Comment. Introduction: London is fast becoming Europe's leading 21st century city. The capital's vibrancy is reflected many ways: the ethnic diversity, the bounding economy, and the constant regeneration of neighbourhoods. Every day the city morphs, generating new possibilities: Thomas Heatherwick's glorious bus roams the highways, taxis go green, and Crossrail nears completion. Pause, and you might see the great city of the coming century emerging, part quirky slow city, part digital and fast city, both industrious yet liberal in outlook, except perhaps in Notting Hill Gate. Notting Hill Gate is a great misconception and let down. People visit and it is not the place they ever expected. It could be Luton or even Birmingham: cities centres wrecked by 1960's urban planners. It is colourless, windy, and isolating. The shop frontages are harsh. Despite N.H.I.G many mitigating efforts the overall welcome remains ungenerous. It is not a space where any sensible	Lack of support the draft SPD in its current form and concern that it will reinforce the problems with the current environment noted.	Noted. No Change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>soul might want to ever linger long. At night the overall sadness of its unwanted brutalist design is even more pronounced. Successive planning initiatives have come and gone. None fully grasped either the inherent problems of the initial design or the potential opportunity that such a misshapen and desolate townscape presents. A modern day Christopher Wren, with real ingenuity and wit could easily turn such human-hating concrete monster into a world class boulevard beyond compare. This R.B.K.C/SPD and the potential demolition of Newcombe House does present all parties with an opportunity for welcome change. We very much recognise the professional work that R.B.K.C Planning has generated towards this regard. However after much reflection the Group agrees the SPD, as drafted, and its direction of travel will only re-enforce, for the coming generations, the many inherent failing of the current built environment. Therefore : It is difficult to support the SPD in its current form. Over the next pages we outline why.</p>		
1 Introduction	The Ladbroke Association (Robina Rose)	The Ladbroke Association	1. Welcome the purpose of the project esp. desire to ENSURE a coordinated approach. Also delighted that initial public response has overwhelmingly endorsed RE-THINK as the starting	No comment to make.	Noted.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			position for future endeavour. Lucky that 4 major owners have come forward to take art. What an opportunity. Policy section have done well in highlighting issues and helping us all to focus on them. At this point, everything is possible and the future is all things to all men. The DANGER is that we now all drop the ball and end up with a lesser outcome than we might have, in going the extra mile now called for.		
1 Introduction	The Ladbroke Association (Robina Rose)	The Ladbroke Association	If this whole project is not to descend into another sows ear, a mish-mash of half-hearted compromises at great public cost and inconvenience, then it is time for the raise the game NOW before it is too late - to embrace fully all its inherent possibilities, make worthwhile the destination that it already is. Let us go for the "COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH". And some.	Support for comprehensive approach noted.	No Change.
1 Introduction	GVA (Fred Drabble)	GVA	1. Introduction 1.1 These representations are submitted on behalf of Notting Hill Gate KCS Limited, a consortium of landowners that include Brockton Capital Fund II L.P., Development Securities PLC and Grantham. The consortium owns the properties at Newcombe House and along Kensington Church Street (referred to	Newcombe House option 2 has been removed from the SPD.	Option 2 removed from SPD.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>within the NHG SPD as the 'Newcombe House site').</p> <p>1.2 As recognised in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Core Strategy and the Notting Hill Gate Supplementary Planning Document, Newcombe House is an eyesore and is appropriate for redevelopment. Notting Hill Gate KCS Limited is committed to redeveloping the Site in the near future and is currently developing proposals for a mixed use redevelopment to include new public realm, office, residential, retail, and cultural uses.</p> <p>1.3 To ensure that the redeveloped site is a positive addition to the local area and the wider Borough, extensive pre-application consultation has been undertaken with the Borough and other key stakeholders (including the Greater London Authority, Notting Hill Gate Improvement Group, Kensington Society, Campden Hill Residents, Pembridge Association, and the Cherry Tree Residents Amenity Association) over the last two years. The consultation has benefited from the input of a series of technical consultants who have delivered specialist advice on the feasibility and viability of a number of options for the Site following an exhaustive site analysis exercise. These consultants</p>		

