

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA  
REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,  
PLANNING AND BOROUGH DEVELOPMENT**

---

**APP NO. PP/12/01833/Q06**

**Major Planning Development Committee 26/09/2012**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. STR7**

---

**SITE ADDRESS**

Land at Lancaster Green,  
bounded by Silchester  
Road to the north,  
Grenfell Road and  
Bomore Road to the  
south, Dulford Street  
and Verity Close to the  
east and the  
Hammersmith and City  
Railway Line to the  
west, including the  
existing leisure centre.

**APPLICATION**      25/05/2012  
**DATED**

**APPLICATION**      19/06/2012  
**COMPLETE**

**APPLICATION**      17/08/2012  
**REVISED**

**APPLICANT/AGENT ADDRESS**

Mr M Watterson  
Taylor Young  
Chadsworth House  
Wilmslow Road  
HANDFORTH  
Cheshire  
SK9 3HP

<b><u>LISTED</u></b>	N/A	<b><u>CONS.</u></b>	N/A	<b>WARD</b>	Notting Barns
<b><u>BUILDING</u></b>		<b><u>AREA</u></b>			

<b><u>CAPS</u></b>	No	<b><u>ENGLISH</u></b>	N/A	<b>ART '4'</b>	No
		<b><u>HERITAGE</u></b>			

<b><u>CONSULTED</u></b>	<b><u>OBJECTIONS</u></b>	<b><u>SUPPORT</u></b>	<b><u>PETITION</u></b>	<b><u>COMMENTS</u></b>
0	285	2	0	4

---

<b><u>Applicant</u></b>	Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
-------------------------	---

**PROPOSAL:** Demolition of existing leisure centre and associated sports pitch facilities to facilitate redevelopment to provide a new Leisure Centre of 9,570 sqm (within use class D2), the construction of a new Academy of 12,749 sqm (within use class D1) with associated facilities, the construction of a new residential block to provide 32 units (use class C3) with a basement car park and the provision of hard and soft landscaping across the site with up to 31 on-site and on-street car parking spaces, and 2 coach bays provided. (Major Application)

**RBK&C Drawing No(s):**PP/12/01833

**Applicant's Drawing No(s):** 1265\_PL\_0005\_01, 1265\_PL\_0002\_02, 1265\_PL\_0006\_01, 341/002\_C, 341/003\_C, 1265\_PL\_0009\_05, 1265\_PL\_0100\_02, 1265\_PL\_0101\_02, 1265\_PL\_0102\_02, 1265\_PL\_0103\_02, 1265\_PL\_0104\_02, 1265\_PL\_0105\_02, 1265\_PL\_0250\_01, 1265\_PL\_0251\_01, 1265\_PL\_0252\_01, 1265\_EL\_0253\_00, 1265\_RE\_0300\_02, 1265\_RE\_0301\_02, 1265\_RE\_0302\_02, 1265\_RE\_0310\_03, 1265\_RE\_0311\_03, 1265\_RE\_0312\_03, 1265\_RE\_0200\_02, 1265\_RE\_0201\_01, 1265\_EL\_0155\_01, 1265\_EL\_0156\_01, 1265\_EL\_0400\_02, 1265\_EL\_0402\_02, 1103\_020\_P1, 1103\_110\_P8, 1103\_111\_P9, 1103\_112\_P8, 1103\_113\_P8, 1103\_120\_P6, 1103\_130\_P7, 1103\_131\_P4, 1103\_150\_P3, 1103/151\_P3, 1103\_152\_P3, 1103\_154\_P1, 1103\_155\_P1, 1265\_PL\_5100\_02, 1265\_PL\_5110\_02, 1265\_PL\_5200\_02, 1265\_PL\_5300\_02, 1265\_PL\_5301\_06, 341/904\_C, 341/004\_C, 341/005\_A, 341/007\_B, 341/008\_A, 341/207, 341/208, 341/209, 341/021, 341/022.

