Schedule of changes – Post Submission

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph No.** | **Original Wording** | **New Wording** | **Reason** |
| Key Diagram |  | Additional dashed hexagon in Earl’s Court on RBKC/LBHF border signifying a potential new retail centre | RBKC. This change is requested to highlight the potential retail offer which may come forward as part of the wider Earl’s Court development |
| Key Diagram | Legend: New Centre | Legend: Possible New Centre | RBKC. This change is linked to the above change in order to reflect the location of new centres in or near the Borough boundary |
| Key Diagram |  | Change Wood Green Station icon from a new Station to open station | RBKC. This change is request to ensure the Key Diagram is correct at time of adoption. |
| 2.3.19 | It can be seen that the key issues and broad spatial patterns present four components that must drive the direction of the Core Strategy | It can be seen that the ~~key issues and broad spatial patterns~~ key characteristics and broad spatial patterns present four components that must drive the direction of the Core Strategy | RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| CV1 | • stimulate regeneration in North Kensington through the provision of better transport, better housing and better facilities;By 2028 regeneration in North Kensington will have resulted in significantly improved transport, with a new Crossrail station at Kensal, better links to Hammersmith and Fulham across the West London line and improved north-south bus links overcoming the generally lower levels of accessibility in the north.2-3000 new homes will have been built, both private market and affordable, addressing the serious shortfall in housing need, and helping to diversify supply.It will be of a high quality design, well integrated into its context, overcoming some of the barriers to movement by which the North of the Borough is characterised.Better facilities will have been provided by the building of a new academy to serve the communities of North Kensington to address the serious shortage of secondary school places in the borough, helping to make life more local for residents.The deficiency in local shopping will have been addressed with two new town centres at Kensal and Latimer.The unique character of Portobello Road will have flourished, including the antiques and street market, adding to the vitality of the area.Jobs will be readily available as the Employment Zones will have been protected from encroaching residential and be thriving centres for small businesses and the cultural industries sector.The north of the Borough will be at the heart of environmental sustainability with the combined heat and power network extending from the hubs at the major new developments at Kensal, Latimer and Wornington Green• enhance the reputation of our national and international destinations – Knightsbridge, Portobello Road, South Kensington, the King’s Road, Kensington High Street, and Earl’s Court – by supporting and encouraging retail and cultural activities in particular;In the Borough as a whole our reputation as a national and international destination will have been further enhanced. The Borough will have avoided becoming little more than a residential suburb, with a flourishing and rich variety of retail and cultural activities adding so much to the quality of life of the residents.Our top retail destinations of Knightsbridge, King’s Road, Kensington High Street and Portobello will have been maintained and enhanced.Opportunities to expand retail floorspace in Knightsbridge, King’s Road, Fulham Road and South Kensington will have been taken up.Earl’s Court will remain an important cultural destination, as well as providing offices and around 2000 new dwellings on surrounding sites.Exhibition Road in South Kensington will be providing a first class experience to visitors to the national institutions, and have set a new standard nationally of streetscape design.The Royal Marsden and Brompton hospitals will continue to further its international reputation for delivering world class health care, education and research activities. • uphold our residential quality of life so that we remain the best place in which to live in London, through cherishing quality in the built environment, acting on environmental issues and facilitating local living, including through strengthening local neighbourhood centres.Our residential quality of life will be improved for everyone and we will remain the best place to live in London with our glorious built heritage protected and improved, the removal of eyesores, and new buildings of exceptional design quality.New homes will have further diversified housing tenure, and provide high standards of environmental performance.The waste we produce will be re-used, recycled or disposed of in or very near to the borough.Sustainable Urban Drainage systems will be commonplace throughout the borough, reducing the risk of flood events, especially in the west of the Borough when combined with the upgrading of Counters Creek sewer and storm drain.Green links will help to improve biodiversity and air quality and noise will have been significantly improved. | • stimulate regeneration in North Kensington through the provision of better transport, better housing and better facilities;By 2028 regeneration in North Kensington will have resulted in significantly improved transport, including ~~with~~ a new Crossrail station at Kensal, better links to Hammersmith and Fulham across the West London line and improved north-south bus links overcoming the generally lower levels of accessibility in the north.2-3000 new homes will have been built, both private market and affordable, addressing the serious shortfall in housing need, and helping to diversify supply.It will be of a high quality design, well integrated into its context, overcoming some of the barriers to movement by which the North of the Borough is characterised.Better facilities will have been provided ~~including~~ by the building of a new academy to serve the communities of North Kensington to address the serious shortage of secondary school places in the borough, helping to make life more local for residents.The deficiency in local shopping will have been addressed with two new town centres at Kensal and Latimer.The unique character of Portobello Road will have flourished, including the antiques and street market, adding to the vitality of the area.Jobs will be readily available as the Employment Zones will have been protected from encroaching residential and be thriving centres for small businesses and the cultural industries sector.The north of the Borough will be at the heart of environmental sustainability including ~~with the~~ combined heat and power network extending from the hubs at the major new developments at Kensal, Latimer and Wornington Green• enhance the reputation of our national and international destinations – Knightsbridge, Portobello Road, South Kensington, the King’s Road, Kensington High Street, and Earl’s Court – by supporting and encouraging retail and cultural activities in particular;In the Borough as a whole our reputation as a national and international destination will have been further enhanced. The Borough will have avoided becoming little more than a residential suburb, with a flourishing and rich variety of retail and cultural activities adding so much to the quality of life of the residents.Our top retail destinations of Knightsbridge, King’s Road, Kensington High Street and Portobello will have been maintained and enhanced.Opportunities to expand retail floorspace in Knightsbridge, King’s Road, Fulham Road and South Kensington will have been taken up.Earl’s Court will remain an important cultural destination, as well as providing offices and around 2000 new dwellings on surrounding sites.Exhibition Road in South Kensington will be providing a first class experience to visitors to the national institutions, and have set a new standard nationally of streetscape design.The Royal Marsden and Brompton hospitals will continue to further its international reputation for delivering world class health care, education and research activities. • uphold our residential quality of life so that we remain the best place in which to live in London, through cherishing quality in the built environment, acting on environmental issues and facilitating local living, including through strengthening local neighbourhood centres.Our residential quality of life will be improved for everyone and we will remain the best place to live in London with our glorious built heritage protected and improved, the removal of eyesores, and new buildings of exceptional design quality.New homes will have further diversified housing tenure, and provide high standards of environmental performance.The waste we produce will be re-used, recycled or disposed of in or very near to the borough.Sustainable Urban Drainage systems will be commonplace throughout the borough, reducing the risk of flood events, especially in the west of the Borough when combined with the upgrading of Counters Creek sewer and storm drain.Green links will help to improve biodiversity and air quality and noise will have been significantly improved. | RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| 3.3.9-3.3.15 |  | Our Local Case | RBKC. Wording in bold to be included at the beginning of each of those paragraphs for clarification purposes. |
