

Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area Joint Supplementary Planning Document

CONSULTATION RESPONSES SCHEDULE: DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY SCENARIOS

SPD Supporting Evidence Document: Development Capacity Scenarios

ID	First Name	Surname	Organisation Representing	Chapter comments relate to	Section comments relate to	Comment Made	Officer Response
103	Iona	Carson		Development Capacity Scenarios		From inspecting the plans there are 3 different development options for building heights. My preferred option is plan 1 over plan 2. I assume that as plan 3 states that it is 'previously published' that it is an abolished plan? The heights of the proposed buildings in plan 3 are unacceptable. I would also consider many buildings in plans 1 and 2 too height, but acknowledge an improvement. Which plan 1,2 or 3 is the one?	Change proposed. As stated clearly in paragraph 1.15 of the Development Capacity Scenarios Supporting Evidence Study, none of the illustrative masterplans that it contains presents a conclusive or final solution for the development of the OA. The sole function of these illustrations is to test the Key Objectives and Key Principles established in the SPD against the capacity of the site. Development Capacity Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 are all as 'previously published', as set out in paragraph 1.3 The Alternative Scenario is the only one that was not published in the previous draft of the SPD. This will be clarified.
131	David	Hammond	Natural England	Development Capacity Scenarios	Para 1.89	"Station Squares" as mentioned under paragraph 1.89 in this document, should seek to include provision of Green Infrastructure, soft landscaping where appropriate, linking in to the main document and green space provision.	No change necessary. The purpose of the Development Capacity Scenarios is to test the Key Objectives established in the SPD against the potential capacity of the site. This Study is not intended to offer design guidance in relation to the nature of open spaces.
415	Paul	Dumond		Development Capacity Scenarios	Para E7	<p>[bold] 1.Cluny Mews [end bold]</p> <p>There has been considerable improvement from the initial version of the SPD in relation to edge strategies which affect the Cluny Mews area. However there are still significant points regarding building heights requiring amendment to avoid ambiguity which may be exploited at a later date in any planning application.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <p>2 Graphics in the 'Development Capacity Scenarios' appendix of the document depict previous development scenarios. Scenario 3 is now referred to as 'previous published development capacity scenario 3' but the other two are still referred to as 'development capacity scenario 1' and 'development capacity scenario 2' which could lead one to infer that they are still in some way current. All three contain graphics showing building heights in Cluny Mews that are way too high and inconsistent with other parts of the SPD. For example, all three scenarios depict building height diagrams with 25m high (AGL) buildings in Cluny Mews, of 6 stories for commercial buildings, compared to the current commercial buildings and Philbeach houses of 17m. Buildings of the heights in these scenarios would not respect the existing buildings in the conservation zone and would be overly massive, overbearing, compromise privacy and daylight. They would also be out of line with the existing planning precedent in relation to Cluny Mews (see appendix below).</p> <p>These offending references can be found in the colour coded drawings on:</p>	Change proposed. All three Scenarios should have the same headings. This will be rectified. Please note that all of the illustrations in the Development Capacity Scenarios are illustrative ONLY. As stated in para 1.15 of this supporting document, "none of these illustrative Masterplans present a conclusive or final solution for the development of the OA." Their sole function is to test the Key Objectives and Key Principles established in the SPD against the capacity of the site. Therefore, the heights shown in these graphics should not be seen as representative of a proposal for the site. In terms of height, any application(s) will be assessed against the Key Principles in the Urban Form Chapter of the main body of the SPD, not against the illustrative material in the Development Capacity Scenarios Supporting Evidence document.