---

**RECOMMENDED DECISION:**

(1) Grant Planning Permission subject to a Planning Obligation under S.106 to secure Contributions (apportioned between the residential and non-residential elements) to Health £25,600, Library Facilities £7,828.40, Play space £1,567.50, Open Space Contribution £21,213.33, Air Quality £23,600, Training Contribution £22,000, Construction Training Contribution £38,750, Monitoring Fee £4975.13, Construction Traffic Management Plan £2,800 (per plan), Travel Plan £2,000 (per plan), Transport £350,000, public access to the public domain areas, adherence to local procurement code, Provision of informal street crossings, section 278 works and a permit free agreement for the residential block.

(2) DELEGATE to the Executive Director, Planning and Borough Development the authority to issue the planning permission following completion of a S.106 Agreement.



## **CONDITIONS/REASONS FOR THE IMPOSITION OF CONDITIONS:**

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. (C001)**

*Reason - As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to avoid the accumulation of unexercised Planning Permissions. (R001)*

2. **The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on submitted plans, 1265\_PL\_0005\_01, 1265\_PL\_0002\_02, 1265\_PL\_0006\_01, 341/002\_C, 341/003\_C, 1265\_PL\_0009\_05, 1265\_PL\_0100\_02, 1265\_PL\_0101\_02, 1265\_PL\_0102\_02, 1265\_PL\_0103\_02, 1265\_PL\_0104\_02, 1265\_PL\_0105\_02, 1265\_PL\_0250\_01, 1265\_PL\_0251\_01, 1265\_PL\_0252\_01, 1265\_EL\_0253\_00, 1265\_RE\_0300\_02, 1265\_RE\_0301\_02, 1265\_RE\_0302\_02, 1265\_RE\_0310\_03, 1265\_RE\_0311\_03, 1265\_RE\_0312\_03, 1265\_RE\_0200\_02, 1265\_RE\_0201\_01, 1265\_EL\_0155\_01, 1265\_EL\_0156\_01, 1265\_EL\_0400\_02, 1265\_EL\_0402\_02, 1103\_020\_P1, 1103\_110\_P8, 1103\_111\_P9, 1103\_112\_P8, 1103\_113\_P8, 1103\_120\_P6, 1103\_130\_P7, 1103\_131\_P4, 1103\_150\_P3, 1103/151\_P3, 1103\_152\_P3, 1103\_154\_P1, 1103\_155\_P1, 1265\_PL\_5100\_02, 1265\_PL\_5110\_02, 1265\_PL\_5200\_02, 1265\_PL\_5300\_02, 1265\_PL\_5301\_06, 341/904\_C, 341/004\_C, 341/005\_A, 341/007\_B, 341/008\_A, 341/207, 341/208, 341/209, 341/021, 341/022. (C068)**

*Reason - The details are considered to be material to the acceptability of the proposals, and for safeguarding the amenity of the area. (R068)*

3. **Prior to commencement of Phase 4 (Residential Block) as identified in drawing no. 1265 RE0009\_05, full particulars of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details so approved and shall be so retained:**

**a) samples of all external materials;**

**b) sample panels of all facing materials, brickwork or stonework showing the proposed colour, texture,**

facebond, and pointing to be used on the external faces of the relevant Block provided on site and be retained on site until the work is completed;

c) details of all elevations (at Scale 1:50) including entrances to the residential block and the penthouse (top) storey;

d) samples of materials and detailed drawings (at Scale 1:50) of all fenestration, including surrounds, panelling, framing and glazing details, balustrades and balconies (including all roof terraces);

e) the treatment of all open land within the site including hard and soft landscaping, details of the car park venting with detailed drawings;

f) all proposed boundary treatments including all proposed walls, fences, or railings;

g) details of electric charging points to basement car park to be provided for 4 spaces and conversion capability for a further 3 spaces;

h) lift access to the basement;

i) details of the design of the residential car park ramp and of the traffic management measures.

*Reason - The particulars are considered to be material to the acceptability of the development and the Local Planning Authority wishes to ensure that the details of the development are satisfactory.*

4.