| 4.3.5 | In terms of business uses, the Employment Land and Premises Study shows that there is a forecast demand of just short of 70,000 sq m of net additional space in the plan period. Of this just over 45,000 sq m is in the pipeline in existing permissions. That leaves approximately 20-25,000 sq m of office floorspace to be provided for. | In terms of business uses, the Employment Land and Premises Study shows that there is a forecast demand of just short of 70,000 sq m of net additional space ~~in the plan period~~ between 2004 and 2026. There has been a net increase of 9,000 sq m of office floorspace between 2004 and 2008, which leaves 60,000 sq m of additional floorspace to be provided between 2008 and 2026 if the demand is to be met. Of ~~this~~ the 69,000 sq m needed between 2004 and 2026 just over 45,000 sq m is in the pipeline in existing permissions, or has already been/ is being built out. ~~That~~ This leaves approximately 20-25,000 sq m of office floorspace to be provided for. | RBKC. The figures for office need have been updated to reflect the net increase in office space that has occurred within the Borough between 2004 and 2008, i.e. from the original baseline of the initial Employment Land and Premises Study. |
| Policy CP1 | The Council will provide2) 69,200 sq m of office floorspace to 2028. | The Council will provide2) ~~69,200~~ 60,000 sq m of office floorspace to 2028. | RBKC. The figures for office need have been updated to reflect the net increase in office space that has occurred within the Borough between 2004 and 2008, i.e. from the original baseline of the initial Employment Land and Premises Study. |
| 4.4.1 | **4.4.1** The *Place Profiles* provide the **integrating** function of the spatial strategy. They take the 'what', 'when', 'where' and 'how', and bring these together to show, through a vision, how that Place will develop over the lifetime of the plan. There are 14 Places identified (see Plan). The Borough comprises many more places than these. The Places selected for the Core Strategy are those where significant change is planned, and the district, major and international which are town centres which are the focus for activity. The one exception to these criteria is the Westway. This has been included because of its particular negative impacts, which need to be addressed as part of the programme of regeneration in North Kensington.  | **4.4.1** The *Place Profiles* provide the **integrating** function of the spatial strategy. They take the 'what', 'when', 'where' and 'how', and bring these together to show, through a vision, how that Place will develop over the lifetime of the plan. There are 14 Places identified (see Plan). The Borough comprises many more places than these. The places mainly relate to the two spatial themes of the Vision for the Borough (CV1): the regeneration of North Kensington, and enhancing the reputation of those places in the Borough with a national or international reputation – by and large our town centres.There are some exceptions to these two groups. We have also included other places where either significant change is planned, or ~~and~~ ~~the district, major and international~~ which are town centres ~~which are the focus for activity~~ not otherwise picked up in the spatial categories of the Vision. ~~The one exception to these criteria is~~ We have also included the Westway~~. This has been included~~ because of its particular negative impacts, which need to be addressed as part of the programme of regeneration in North Kensington.

| **Chapter**  | **Place** | **Spatial themes within the Borough Vision** | **Area of change or Town Centre?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | Kensal | North Kensington Regeneration | Area of Change |
| 6 | Golborne/Trellick | North Kensington Regeneration | Area of Change |
| 7 | Portobello | North Kensington Regeneration | Town Centre |
| 8 | Westway | North Kensington Regeneration | Neither – the exception to the rule |
| 9 | Latimer | North Kensington Regeneration | Area of Change |
| 10 | Kensington High Street | Place with National or International Reputation | Town Centre |
| 11 | Earl’s Court | Place with National or International Reputation | Both an Area of Change and a Town Centre |
| 12 | Knightsbridge | Place with National or International Reputation | Town Centre |
| 13 | Brompton Cross | Place with National or International Reputation | Town Centre |
| 14 | South Kensington | Place with National or International Reputation | Town Centre |
| 15 | Kings Road / Sloane Square | Place with National or International Reputation | Town Centre |
| 16 | Notting Hill Gate | Other | Town Centre |
| 17 | Fulham Road | Other | Town Centre |
| 18 | Lots Road / World’s End | Other | Area of Change |

Within most of the places listed above as Areas of Change we have identified significant sites for redevelopment. These are called the Strategic Sites, and they are allocated in this plan (Section 2A, Chapters 20-26) for specific uses. The table below shows which Places also have a Strategic Site Allocation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Chapter**  | **Place** | **Strategic Site** |
| 5 | Kensal | Kensal Gasworks (Chapter 20)(also referred to as Kensal Canalside in the London Plan Annex 1 – list of opportunity areas) |
| 6 | Golborne/Trellick | Wornington Green (Chapter 21)Land adjacent to Trellick Tower (Chapter 22) |
| 7 | Portobello | No strategic sites |
| 8 | Westway | No strategic sites |
| 9 | Latimer | Kensington Leisure Centre (Chapter 23) |
| 10 | Kensington High Street | Commonwealth Institute (Chapter 24) |
| 11 | Earl’s Court | Warwick Road (Chapter 25)Earl’s Court Exhibition Centre (Chapter 26) |
| 12 | Knightsbridge | No strategic sites |
| 13 | Brompton Cross | No strategic sites |
| 14 | South Kensington | No strategic sites |
| 15 | Kings Road / Sloane Square | No strategic sites |
| 16 | Notting Hill Gate | No strategic sites |
| 17 | Fulham Road | No strategic sites |
| 18 | Lots Road / World’s End | No strategic sites |

 | RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| 4.4.2 | Place shaping is at the centre of spatial planning. Place shaping requires that different plans and programmes from across the Council and its partners are integrated. It also requires a clear vision of how different places are to evolve in the future, to give a clear framework for future actions, both of the Local Planning Authority, other parts of the Council, and our partners,. This is the function of the *Place Profiles*.  | Place shaping is at the centre of spatial planning. Place shaping requires that different plans and programmes from across the Council and its partners are integrated. It is not enough, therefore, to allocate specific development sites, nor to set out ‘generic’ policies to guide development across the Borough. Each Place as a whole needs to be considered, in terms of development management and in terms of the actions of other bodies, both public and private, that have a bearing on the future quality of the Place. ~~It also~~ ~~requires~~ ~~a~~ A clear vision is therefore required of how different places are to evolve in the future, to give a clear framework for future actions, both of the Local Planning Authority, other parts of the Council, ~~and~~ our partners, and private land owners. This is the function of the *Place Profiles*.  | RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| 4.4.4 – 4.4.5 | **4.4.4** The last section of each Place Profile is Delivery. A policy to guide development management decisions is provided, and a indication of the likely extent of development is given in each Place. The quantum of development envisaged in each Place is included at the end of each Place Profile. In many Places, potential development opportunities in addition to the strategic sites are identified, but these are small, and thus to allocate them would be inappropriate in a Core Strategy.**4.4.5** They must not be confused with allocations. Strategic allocations are included in this plan in Section 2(B). Each of the strategic allocations is located within one of the places - but not every place has such an allocation.  | **4.4.4** The last section of each Place Profile is Development, Infrastructure and Monitoring. ~~Delivery~~. A policy to guide development management decisions is provided. However, as is stated above, it is the Vision and Priorities for Action that are seen a providing the framework to guide future decisions relating to the place. The Place Policy is included in order to ensure that the place shaping role of the development management function can be given due weight in relation to the application of the policies in the plan, particularly with regard to the generic development management policies in Section 2B, Chapters 30 – 36.~~, and a~~An indication of the likely ~~extent~~ quantum of development is given in each Place. ~~The quantum of development envisaged in each Place is included at the end of each Place Profile~~. In many Places, potential development opportunities in addition to the strategic sites are identified, but these are small, and thus to allocate them would be inappropriate in a Core Strategy. **~~4.4.5~~** They must not be confused with allocations. Strategic Site ~~a~~Allocations are included in this plan in Section 2(B). ~~Each of the strategic allocations is located within one of the places - but not every place has such an allocation.~~ The specific infrastructure known at this stage is identified, future planning documents that are seen as necessary to the delivery of the Vision are also set out, and criteria on which the delivery of the Vision will be monitored are included at the very end of each Place Profile.  | RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| 5.1.6 | The western part of the Kensal ‘Place’, has significant development potential through the redevelopment of the Kensal Gasworks sites, amounting to some 17 hectares (40 acres). Together, these sites are not dissimilar in size to that of Paddington Basin development in the neighbouring City of Westminster.  | The western part of the Kensal ‘Place’, has significant development potential through the redevelopment of the Kensal Gasworks sites, amounting to some 17 hectares (40 acres). Together, these sites are not dissimilar in size to that of Paddington Basin development in the neighbouring City of Westminster. This site is allocated in this Core Strategy as a Strategic Site – see Chapter 20. | RBKC. Clarification purposes. Reference to strategic sites. |
| Places |  |  | Changes throughout the Places chapters. Same as in paragraph 5.1.6 for clarification purposes. |
| 6.1.5 | At Wornington Green, the Kensington Housing Trust are exploring ways to renew the Estate. The need for renewal is driven by a number of factors. (…) | There are two strategic site allocations in Golborne/Trellick. One is at ~~At~~ Wornington Green (Chapter 21), where the Kensington Housing Trust ~~are~~ have been exploring ways to renew the estate, and planning permission, in outline for the whole estate, and in detail for phase one, nearest the Golborne road, was granted in March 2010. The need for renewal is driven by a number of factors. (...)  | RBKC. Clarification purposes and in the light of the recent planning permission. |
| 6.1.6 | The Edenham Site, located next to Trellick, also provides opportunities for regeneration including new housing and extra care facilities.  | The other strategic site allocation is the Edenham Site – ~~located next to~~ the land adjacent to Trellick Tower (Chapter 22) – also provides opportunities for regeneration including new housing and extra care facilities.  | RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| 9.1.5 |  | Insert the following paragraphs after 9.1.5 There is a specific opportunity in relation to the existing site of the leisure centre. This Core Strategy allocates the Leisure Centre site as the site of the much needed new school in the north of the Borough (see Chapter 23). Preliminary work undertaken in the summer of 2009 indicated that the school could be accommodated without compromising the existing leisure centre. Other specific opportunities to realise the Vision (see below) have not been identified in this Core Strategy. They will be identified through a subsequent planning document focusing only on the Latimer area.  | RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| CV9, Vision for Latimer | “Latimer will have been rebuilt, in a phased way, to a new street pattern. It will be a place ….”  | Latimer will have been rebuilt, in a phased way, to a new street pattern, guaranteeing all existing tenants the opportunity of a new home as well as creating capacity for new residents to move to the area. It will be a place ….  | In response to comments made by KCSC, make the Latimer Place more explicit in its protection of homes of existing tenants  |
| 9.4.4 | The Council will prepare a masterplan and Area Action Plan to explore the potential for the area | The Council will prepare a masterplan to form part of the LDF ~~and Area Action Plan~~ to explore the potential for the area | RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| Proposed paragraph after 10.1.2 | There are 5 sites along the west of Warwick Road and north of Cromwell Road where significant change is planned. This is likely to be in the form of a mixed use development, with increased provision of open space and education facilities. The sites are allocated as a Strategic Site considered in Chapter 25.  | There are 5 sites along the west of Warwick Road and north of Cromwell Road where significant change is planned. This is likely to be in the form of a mixed use development, with increased provision of open space and education facilities. The sites are allocated as ~~a Strategic Site~~ the Warwick Road considered in Chapter 25. | RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| 10.1.6 | (…) After 2012, however, the landowners plan to redevelop the site. The Earl’s Court Exhibition Centre Site extends (...)  | (…) After 2012, however, the landowners plan to redevelop the site. It is allocated as a strategic site in this Core Strategy, see Chapter 26. The Earl’s Court Exhibition Centre Site extends (…) | RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| 11.1.9 | The Commonwealth Institute building is at the western end of the centre. A high-quality public institutional use could help to enhance the attractiveness of the High Street and attract more visitors.  | The Grade II\* Listed Commonwealth Institute building is at the western end of the centre. A high-quality public institutional use could help to enhance the attractiveness of the High Street and attract more visitors. To that end it is included as a strategic site allocation within this Core Strategy – see Chapter 24. A planning application was received in 2009 which included modifications to the building for the Design Museum, with enabling residential development also on the site. The Council is minded to grant permission subject to a s.106 agreement.  | RBKC. Clarification purposes and in the light of the recent planning permission. |
| Rest of places:Portobello/Notting Hill, Westway, South Kensington, Brompton Cross, Knightsbridge, King’s Road/Sloane Square, Notting Hill Gate, Fulham Road and Lots Road/World’s End |  | There are no strategic site allocations within [name of place to be inserted] place contained in the Core Strategy.  | Insert a new paragraph at the end of the introduction, before the Vision.RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| 14.3.12 | The Council will continue to work in partnership with the City of Westminster to achieve a shared vision for the area.  The possibility of implementing public realm improvements in Montpellier Street to provide space for alfresco dining, market stalls and events will be investigated | The Council will continue to work in partnership with the City of Westminster to achieve a shared vision for the area.  The possibility of implementing public realm improvements in Montpellier Street to provide space for ~~alfresco dining,~~ market stalls and events will be investigated.Reference to alfresco dining will also be removed from the Knightsbridge map. | In response to comments made by the Knightsbridge Association, and their concern that alfresco dining in Montpelier Street will directly conflict with the amenity of nearby residential properties.  |