					<p>Page 10 of the Development Capacities scenarios section," Figure 1.5 : Illustrative acceptable building heights diagram for Development Capacity Scenario 1" (height 25m);</p> <p>Page 18 of the same document "Figure 1.10: Illustrative acceptable building heights diagram for Development Capacity Scenario 2" (height 25m); and</p> <p>Page 26 of the same document "Figure 1.15: Illustrative acceptable building heights diagram for Development Capacity Scenario 3" (height 25m).</p> <p>[Bold] All three scenarios should be referred to as [underline] previously published [end underline] development capacity scenarios (1, 2 and 3) [underline] OR [end underline] the colour coding needs to be changed in these diagrams to reflect the correct 15m building height in the Cluny Mews area to avoid any conflict with the Edges Studies document and avoid any confusion that buildings taller than the existing Victorian houses might be acceptable. [end bold]</p>	
417	Paul	Dumond		Development Capacity Scenarios	<p>[bold] 1.Cluny Mews [end bold]</p> <p>There has been considerable improvement from the initial version of the SPD in relation to edge strategies which affect the Cluny Mews area. However there are still significant points regarding building heights requiring amendment to avoid ambiguity which may be exploited at a later date in any planning application.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <p>4 The terms AGL and AOD are used along side each other in various sections of the report. There appears to be some confusion about ground levels in the OA and these references are therefore confusing. Wherever possible references to building heights on the margins of the development should be to existing (Victorian) buildings rather than AOD or AGL to avoid confusion.</p>	<p>Change proposed. There needs to be some clarification of where the terms AOD and AGL are used in the documents to ensure that the approach is consistent. However, both terms will continue to be used as they are both needed to describe different circumstances. In the Development Capacity Scenarios the term AGL is used because it describes the illustrative heights of buildings when measured from a illustrative remodelled ground level that would enable inclusive access across the whole OA. In other circumstances throughout the SPD and supporting documentation, the term AOD is more suitable so that a direct comparison between building heights can be made, regardless of where the ground level is.</p>
470	Arthur	Tait	Friends of Brompton Cemetery	Development Capacity Scenarios	<p>7. KEY OBJECTIVE Page 69 -- 'Ensure that new buildings on the edges of the OA are sensitively integrated into and enhance the existing context'.</p>	<p>No change necessary. The masterplans in the Development capacity Scenarios SPD Supporting Evidence Document are illustrative only and should not be treated as proposals for the development of the OA. No application(s) will be assessed against these illustrative masterplans. The same trees are shown in Scenario 3 as Scenarios 1 and 2. They were omitted from the Alternative Scenario because of concerns raised during the last public consultation about</p>

						7.4. We note that whereas in Scenarios 1 and 2 trees are shown between the Cemetery and the Seagrave Road buildings, which are therefore set back somewhat from the boundary, no trees are shown in Scenario 3 and the Alternative Scenario. The buildings, even at four storeys height, should be set back from the boundary.	whether tree planting alongside the railway line would be deliverable. The inclusion of these trees has no impact on the distance between the boundary and the buildings.
471	Arthur	Tait	Friends of Brompton Cemetery	Development Capacity Scenarios		7. KEY OBJECTIVE Page 69 -- 'Ensure that new buildings on the edges of the OA are sensitively integrated into and enhance the existing context'. 7.5. It is incidentally impossible to comment fully on the Alternative Scenario without seeing the proposed heights of buildings. Also in Scenario 3 it is unclear what heights of buildings are suggested.	No change necessary. As stated in paragraph 1.17 in the Development Capacity Scenarios SPD Supporting Evidence Document, the Alternative Scenario is intended as a layout test used to ensure that all of the Key Objectives could be met. It is not treated as a capacity study and therefore it was not possible to include illustrative heights. It should be noted that these drawings are illustrative only and should therefore not be treated as a proposal for the OA. Furthermore, no application(s) will be assessed against them. The heights of any application(s) will be assessed against the Key Principles in the main body of the SPD.
1999	Matthew	Gibbs	CapCo/Earl's Court and Olympia Group	Development Capacity Scenarios		The purpose of the development scenarios The development capacity scenarios included as supporting material must not be relied upon as providing a specific design solution nor should they set an overall cap or maximum limit on development land use mix and quantum. This would serve to overly and unnecessarily constrain development proposals were this to be the case and would disregard the masterplanning, design analysis and assessment work associated with the planning application stage.	Change proposed. Paragraph 1.1 in the overview of the Development Capacity Scenarios SPD Supporting Evidence document will have the following text added to it; "They do not provide specific design solutions or set an overall cap or maximum limit on development, land use mix or quantum."