**Full particulars of the following in respect of Phase 1 (Academy Building) as designated by Drawing No. 1265 RE 0009\_05 of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of this phase of the development and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details so approved and shall be so retained:**

a) detailed elevational drawings at Scale 1:20 and vertical and horizontal sectional drawings at a scale of 1:20 of all windows, louvres, doors and entrances, including surrounds, panelling, framing and glazing details;

b) samples of all external materials;



**c) sample panels of all facing materials, brickwork or stonework showing the proposed colour, texture, facebond, and pointing to be used on the external faces of the relevant Block provided on site and be retained on site until the work is completed;**

**d) detailed elevational and section drawings of all proposed canopies, balustrades, barriers and gates;**

**e) details of cycle parking and cycle access arrangements;**

**f) detailed elevations and sections at scale 1:20 of proposed lightwell structure at 4<sup>th</sup> floor level;**

**g) detailed elevations and sections at scale 1:20 of proposed MUGA enclosure;**

**h) details and detailed sections of photovoltaic panels and mounting frame at scale (1:20);**

**i) detailed layouts of all external terraces.**

*Reason - The particulars hereby reserved are considered to be material to the acceptability of the development, and the Local Planning Authority wishes to ensure that the details of the development are satisfactory. (R011)*

- 5. Full particulars of the following in respect of Phase 2 (Leisure Centre Building) as designated by Drawing No. 1265 RE 0009\_05 of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of this phase of the development (save for demolition) and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details so approved and shall be so retained:**

**a) detailed elevational drawings at Scale 1:20 and vertical and horizontal sectional drawings at a scale of 1:20 of all windows, doors and entrances, including surrounds, panelling, framing, rooflights and glazing details;**

**b) samples of all external materials;**

**c) sample panels of all facing materials, brickwork or stonework showing the proposed colour, texture, facebond, and pointing to be used on the external faces of the relevant Block provided on site and be**



**retained on site until the work is completed;**

**d) detailed elevational and section drawings at Scale 1:20 of all proposed gates;**

**e) details of staff cycle parking and cycle access arrangements;**

**f) details and specification of the biodiversity (green/brown) roofs including a detailed section;**

**g) detailed elevation, plans and sections of the proposed roof plant enclosure.**

*Reason - The particulars hereby reserved are considered to be material to the acceptability of the development, and the Local Planning Authority wishes to ensure that the details of the development are satisfactory. (R011)*

6. **Full particulars of the following in respect of Phase 3 (Public Realm) as designated by Drawing No. 1265 RE 0009\_05 of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of this phase of the development and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details so approved and shall be so retained:**

**a) details and samples of all external materials including fence to Academy building;**

**b) detailed plan and sections to show the paving to north-south route and east-west route;**

**c) detailed plan and sections of proposed drainage channels;**

**d) details of cycle parking and cycle access arrangements;**

**e) detailed sections of raised seated walls at scale 1:20;**

**f) detailed plan and sections drawings at scale 1:20 of all external fitness equipment/table tennis tables/street furniture;**

**g) details of all soft landscaping;**

**h) details and location of all static and retractable bollards;**

**i) details and location of all lighting;**

**j) a landscaping and tree/shrub planting scheme including species type;**

**k) details of bird and/or bat nesting boxes / bricks;**

**i) details of all wayfinding provisions for the site.**

*Reason - The particulars hereby reserved are considered to be material to the acceptability of the development, and the Local Planning Authority wishes to ensure that the details of the development are satisfactory. (R011)*

7. **Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved (save for demolition) a Coach Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the plan shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details.**

*Reason - To ensure that any coaches/minibuses visiting the site do not have an undue impact on traffic and parking in the vicinity. (R011)*

8. **Prior to commencement of the development (save for demolition) hereby approved a Traffic Management Plan (covering school traffic and the management of the north south link) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the plan shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details.**

*Reason - To ensure that the development will not have an undue impact on traffic and parking in the vicinity. (R011)*

9. **Within 6 months of first occupation of Phase 1 (Academy) as designated by Drawing No. 1265 RE 0009\_05 of the development hereby permitted a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the plan shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details.**

*Reason - To ensure that the development will not have an undue impact on traffic and parking in the vicinity. (R011)*



10. **Within 6 months of first occupation of Phase 2 (Leisure Centre) as designated by Drawing No. 1265 RE 0009\_05 of the development hereby permitted a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the plan shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details.**

*Reason – To ensure that the development will not have an undue impact on traffic and parking in the vicinity. (R011)*