| Para 16.3.3 | The Council will generally discourage applications for new hot-food takeaways, estate agents and bureau do change, as these are already over-subscribed within the centre and do not cater for the local catchment. The Council will also use … | The Council will generally discourage applications for new hot-food takeaways, estate agents and bureau do change, as these are already over-subscribed within the centre and do not cater for the local catchment. Whilst the Council will support improving the ‘quality’ of existing restaurants in the centre, new restaurants will only be supported where do not breach the criteria set out within Policy CF3 (diversity of shops within town centres) The Council will also use … | RBKC. This amendment is made to make it clear that the Council’s support within the vision for “improved restaurants” does not mean that the criteria set out within Policy C3 can be ignored.  |
| 19.1.2 |

|  |
| --- |
| Kensal |
| Wornington Green |
| ~~Edenham~~ Land Adjacent to Trelllick Tower |
| North Kensington Sports Centre |
| Commonwealth Institute |
| Warwick Road |
| Earl’s Court |
| Lots Road Power Station (not allocated, but for information only) |

 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Chapter**  | **Place** | **Strategic Site** |
| 5 | Kensal | Kensal Gasworks (also referred to as Kensal Canalside in the London Plan Annex 1 – list of opportunity areas) |
| 6 | Golborne/Trellick | Wornington GreenLand adjacent to Trellick Tower |
| 7 | Portobello | No strategic sites |
| 8 | Westway | No strategic sites |
| 9 | Latimer | Kensington Sports Centre |
| 10 | Kensington High Street | Commonwealth Institute |
| 11 | Earl’s Court | Warwick RoadEarl’s Court Exhibition Centre |
| 12 | Knightsbridge | No strategic sites |
| 13 | Brompton Cross | No strategic sites |
| 14 | South Kensington | No strategic sites |
| 15 | Kings Road / Sloane Square | No strategic sites |
| 16 | Notting Hill Gate | No strategic sites |
| 17 | Fulham Road | No strategic sites |
| 18 | Lots Road / World’s End | No strategic sites |

 | RBKC. Clarification purposes. |
| 20.1.4 | Kensal Gasworks is located in the Kensal Place, Chapter 5, where the Strategic Objectives of the plan as a whole, have been listed in the following order of priority: Respecting Environmental Limits, Better Travel Choices, Diversity of Housing, Keeping Life Local, An Engaging Public Realm, renewing the Legacy and Fostering Vitality. | Kensal Gasworks is located in the Kensal Place, Chapter 5. Particular attention is drawn to the Vision for Kensal (see section 5.2), and the Priorities for Action (section 5.3), which consider the wider Kensal area beyond this specific strategic site allocation. In the Priorities for Action section, the actions are set out under the headings of the ~~, where the~~ Strategic Objectives of the plan as a whole, but ~~have been listed~~ in the ~~following~~ order of priority regarded as appropriate for Kensal: Respecting Environmental Limits, Better Travel Choices, Diversity of Housing, Keeping Life Local, An Engaging Public Realm, renewing the Legacy and Fostering Vitality. | RBKC. For clarification purposes. |
| Rest of Strategic Site Allocations |  |  | Same changes as paragraph 20.1.4 for each strategic site. RBKC. For clarification purposes. Standard Text Changes |
| 20.3.5 | 2011: Commence work on site | 2011/ 2012: Commence work on site | RBKC. For clarification purposes. |
| Policy CK1(c)iii | Significantly improve Social and community uses elsewhere in the Borough… | Significantly improve or provide newSocial and community uses elsewhere in the Borough… | RBKC. This provides a greater reflection of the aims of the policy |
| Policy CK2 and subheading | Local Shopping Facilities | Walkable Neighbourhoods and Local Shopping Facilities | RBKC. This change will provide clarity and highlight the relationship between local shopping and walkable neighbourhoods  |
| 20.2.2 | The Council considers the site to have the capacity of upwards of 2,500 new dwellings and ~~the Council considers that the site~~ also has potential for at least 10,000sqm of offices | The Council considers the site to have the capacity of upwards of 2,500 new dwellings and ~~the Council considers that the site~~ also has potential for at least 10,000sqm of offices or other B1 uses | RBKC. The Council wish to acknowledge that other compatible employment uses will also be encouraged. |
| 20.3.6 | National Grid, who own the gas holders, have informed the Council that they are looking to remove them by 2017. The gas holders site will therefore be in the second phase of the development…. | National Grid, who own the gas holders, have informed the Council that they are looking to remove them by 2017 at the earliest. The gas holders site will therefore be in the second phase of the development. | National Grid. This change was requested in the Statement of Common Ground to provide consistency with other parts of the chapter |
| Para 31.3.18 | …The Council’s favoured method for the provision of ‘affordable shops’ is for developers to provide premises to be managed under the Council’s Neighbourhood Shopping Policy. The Council also recognises that there may be circumstances where it would be appropriate for the affordable shop to be provided off site, but within the same centre. These could include, for example, where the proposed retail development has a narrow street frontage, and where the provision of an additional shop on site could jeopardise the successful operation of the principal shop. The onus will be on the applicant to successfully demonstrate where off site provision will be appropriate.  |  …The Council’s favoured method for the provision of ‘affordable shops’ is for developers to provide premises to be managed under the Council’s Neighbourhood Shopping Policy, although the Council does recognise that other mechanisms for the provision of affordable shops, secured through s106 agreements, may also be appropriate. The Council also recognises that there may be circumstances where it would be appropriate for the affordable shop to be provided off site, but within the same centre. These could include, for example, where the proposed retail development has a narrow street frontage, and where the provision of an additional shop on site could jeopardise the successful operation of the principal shop. ~~The onus is on the applicant to successfully demonstrate where off site provision would be appropriate.~~ Where an affordable unit cannot be provided, the Council will seek financial contributions, through planning obligations (where appropriate, feasible and viable), to provide the mitigation necessary to support retail diversity within the centre or an adjoining centre. The onus will be on the applicant to successfully demonstrate where ~~off site provision will be appropriate.~~ a contribution to the retail diversity of the centre, be this by ‘on’ or ‘off’ site provision of an affordable unit, or by a financial contribution, is not appropriate.”  | RBKC. As phrased the supporting text to policy CF2 does not offer the flexibility with regard the provision of affordable shops or the possibility of targeted financial contributions to support the retail diversity of a centre. The amendment is intended to make this flexibility clear.  |
| Policy CF2 | (c) require new large scale retail development or mixed use development with a significant retail element, to provide affordable shops, to be managed under the Council’s Neighbourhood Shopping Policy. Affordable shops can be provided off site within the same centre where appropriate. | 1. require new large scale retail development or mixed use development with a significant retail element, to provide affordable shops, ~~to be managed under the Council’s Neighbourhood Shopping Policy,~~ or where this is not appropriate, to provide a financial contribution through planning obligations to support retail diversity within the centre. Affordable shops can be provided off site within the same centre where appropriate.”
