

ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON & CHELSEA LOCAL PLAN PARTIAL REVIEW

RESPONSE BY KENSINGTON SOCIETY TO INSPECTOR'S MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS ON ISSUES 2A AND 2B

Matter 2 – Spatial Strategy

Issue 2a: Vision and Strategic Objectives (CV1 and CO1-7)

Q1 Has the vision for Kensington and Chelsea to 2028 as reflected in the proposed changes to CV1 and the strategic objectives CO1-CO7 been positively prepared?

Yes

Q2 Does it remain justified as the most appropriate strategy for the Royal Borough?

No: This Vision was originally drawn up in 2008 as part of the Community Strategy as a 20-year forward look. Ten years later it has been refreshed, but post Grenfell there is a need for a rethink, using active community engagement, of the community's aspirations for a more inclusive future. This will produce a far more inclusive vision.

In addition, the evolving environmental agenda and the vision in the new Draft London Plan need to be embraced.

Prime candidate for early review.

Q3 Is it in general conformity with the London Plan?

Yes, for the most part, although there are issues in the London Plan 2016 that do not yet find expression in the LPPR, partly as a matter of timing. The Draft London Plan raises new issues, identifies gaps, but more particularly the need for the Borough to fully apply London Plan policies, which appear to be seldom used in decision making.

The Local Plan may need an early review on key issues – the world is moving on.

Q4 Will it support the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with national policy?

Yes, except for the issue of meeting “objectively-assessed need” for housing, where the nature of the new stock delivered should reflect better the housing required to meet the needs of people who need to live here.

Issue 2b: Estate Regeneration (Policy CH5, Chapter 7 and Site Allocations CA2, CA5 and CA8)

Q1. What bearing does the Council's proposal to suspend estate regeneration projects in the borough have on the overall vision and spatial strategy for Kensington and Chelsea?

Since the July 2017 announcements by the Council that estate regeneration projects are on hold, the Council's Deputy Leader confirmed at the January 2018 Council meeting that these projects are '*terminated, on my watch*'. Commitments have been given that any new proposals for refurbishment of estates will be based on extensive tenant and leaseholder involvement

Q2. Is the proposal to delete Policy CH5 and Site Allocations CA2 (Barlby-Treverton), CA5 (Silchester Estates) and CA8 (Warwick Road Estate) and the whole of chapter 7 (Latimer) and address these areas of the borough in an early review of the Local Plan justified as the most appropriate strategy for the RBKC LPPR?

Yes, this is appropriate in the current context of the Borough.

Q3. Would the vision and spatial strategy remain robust, effective, in general conformity with the London Plan and consistent with national policy in enabling the delivery of sustainable development over the Plan period without these estate regeneration proposals?

The overall vision and spatial strategy should remain consistent with national and London Plan policy, provided that the Council swiftly reviews its housing trajectory in the light of a reduced target within the new London Plan and starts early work on a further Partial Review of relevant chapters of the Local Plan.

Q4. Should these changes be reflected in any further modifications to the vision in CV1? If so what changes should be considered?

As currently drafted, the vision in CV1 makes too many assumptions. A new Elizabeth Line station at Kensal should be referred to as a potential or possible new station. The term 'Conservation areas of the Future' was applied previously to estate renewal schemes which have now been halted, and in any event is an imprecise term to use in a statutory Local Plan.