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>have significantly informed the owner's knowledge of the Site and its constraints. It is therefore with considerable background knowledge that these representations are submitted.</p> <p>1.4 Notting Hill Gate KCS Limited (hereafter referred to as the Owner), has engaged fully with the SPD process over the last two years and has made available its own extensive research to the Council in order to aid the process. Whilst we support the key aspirations of the SPD, it is disappointing to note that the Council has included an option within the draft SPD (namely Option 2 for the Newcombe House Site) that was introduced to key stakeholders only 3 weeks before publication and is yet to be properly assessed. These proposals have not been discussed fully with landowners and are by the Council's own admission 'untested'. As set out later, we consider that these proposals are highly unlikely to come forward within the plan period and on this basis, the SPD does not provide clarity or certainty to landowners and residents, as it states it intends to do.</p> <p>1.5 Government guidance is clear that Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) should be used to provide additional guidance and to "help</p>		

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery, and should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development" (Para 153, NPPF). The supporting National Planning Practice Guidance prepared by DCLG clearly states in respect of SPDs that SPDs "should build upon the policies in the Local Plan, and cannot be used to introduce new policies or revise existing policies; nor should they add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development". It is in this context that these representations are made.</p> <p>1.6 This representation addresses each chapter of the SPD in turn, commenting where we are supportive of the proposed guidance and setting out where amendments are sought.</p> <p>1.7 Given the significance of these representations, and given the importance of the SPD in guiding the redevelopment of a such key part of the Borough, we request that the Council holds a further round of consultation prior to adoption of the SPD.</p>	The Council has decided to hold a further round of consultation before the SPD is adopted.	Noted.
1 Introduction	Catherine McBride		Both RBKC and Westminster need sporting facilities in the centre of their boroughs especially a 25m or 50m swimming pool. There is a great emphasis on retail space in this	Suggestion that a public swimming pool should be incorporated into the development noted, but the development that is likely to come forward does not include a site that	No Change.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>application however with internet shopping there will be less and less need for retail space in the future. The commercial spaces that will thrive in the future are Leisure and Sporting Facilities and Restaurants. As the population ages it is becoming more and more important for people to keep fit. Swimming is one of the best way of staying healthy as it improves cardiovascular health as well as flexibility and strength. It also has the lowest injury rate of any sport as it is extremely low impact and puts very little pressure on the joints. Swimming is never cancelled due to bad weather. There is also a need for an open gym or hall space for palates, ballet or dance classes as these activates bring people together socially as well as keeping people fit. It is only in a large redevelopment such as the redevelopment of Newcombe House or the Ivy Lodge to United House that large municipal sporting facilities can be included. According to the application there are 30,000 people living around this development area. It is vital that municipal sporting facilities are included in such a redevelopment. There are also exceptionally good public transport links to this area. At the moment there is only 1 small (4 lane) 25m swimming pool in RBKC</p>	<p>would be suitable for a swimming pool.</p> <p>Claimed need for an open gym or hall space for pilates, ballet or dance classes also noted, this is the first time this view has been expressed in consultation responses.</p>	

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
			<p>and it is situated south of the Kings Road and another is being built in North Kensington near the border with Westminster. However Westminster have the Jubilee pool in this area and are building another at Morbely on the border with Brent. The middle of the borough has been completely neglected by both councils for far too long. The 30,000 people living around this development deserve Municipal, low cost, sporting facilities. Please ensure that sporting facilities, especially a 25m or 50m swimming pool, that is open to everyone and not run as a private club, is included in this development. The nearest 50m pool is 8 miles away in Crystal Palace or at the Olympic Site in East London. Both are over an hour away by public transport or even longer by private car in London traffic. The sporting facilities at the Holland Park School, that were expected to be open for use by local residents as a condition of their planning approval, are unlikely to ever be used by the public due to a lack of access to the facilities other than through the school's main building. Also the pool is now closed due to shoddy building practices so is not even able to be used by the schools pupils.</p>		
1	H M Fox		In principle I support any measure	Support for measures to relieve vehicle	Noted.

Document Section	Respondent name	Respondent company / organisation	Comment	Council response	Recommended change to draft SPD
Introduction			which will relieve the competing stresses caused by current vehicular and pedestrian traffic and the requirements of residents in NHG.	and pedestrian congestion noted.	
1 Introduction	Knox-Peebles		I appreciate the opportunity to read the document and comment on it.	No comment to make.	Noted.