11. **Prior to commencement of Phases 1, 2 and 3 (Academy, Leisure Centre & Public Realm) as designated by Drawing No. 1265 RE 0009\_05, a Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement should include:**

- **routeing of demolition, excavation and construction vehicles;**
  - **access arrangements to the site;**
  - **the estimated number of vehicles per day/week;**
  - **details of any vehicle holding area;**
  - **details of the vehicle call up procedure;**
  - **estimates for the number and type of parking suspensions that will be required;**
  - **details of any diversion, disruption or other abnormal use of the public highway during demolition, excavation and construction works;**
  - **a strategy for coordinating the connection of services on site with any programmed work to utilities upon adjacent land;**
  - **work programme and/or timescale for each phase of the demolition, excavation and construction works; and**
  - **where works cannot be contained wholly within the site a plan should be submitted showing the**
- The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan.**

*Reason - In the interest of highway safety and to safeguard the amenity of the area and to comply with the Subterranean Development SPD and policy CT1 and CL5.*

12. **Prior to commencement of Phase 4 (Residential) as designated by Drawing No. 1265 RE 0009\_05, a Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement should include:**

- **routeing of demolition, excavation and construction vehicles;**
- **access arrangements to the site;**



- the estimated number of vehicles per day/week;
  - details of any vehicle holding area;
  - details of the vehicle call up procedure;
  - estimates for the number and type of parking suspensions that will be required;
  - details of any diversion, disruption or other abnormal use of the public highway during demolition, excavation and construction works;
  - a strategy for coordinating the connection of services on site with any programmed work to utilities upon adjacent land;
  - work programme and/or timescale for each phase of the demolition, excavation and construction works; and
  - where works cannot be contained wholly within the site a plan should be submitted showing the
- The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan.**

*Reason - In the interest of highway safety and to safeguard the amenity of the area and to comply with the Subterranean Development SPD and policy CT1 and CL5.*

13. **Prior to commencement of the development (save for demolition) full particulars of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details so approved and shall be so retained:**

**a) details of Junction layouts to Silchester Road and Grenfell Road;**

**b) road safety audits of proposed junction treatments to Silchester Road and Grenfell Road;**

**c) detailed engineering drawing of the proposed north south route including technical specifications of all materials and street furniture.**

*Reason - The particulars are considered to be material to the acceptability of the development and the Local Planning Authority in terms of traffic and safety to ensure that the details of the development are satisfactory.*

14. **No residential unit hereby approved shall be occupied until a Code for Sustainable Homes development completion certificate has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to confirm that the residential unit in question has achieved a Code for Sustainable**

**Homes rating of level 4 or higher.**

*Reason - To ensure that the development contributes to the attainment of sustainable development.*

15. **The leisure and education floorspace hereby approved shall achieve a BREEAM rating of Excellent. None of the leisure or education floorspace hereby approved shall be occupied until a design stage interim Excellent certificate has been achieved. Following the occupation of the non-residential floorspace, a post construction review certificate, certifying that a BREEAM rating of Excellent has been achieved, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within 1 year of the occupation.**

*Reason - To ensure that the development contributes to the attainment of sustainable development and to comply with policy CE1 of the Core Strategy.*

16. **Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted (save for demolition) a low emission strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The low emission strategy must calculate the total emissions and per unit/area from the existing use of the site and the new development. This shall include transport sources and all combustion plant including, boilers, energy plant and emergency generators. The strategy should detail the measures that will be taken to achieve a reduction in emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>. Where any combustion plant does not meet this emissions standard it should not be operated without the fitting of suitable NO<sub>x</sub> abatement equipment or technology as determined by a specialist to ensure comparable emissions. The development will not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the strategy so approved.**

*Reason - To comply with the requirements of the NPPF and Policy CE5 of the Core Strategy.*

17. **Prior to each phase (either phase 1, 2, 3, 4) of the development identified in drawing no. 1265 RE0009\_05 a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This should include an inventory and timetable of dust generating activities, an assessment of the cumulative impact of works taking place during other concurrent phases, emission control methods and continuous PM<sub>10</sub> air quality monitoring during**