 | RBKC. As phrased the policy does not offer the flexibility with regard the provision of affordable shops or the possibility of targeted financial contributions to support the retail diversity of a centre. The amendment is intended to make this flexibility clear.  |
| Para 31.3.31 | There is a forecast demand for 15% growth of office jobs over the plan period. This equates to a net addition of 69,000 sq m of office floorspace… | There is a forecast demand for 15% growth of office jobs between 2004 and 2026 ~~over the plan period,~~ This equates to a net addition of 69,000 sq m of office floorspace… | Text added to make sure that it is clear that forecast office demand uses a 2004-2026 figure.  |
| Para 31.3.32 | On the supply side, office floorspace under construction and outstanding permissions provide a net addition of 46,000 sq m. This level of building will meet office demand until 2017. The Council therefore recognizes that a further 23,000 sq m of office floorspace needs to be developed within the Borough, within the plan period for the predicted need to be met. | On the supply side, office floorspace under construction, ~~and~~ outstanding permissions and floorspace that has been built out between 2004 and 2008 provide a net addition of 46,000 sq m. This level of building will meet office demand until 2017. The Council, therefore, recognizes that a further 23,000 sq m of office floorspace needs to be developed ~~within the Borough~~, within the plan period for the predicted need to be met.  | Text added to ensure that it is clear that figures date from a 2004 baseline – the baseline used in the Employment Land and Premises Study. |
| Para 31.3.33 | The continued concentration of large (greater than 1,000 sq m (GEA)) and medium scale (30 0 sq m to 1,000 sq m (GEA)) business developments on the upper floors of sites within town centres and in other accessible areas is important as it supports both the continued viability of the Borough’s town centres,(increasing the number of people visiting the centre but not t the expense of existing shopping floorspace) and ensures that as many people as possible can reach these areas without having to rely on the private car. This is a central tenet of a sustainable pattern of development.  | The continued concentration of large (greater than 1,000 sq m (GEA)) and medium scale (300 sq m to 1,000 sq m (GEA)) business ~~developments~~premises on the upper floors of sites within town centres and in other accessible areas is important as it assists in the provision in the range of premises needed, supports ~~both~~ the continued viability of the Borough’s town centres, ~~(increasing the number of people visiting the centre but not t the expense of existing shopping floorspace)~~ and ensures that as many people as possible can reach these areas without having to rely on the private car. This is a central tenet of a sustainable pattern of development.  | Clarification that business developments may include a number of smaller units within them.  |
| Para 31.3.33 | The protection of offices within town centres should not however be at the expense of existing town centre occupiers who are in need of expansion. Meeting the needs of employers is integral to fostering the vitality of the Borough. For the sake of clarity, the expansion of residential uses at the expense of offices within town centres is not supported. | Whilst a town centre is considered to be an appropriate location for a business use, the protection of offices within town centres should not ~~however~~ be at the expense of the creation of new retail space, the needs of existing town centre occupiers who are seeking ~~who are~~ ~~in need of~~ expansion or the promotion of social and community uses which serve local people. ~~Meeting the needs of employers is integral to fostering the vitality of the Borough.~~ ~~For the sake of clarity,~~ The expansion of residential uses at the expense of offices within town centres is not supported. | RBKC. This amendment makes it explicit that new retail floorspace and social and community uses, which serve Borough residents, will be favoured above office uses within the Borough’s town centres. |
| Para 31.3.34 | The Council considers an area which has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) score of 4 or greater to be accessible. | The Council considers that a small, medium-sized or large business development is one with a total floor area of between 100 sq m and 300 sq m,  between 300 sq m and 1,000 sq m and more than 1,000 sq m respectively. It may be a development which will contain a single occupier or one which will contain a number of smaller units. The Council considers an area ….. | Following discussions with the Kensington Society the Council has made minor alterations to clarify that the Council seeks to require office developments or certain sizes to be located in particular areas, not merely the offices units themselves. |
| Para 31.3.35 | The availability of small (floor area of 300 sq m (GEA) or less) and very small (floor area of 100 sq m (GES) or less) business premises across the Borough is also valued as these are the premises which are the greatest demand by the Borough’s residents. These smaller units… | The availability of small (floor area of 300 sq m (GEA) or less) and very small (floor area of 100 sq m (GES) or less) business premises across the Borough is also valued as these are the premises which are the greatest demand by the Borough’s residents. They are not ‘high trip generators’, and do not require a highly accessible or a town centre location to be successful. These smaller units … | RBKC. Clarification that small offices are not high trip generators and therefore don’t require a highly accessible location. |
| New para after 31.3.37 |  | The protection of offices as set out in Policy CF5 includes the protection of both units and floor space. | RBKC. This amendment is made to ensure that it is explicit that the protection of offices relates to floorspace as well as units. |
| Policy CF5 | 1. ii. the office is within a town centre and being replaced by a shop or shop floorspace, or another (not residential) town centre use where this allows the expansion of an adjoining premises.
 | 1. ii. the office is within a town centre and being replaced by a shop or shop floorspace; by a social and community use which predominantly serves, or which provides significant benefits to, Borough residents; or by another (not residential) town centre use where this allows the expansion of an adjoining premises.
 | RBKC. This amendment makes it explicit that social and community uses, which serve Borough residents will be favoured above office uses within the Borough’s town centres. |
| Policy CF5 | c ) permit small offices anywhere in the Borough; require medium offices to be located in town centres, in other accessible areas, in Employment Zones and in commercial mews; require large offices to be located in Higher Order Town Centres, and other accessible areas, except where ……Employment Zones(k) resist large scale offices. | c ) permit small office developments anywhere in the Borough; require medium-sized office developments to be located in town centres, in other accessible areas, in Employment Zones and in commercial mews; require large office developments to be located in Higher Order Town Centres, and other accessible areas, except whereEmployment Zones(k) Permit large office developments where consisting entirely of very small, small or medium units.  ~~Resist~~ Large scale offices will be resisted. | Following discussions with the Kensington Society the Council has made minor alterations to clarify that the Council seeks to require office developments or certain sizes to be located in particular areas, not merely the offices units themselves.The amendment of part (k) is necessary to make it clear that employment zones will be promoted as locations for smaller businesses, whether these are ‘stand alone’ or part of large business centres.  |
| 34.3.12 | The Royal Borough has a distinctive townscape of high quality, often characterised by a wide variety of architectural styles within relatively small areas. To renew the legacy, a sensitive approach to the architectural design of new buildings, and to extensions and modifications to existing buildings, will be required. | The Royal Borough has a distinctive townscape of high quality, often characterised by a wide variety of architectural styles within relatively small areas. To renew the legacy, a sensitive approach to the architectural design of new buildings, and to extensions and modifications to existing buildings**,** will be required. This should be to a high quality, with very high quality expected within conservation areas. | RBKC. This amendment makes its explicit that new development should be of the very highest quality within the Borough’s conservation areas. |
| 34.3.17 | …in the Council’s view there are currently only three buildings which are considered to be eyesores, the Holiday Inn in Kensington, Forum Hotel in Gloucester Road and Newcombe House in Notting Hill Gate. | …in the Council’s view there are currently only ~~three~~ two buildings which are considered to be eyesores, ~~the Holiday Inn in Kensington,~~ the Forum Hotel in Gloucester Road and Newcombe House in Notting Hill Gate. | RBKC. The Holiday Inn in Kensington, Forum Hotel in Gloucester Road are two names for the same building. |
| 34.3.24 | Local landmarks define points of townscape interest or public functions that are relevant to those living or working within the immediate areas. They do not necessarily rise above the predominant building height – such as the Michelin Building at Brompton Cross – but where they do, they will not tend to be more than 11/2 times the height above the context, and as such are compatible with their context.  | Local landmarks are occasional features in the Borough which define points of townscape interest or public functions that are relevant to those living or working within the immediate areas. They do not necessarily rise above the predominant building height – such as the Michelin Building at Brompton Cross – but where they do, they will not tend to be more than 11/2 times the height above the context, and as such are compatible with their context. Regardless of their location, they should always be of very high design quality, but used only occasionally in new development. | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole. |
| 34.3.22  | The relatively modest and consistent height of buildings within Kensington and Chelsea reflects the primarily residential character of the Borough. High residential densities are delivered within this townscape without recourse to tall buildings. This pattern of development with its medium-rise, high-density residential areas has produced a very attractive townscape and is central to the Borough’s charm. The Borough has comparatively few tall buildings; the tallest being Trellick Tower at 98m. Tall buildings are very much the exception. Building height is thus a critical issue and a very sensitive feature of the townscape.  | The relatively modest and consistent height of buildings within Kensington and Chelsea reflects the primarily residential character of the Borough. High residential densities are delivered within this townscape without recourse to tall buildings. This pattern of development with its low to medium-rise, high-density residential areas has produced a very attractive townscape and is central to the Borough’s charm. The Borough has comparatively few tall buildings; the tallest being Trellick Tower at 98m. Tall buildings are very much the exception. Building height is thus a critical issue and a very sensitive feature of the townscape. It is important that the Council carefully manages the height of new development that may otherwise erode the Borough’s distinctive townscape character. | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole. |
| 34.3.23  | One approach to determining the appropriate location of high buildings would be to identify where they are not appropriate – such as in Conservation Areas. However, such an approach risks inferring that they are therefore appropriate anywhere else. ~~That would not be an appropriate approach because~~ Higher buildings should ~~must~~ only be located where – depending on their impact – they give meaning to the local or Borough townscape. | High buildings have a greater impact on their environment than other building types, posing problems of microclimate, overshadowing and overlooking. This is especially harmful to residential environments and amenity spaces, and needs to be avoided through careful siting and design (see Policy CL5). | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole. |
| 34.3.24  | Local landmarks define points of townscape interest or public functions that are relevant to those living or working within the immediate areas. They do not necessarily rise above the predominant building height ~~line~~ – such as the Michelin Building at Brompton Cross – but where they do, they will not tend to be more than 1½ times in height above the context, and as such are compatible with their context. | High buildings in the wrong location can be visually disruptive. For example, they can harm the character and appearance of a conservation area, the setting of a listed building or the visual amenity of important open space; or they can interrupt important views, such as the strategic view from King Henry VIII’s Mound (Richmond) to St. Paul’s Cathedral, or those identified within the Council’s Conservation Areas Proposal Statements or other adopted documents (see Policies CL1, CL3-4 and CR5). One approach to determining the appropriate location of high buildings would be to identify where they are inappropriate. However, such an approach risks inferring that they are therefore appropriate everywhere else, which is mistaken. | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole; and to respond to common ground matters with the GLA. |
| 34.3.25  | District landmarks, on the other hand, are visible over wider areas, and tend to highlight major public functions. They can rise up to 4 times their context in height. | It is not enough to ensure that their location avoids causing harm. They should also make a positive intervention in the existing townscape. This is not just a matter of design quality, but also of contributing to townscape legibility. Buildings that rise above the prevailing building height are successful where, depending on their impact, they give meaning to the local or Borough townscape, highlighting locations or activities of public importance. | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole. |
| 34.3.26 | Very tall buildings, more than 4 times their context, characterise central metropolitan areas and are thus inappropriate to this Borough. | Local landmarks are occasional features in the Borough which define points of townscape interest or public functions that are relevant to those living or working within the immediate areas. Local landmarks do not necessarily rise above the prevailing building height – for example, the Michelin Building at Brompton Cross – but where they do, they will tend not to be more than 1½ times in height above their context, and remain compatible with their context. Regardless of their location, they should always be of very high design quality and occasional features if they are to retain their meaning. | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole. |
| 34.3.27  | ~~Height is one of several factors which are important when assessing high buildings. The profile and proportions of the building where it sits above the prevailing building height are very important.~~ Height is not the only factor which is important when assessing high buildings. The profile and proportion of the building, especially the part which sits above the prevailing building height, is also a sensitive feature. Bulky tall buildings are not attractive to look at and disfigure the skyline. | District landmarks, on the other hand, are visible over wider areas, and tend to highlight major public functions. They can rise to up to 4 times their context in height. They are not characteristic of the Borough, being very occasional features in a borough of predominantly low to medium rise development. Because district landmarks are visible over a much wider area, their location and use must be of significance to the Borough as a whole; and inevitably, they will remain very occasional features. Their location and relationship to the local townscape are of the utmost importance. | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole. |
| 34.3.28  | High buildings in the wrong location can interrupt views that are important in the townscape, both those identified within the London Plan or within the Council’s Conservation Area Proposal Statements or other adopted documents. It is not enough, however, to ensure that their location avoids this. They should make a positive intervention in the existing townscape. Because district landmarks are visible over a wider area, their location must be of significance to the Borough as a whole and they will therefore be exceptional. Their location and ~~the townscape sensitivity~~ relationship to the local townscape are therefore of the utmost importance. | Care is needed to ensure that their visibility is assessed contextually to ensure that they have a wholly positive visual impact and do not appear incongruous within their surroundings. A computer generated zone of visual influence, that includes an accurate model of the relevant context, is an essential tool in assessing the visual impact of district landmarks. | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole. |
| 34.3.29  | Care is needed to ensure that their visibility is assessed ~~in the round~~ contextually to ensure that they do not appear incongruous within their context. A computer generated zone of visual influence, that includes an accurate model of the relevant context, is an essential tool in assessing the visual impact of district landmarks. | On sites where there may be scope for a district landmark, a design-led approach is essential. In such cases the Council will promote close working with the stakeholders and, where appropriate, with strategic and neighbouring authorities in the production of an urban design framework that will guide the siting and appropriate height of the building(s), particularly in relation to existing views and to ensuring a wholly positive benefit to the townscape. | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole; and to respond to common ground matters with the GLA. |
| 34.3.29a |  | Height is not the only factor which is important when assessing high buildings. District landmarks should be of an exceptional quality of architecture, sustainability and urban design. Successful tall buildings possess an architecture that is convincing and highly attractive, especially when viewed in the round, and that makes for a distinguished landmark on the skyline. This requires the skilful handling of scale, height, massing, silhouette, crown and facing materials and the careful incorporation of building services and telecommunications equipment. The profile and proportion of the building, especially the part which sits above the prevailing building height, is a sensitive feature. Bulky tall buildings are not attractive to look at and disfigure the skyline; slender ones are more successful.  | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole. |
| 34.3.29b |  | Design quality applies equally to the top, where the impact is on the skyline, as to the base. At lower levels it is not only the impact on the streetscape and local views, but also how the building functionally relates to the street. Successful high buildings are those that create a meaningful public realm, interacting positively with the surrounding buildings and spaces. It includes contributions to permeability and connectivity, defining edges that reinforce existing building lines and give a coherent form to open space, and providing active ground floor frontages and a stimulating and inclusive public realm (see Policies CR1-2). | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole. |
| 34.3.29c |  | Very tall buildings – more than 4 times their context – characterise central metropolitan areas, and are thus inappropriate to this Borough. | RBKC. Paragraph re-ordered. |
| Policy CL2(h-m) High Buildings | (h) resist a proposal that exceeds the prevailing building height within the context, except where the proposal is:i) of a slender profile and proportion; andii) not within any identified linear views; andiii) of exceptional design quality;  1. require a proposed local landmark to:
2. be compatible with the scale of its context; and
3. articulate positively a point of townscape legibility of local significance;
4. require a proposed district landmark to:

(i) articulate positively a point of townscape legibility of significance for the wider Borough and neighbouring boroughs, such as deliberately framed views and specific vistas; and(ii) provide a strategic London-wide public use;1. require an assessment of the zone of visual influence of a proposed district landmark within or visible from the Borough, to demonstrate that the building has a wholly positive visual impact on the quality and character of the Borough’s or neighbouring boroughs’ townscape when viewed from the Royal Borough;
2. resist a proposal that is of metropolitan scale;

(m) require a full planning application for ~~a proposed district landmark~~ all proposed high buildings. | h. resist ~~a~~ proposals that exceed~~s~~ the prevailing building height within the context, except where the proposal is for a local or district landmark.~~i.of a slender profile and proportion; and~~~~ii.not within any identified linear views; and~~~~iii.of exceptional design quality~~ i. require ~~a~~ proposed local landmarks to:1. be of very high design quality
2. be compatible with the scale, rhythm, mass, bulk and character of the context
3. articulate positively a point of townscape legibility of local significance.