**demolition and construction, and the plan shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details.**

*Reason - To comply with the requirements of the NPPF and Policy CE5 of the Core Strategy*

18. **All of those trees shown on drawing no. 341/904C to be retained shall be protected against damage as per Arboricultural Report of B.J Unwin dated 2/5/12 throughout the period of building and other operations pursuant to this permission, including site preparation. (C020)**

*Reason - To ensure that the trees are adequately protected and to safeguard the amenities of the area. (R020)*

19. **The Council's Principal Arboricultural Officer shall be informed 14 days before the commencement of each phase (either phase 1, 2, 3, 4) of the development as identified in drawing no. 1265 RE0009\_05, in order to verify that the tree protection measures are in place.**

*Reason - To ensure that the trees are adequately protected and to safeguard the amenities of the area. (R020)*

20. **Development shall not commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage strategy should be prepared in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Curtins Consulting (Ref: LO1023 Rev C, dated 6 August 2012). No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed.**

*Reason - the development may lead to sewage flooding; to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon our residents.*

21. **Development (save for demolition) cannot commence until an additional site investigation and a satisfactory risk assessment have been undertaken and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority relating to the conditions found on site with appropriate standards. The risk assessment shall assess the degree and nature of any contamination identified in the site investigation and assess the risk posed by any contamination to human health, controlled waters and the wider environment. This must be conducted in**



**accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.**

*Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.*

22. **Development (save for demolition) shall not commence until an appropriate remediation strategy (if required) has been devised to deal with any contamination and risks identified in the desk top study, site investigation and risk assessment reports. The strategy must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. This must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

*Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.*

23. **No part of the development (either phase 1, 2, 3, 4) as identified in drawing no. 1265 RE0009\_05 shall be occupied until an appropriate validation report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must show that all contamination that presented a risk has been dealt with and that any imported topsoil for soft landscaped areas is suitable for use.**

*Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.*

24. **Noise emitted by all building services plant and equipment installed on the Academy the Leisure Centre and the residential component of the proposed development shall be -10dBA below the existing measured lowest LA90(15min) background noise level at any time when all plant is in use, where the plant noise source has a tonal spectrum it shall**

be -15dBA. The noise emitted shall be measured or predicted at 1.0m from the façade of the nearest residential window or at 1.2m above any adjacent residential garden, terrace, balcony or patio. The plant and equipment shall be serviced regularly in accordance with manufacturer's instructions and as necessary to ensure that the requirements of the condition are maintained.

*Reason - To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring property. (R042)*

25. **The use shall not commence until a noise survey report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall show how noise emitted by the finally installed building services plant and equipment will comply with Condition 22.**

*Reason - To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring property. (R042)*

26. **The building services plant and equipment shall be supported on adequate proprietary anti-vibration mounts as necessary to prevent the structural transmission of vibration and regenerated noise, and these shall be so maintained thereafter.**

*Reason - To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring property. (R042)*

27. **Details of the facade construction, including glazing, with commensurate composite sound insulation performance predictions and resulting internal levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of the relevant phase of the development (either phase 1, 2, 4) as identified in drawing no. 1265 RE0009\_05 and shall be installed prior to occupation of the relevant part of the development and be so retained. Façade sound insulation including glazing shall be of a standard to achieve noise levels within bedrooms and living rooms of the proposed residential dwellings as recommended in Table 5 of BS 8233: 1999(revised) 'Sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings – Code of Practice'.**

*Reason - To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring property. (R042)*

28. **Prior to the occupation of the academy an acoustic report shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall show that noise levels within teaching spaces within the**



**school comply with the requirements of Building Bulletin 93.**

*Reason - To ensure the building complies with BB93 and policy CE6 of the Core Strategy. (R042)*

29. **Prior to commencement of Phase 1 (Academy) of the development as identified in drawing no. 1265 RE0009\_05, a noise assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall provide an assessment of vibration from the adjacent railway as per section 7.0 of the Council's Noise SPD (May 2009) and any mitigation required to meet the relevant standards and shall be carried out and maintained as approved.**

*Reason - To ensure the development is not impacted upon by railway vibration levels.*