4. require ~~a~~ proposed district landmarks to:
5. be of exceptional design quality
6. be of a slender profile and proportion
7. articulate positively a point of townscape legibility of significance for the wider Borough and neighbouring boroughs, such as deliberately framed views and specific vistas
8. provide a strategic London-wide public use
9. require an assessment of the zone of visual influence of a proposed district landmark within or visible from the Borough, to demonstrate that the building has a wholly positive visual impact on the quality and character of the Borough’s or neighbouring boroughs’ townscape when viewed from the Royal Borough. [
10. *[text moved above, bullet point no-longer required]*
11. resist ~~a~~ proposals that ~~is~~ are of ~~a~~ metropolitan scale.
12. require ~~a~~ full planning application(s) for ~~a proposed district landmark~~ all proposed high buildings that exceed the prevailing height within the context.
 | RBKC. To clarify the Council’s position on high buildings and to ensure the cohesiveness of the policy as a whole. |
| 34.3.43 | The Borough’s densehistoric pattern of development has resulted in buildings that are in close proximity to one another.. It means that amenities such as lightand privacy take on added significance. Current expectations are for better standards of light and privacy than in the past and the historic pattern of development has permitted. The Council considers that proposals for new residential and non-residential developments should ensure visual privacy and provide good conditions for daylight and sunlight taking into account the amenity conditions of the surrounding area. Inassessing the effect of new development on light conditions, the Council will, ,have regard to the guidelines in ‘Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight: a Guide to Good Practice’ publishedby the Building Research Establishment. | The Borough’sdense historic pattern of development has resulted in buildings that are in close proximity to one another It means that amenities such as light and privacy take on added significance. Current expectations are for better standards of light and privacy than in the past and the historic pattern of development has permitted. The Council considers that proposals for new residential and non-residential developments should ensure a reasonable standard of visual privacy and provide good conditions for daylight and sunlight taking into account the amenity conditions of the surrounding area. Inassessing the effect of new development on light conditions, the Council will have regard to the guidelines in ‘Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight: a Guide to Good Practice’ publishedby the Building Research Establishment. Light, including sunlight, is also important to the enjoyment of gardens and open spaces, and these will normally be included in the assessment.34.3.43aIn considering development proposals the Council will not be seeking to ensure that that they meet any particular minimum or maximum standard. Where proposals affect the light conditions in and around adjoining property, the extent to which it involves a significant and unreasonable worsening of light conditions for those properties will be assessed, taking account of the prevailing general standard of light in that local environment. The ‘good neighbourliness’ of an existing property will also be relevant. For example, some buildings are situated very close to the property boundary and would impose significant and unreasonable constraints on adjoining properties if standards were rigidly applied. 34.3.43bWith regard to privacy the Council will not be seeking to ensure that development proposals meet any particular minimum or maximum standard. Where proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, affect the privacy of adjoining property, the extent to which they involve a significant and unreasonable worsening of overlooking to those properties will be assessed, taking into account of the prevailing general standards of privacy in that local environment and the area that is affected. In the case of non-residential development, existing and proposed, it will be necessary to assess whether the proposed occupants have a reasonable expectation of a particular standard of privacy. Privacy is also important to the enjoyment of gardens and open spaces, and these will normally be included in the assessment. 34.43cWith new developments, the Council will take into account the general levels of privacy for future occupants, taking into account the general levels of privacy in the immediate area, and the character of its built form and spaces, as well as the fact that people generally look for better standards than in the past. A distance of about 18 metres between opposite habitable rooms reduces inter-visibility to a degree acceptable to most people. This distance may be reduced if windows are at an angle to each other. A lesser distance is normally acceptable where windows face the public highway.34.43d Given the densely built up nature of the Borough a certain degree of ‘sense of enclosure’ will often be experienced by occupants of a property. This can relate to both the public and private domain. There may be a point where a proposal for development would result in an increase in enclosure so that it becomes an unacceptable burden on the occupiers of adjacent property. This could occur where the amount of adjoining habitable accommodation is limited, or situated within the lower floors of buildings with openings on to lightwells. Mathematical calculation to assess daylighting and sunlighting may be inappropriate measure in these situations; on site judgment will be the best starting point for assessment..  | RBKC. Clarification to previously proposed amendment and Policy CL5. |
| Policy CL5 | AmenityThe Council will require new buildings,extensions and modifications and small scale alterations and additions, to achieve high standards of amenity.To deliver this the Council will:a. require good daylight and sunlightamenity for buildings and amenityspaces, and that the conditions ofexisting adjoining buildings and amenityspaces are not significantly reduced or,where they are already substandard, that there should be no worsening of theconditions;b. require visual privacy foroccupants of nearby buildings;c. require that there is no harmful increase in the sense of enclosure to existing buildings and spaces;d. require that there is no significant impact on the use of buildings and spaces due to increases in traffic, parking, noise, odours or vibration. | AmenityThe Council will require new buildings,extensions and modifications and small scale alterations and additions, to achieve high standards of amenity.To deliver this the Council will:a. require good daylight and sunlightamenity for buildings and amenityspaces, and that the conditions ofexisting adjoining buildings and amenityspaces are not significantly reduced or,where they are already substandard, thatthere should be no material worsening of the conditions;b. require reasonable visual privacy foroccupants of nearby buildings;c. require that there is no harmful increasein the sense of enclosure to existingbuildings and spaces;d. require that there is no significant impacton the use of buildings and spaces dueto increases in traffic, parking, noise,odours or vibration. | RBKC. Clarification to Policy CL5. |
| Policy CH2 (b) | Require new residential developments, including conversions, amalgamations, and changes of use, to be designed to meet all the following standards:1. lifetime homes;
2. floorspace and floor to ceiling heights;
3. wheelchair accessibility for a minimum of 10% of dwellings;

Where compliance with the above standards is not possible to require new residential developments to demonstrate that all reasonable measures to meet them have been taken | Require new residential developments, including conversions, amalgamations, and changes of use, to be designed to meet all the following standards:1. lifetime homes;
2. floorspace and floor to ceiling heights;
3. wheelchair accessibility for a minimum of 10% of dwellings;

Where compliance with the above standards is not possible because of other policy requirements, to require new residential developments to demonstrate that all reasonable measures to meet them have been taken | RBKC. Clarification to previously proposed amendment. |
| Policy CH2 (p) | require a viability assessment, using the GLA toolkit or an agreed alternative, to be submitted where schemes fail to provide 50% affordable housing on floorspace in excess of 800 m2 | require a viability assessment, using the GLA toolkit or an agreed alternative, to be submitted where schemes fail to provide a maximum reasonable amount of ~~50%~~ affordable housing on floorspace in excess of 800 m2 | RBKC. This allows the Council to ensure that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing is provided.  |
| Policy CA7(c) | small scale retail ~~and associated~~ uses ~~(within the~~ (A Classes of the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended)) to serve the day-to-day needs of the new development; | small scale retail and ~~associated~~ other uses within the ~~(~~A Class~~es~~ of the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended~~)~~) to serve the day-to-day needs of the new development; | RBKC. This change assumes that all retail is from the A Class, which is incorrect. |
| Chapter 37 Infrastructure | Infrastructure table |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Place** | **Not in the infrastructure table in Chapter 37 (but listed in the ‘Place’ infrastructure section)** | **Not in the ‘Place’ infrastructure section (but listed in the infrastructure table in Chapter 37**  |
| **Kensal** | * Street trees
* Public art
* Enhanced pedestrian links towards Notting Hill Gate via Portobello Road
 | * CCHP and on-site waste management facility
* Replacement of gas holders
* Additional GP premises
* Education Places
 |
| **Golborne/Trellick** | * No differences
 | * No differences
 |
| **Portobello / Notting Hill** | * Improvements to help close the gap between Portobello Road Centre and Golborne (in the table they are only ‘improvements to the area’)
 | * Enhanced pedestrian links to Notting Hill Gate and Westbourne Grove. (In the infrastructure table the enhanced pedestrian links mentioned are only to Ladbroke Grove.)
 |
| **Westway** | * No differences
 | * No differences
 |
| **Latimer** | * No differences
 | * Provision of a CCHP network
* Co-location of health premises
 |
| **Earl’s Court** | * Additional new public open space, including considering opportunities to create biodiversity
 | * CCHP network or similar
 |
| **Kensington High Street** | * Improvements to the southern end of Kensington Church Street
 | * No differences
 |
| **South Kensington** | * Expansion of medical services (the table only mentions the expansion of services: medical needs to be specified)
* Improvements to the pedestrian tunnel
 | * No differences
 |
| **Brompton Cross** | * Public realm improvements including a central sculptural feature
 | * No differences
 |
| **Knightsbridge** | * No differences
 | * No differences
 |
| **King’s Road /  Sloane Square** | * No differences
 | * New GP surgery
 |
| **Notting Hill Gate** | * Green infrastructure in the form of street trees and living roofs / walls
 | * No differences
 |
| **Fulham Road** | * No differences
 | * No differences
 |
| **Lots Road / World’s End** | * No differences
 | * Chelsea-Hackney Line Improvements
 |

 | RBKC. For clarification purposes. |
| 38.4.1 | For places we have taken the view that we should monitor the implementation of each Place Vision rather than the relevant Place Shaping Policy (policies CP~~4~~ – 17) | For places we have taken the view that we should monitor the implementation of each Place Vision rather than the relevant Place Shaping Policy (polic~~y~~ies CP~~4~~5 – ~~17~~ 18) | RBKC. For clarification purposes. |
| Monitoring section in each place | All original text deleted and replaced by the text in the following collumn | **The Vision**: The focus of monitoring for [insert name of place] must be the extent to which the Vision has, or has not, been achieved. The following output indicators will be used to monitor the Vision.[list of existing indicators for each place to be inserted]**The Priorities for Action**: a separate monitoring framework has not been established for these. Instead, cross references are made through footnotes to policies and actions elsewhere within the plan that are monitored in the framework set out in Chapter 38. **Development Management**: this policy is not separately monitored. The policy is a mechanism to ensure that those aspects of the Vision that can be controlled through development are accorded due weight – it is thus the Vision rather than the policy that should be the focus of monitoring.**Quantum of Development:** this will be monitored through Policy CP1 – additional criteria are not required.**Infrastructure:** this will be monitored through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, from which the place specific infrastructure has been drawn for inclusion in this Place chapter. Additional monitoring criteria are not therefore required.**Future plans and documents**: progress on the preparation of these documents will be recorded in the Council’s Annual Monitoring Report, published in the autumn of each year. | RBKC. For clarification purposes. |
| Glossary |  | Define business development.*Small office/business development*A B1(a)/ B Class development with a total floor area between 100 sq m and 300 sq m (GEA). This may be a development which will contain a single occupier or one which will contain a number of very small units.*Medium-sized office/business development*A B1(a)/ B Class development with a total floor area  between 300 sq m and 1,000 sq m (GEA). This may be a development which will contain a single occupier or one which will contain a number of smaller units.*Large office/business development*A B1(a)/ B Class development with a total floor area of more than 1,000 sq m. (GEA). This may be a development which will contain a single occupier or one which will contain a number of smaller units. | Following discussions with the Kensington Society the Council has made minor alterations to clarify that the Council seeks to require office developments or certain sizes to be located in particular areas, not merely the offices units themselves.A definition of business developments is therefore considered helpful. |
| 38.3 MonitoringCP1(2) | Target69,200 sq m of office floorspace | Target~~69,200~~ 60,000 sq m of office floorspace  | This takes account of the net addition of the 9,000 sq m of office floorspace which has occurred between 2004 and 2008. |
| Policy CA6(p) | a contribution to facilitate the unravelling the Earl’s Court One-Way system; | a contribution to investigate and implement measures to ~~facilitate the~~ return the Earl’s Court one-way system to two-way working ~~unravelling the Earl’s Court One-Way system~~; | RBKC amendment to reflect amendments to the Earl’s Court Strategic Site and Better Travel Choices.  |
| Proposals Map | Lots Road | Delete Lots Road from the Proposals Map | RBKC. The Council considers that Lots Road has only been included for information purposes, it should therefore not appear as an allocation in the proposals map |
| Proposals Map | Flood Zones | Add “Flood Risk Zone 2” and “Flood Zone Risk 3” to the Proposals Map Legend | RBKC. This change is requested to add clarity to the Proposals Map |
| Proposals Map | Notifiable Installations | Add Notifiable Installations point data to Kensal gas holders and add “Notifable Installations” to Legend | RBKC. This change is requested to highlight where the gas holders are situated |
| Proposals Map Inset | N/A | Add detailed map showing the Notifiable Installations and Consultation Zones | RBKC. This change is requested to add clarity to the Proposals Map |
| Proposals Map Inset p.374 | Earl’s Court Strategic Site | Amend map to correctly define the Strategic Site | RBKC requests this change in order to correctly allocate land within the Borough |
| Earl’s Court Strategic Site Allocation Map | Earl’s Court Strategic Site | Amend map to correctly define the Strategic Site to include the property at the junction of Warwick Road and the A4 | RBKC requests this change to ensure redevelopment takes every opportunity to improve the pedestrian environment at this junction. |
| Para 23.2.3 | The Council will therefore support the designation of a neighbourhood centre within the Earl’s Court Opportunity Area.  | The Council will therefore support the designation of a small-scale ~~neighbourhood~~ centre within the Earl’s Court Opportunity Area, provided that this meets the needs of the existing development without harming existing centres. | RBKC change to be consistent with amendment to Core Strategy Policy Cf1(e). |
| Policy CE1(a) | require an assessment to demonstrate that all new buildings and extensions defined as major development achieve …  | require an assessment to demonstrate that all new buildings and extensions of 800m2 or more residential development or 1,000m2 more non-residential ~~defined as major development~~ achieve … | RBKC change to reflect local threshold for affordable housing requirements. |
| Policy CE1(b) | require an assessment to demonstrate that conversions and refurbishments defined as major developmentachieve … | require an assessment to demonstrate that conversions and refurbishments of 800m2 or more residential development or 1,000m2 more non-residential ~~defined as major development~~ achieve … | RBKC change to reflect local threshold for affordable housing requirements. |