30. **The use of the MUGA to the academy building (school) hereby permitted shall only be carried out between 09:00 hours and 22:00 hours, Mondays to Fridays and 09:00 hours and 20:00 hours on Saturdays, Sundays or public holidays. (C044)**

*Reason - To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring property. (R042)*

31. **Prior to the occupation of the academy building, a Community Use Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the Plan so approved .**

*Reason - To ensure the community benefits from the facilities on the site in accordance with policy CA4 of the Core Strategy and 3.18 of the London Plan.*

32. **For each applicable phase of the development (1, 2, 3, 4) as identified in drawing no. 1265 RE0009\_05, prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the development, a Servicing Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Director of Transportation and Highways. The submitted plan should include the following:**

- servicing arrangements for both the leisure centre and academy buildings;**
- a waste management plan, detailing the amount of waste storage and removal from site;**
- tracking diagrams to show how vehicles will manoeuvre for servicing for the leisure centre and academy from the north-south route.**



*Reason - To prevent obstruction of the surrounding streets and to safeguard the amenity of the area.*

33. **Other than the uses identified in the Community Use Plan, the academy hereby approved within Use Class D1 shall be used only for school (education) purposes, and for no other purpose within Class D1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, as amended. (C058)**

*Reason - The Local Planning Authority wishes to retain control over subsequent changes within use class D1 in the interests of the living conditions of residents and highway safety.*

34. **The leisure centre hereby approved within Use Class D2 shall be used only for leisure centre purposes, and for no other purpose within Class D2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, as amended. (C058)**

*Reason - The Local Planning Authority wishes to retain control over subsequent changes within use class D1 in the interests of the living conditions of residents and highway safety.*

35. **The D1 school (academy) use hereby permitted shall not be carried out between 22.30 hours and 7.00 hours the following day. (C045)**

*Reason - To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring property. (R042)*

36. **The D2 Leisure Centre use hereby permitted shall not be carried out between 22.30 hours and 6.00 hours the following day. (C045)**

*Reason - To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring property. (R042)*

37. **The proposed cafe area to the leisure centre shall be ancillary to the leisure centre and shall not be used for any other purpose than as ancillary to the D2 use.**

*Reason - To ensure that the amenity of the surrounding area is not harmed through increased traffic, parking and servicing associated with other uses.*

38. **Tables and chairs associated with the ancillary use of the academy D1 use or Leisure Centre D2 use shall not be permitted within the public realm areas without prior approval from the Local Planning Authority.**

*Reason - To ensure pedestrians have an obstruction free passage through the area.*

39. **No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.**

*Reason - The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on [REDACTED] to discuss the details of the piling method statement.*

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 The Council will anticipate an application for prior consent for the works under section 61 of The Control of Pollution Act 1974. The development shall not then be carried out other than in accordance with the approved documents.
- 2 There are large water mains adjacent to the proposed development. Thames Water will not allow any building within 5 metres of them and will require 24 hours access for maintenance purposes. Please contact Thames Water Developer Services, Contact Centre on Telephone No: [REDACTED] for further information.
- 3 Any Advertisements to be erected at the premises may require consent under the Control of Advertisement Regulations 1992. You are advised to consult the Directorate of Planning and Borough Development. (I05)
- 4 I10 Attention to Conditions
- 5 In granting this permission the Council has had regard to Planning Obligation(s) under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended. (I08)
- 6 Conditional Planning Permission is hereby granted for the development as shown on the approved drawings. Any alteration to the approved scheme, resulting from the requirements of the Building Regulations or for any other reason, may require further permission. You are advised to



consult the Department of Planning and Borough Development before work commences if this is the case. (I09)

7 I30 Demolition (Environmental Prot. Act)

8 I31 Demolition - Codes of Practice

9 I21 Building Regs. - Separate Approval

10 I63 Subterranean Development

11 I29B Noise Insulation

12 Any works/events carried out either by, or on behalf of the developer, whether they are located on, or affecting a prospectively maintainable highway, as defined under Section 87 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, or on or affecting the public highway, shall be co-ordinated under the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 and Traffic Management Act 2004 and licensed accordingly in order to secure the expeditious movement of traffic by minimising disruption to users of the highway network in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

Any such works or events commissioned by the developer and particularly those involving the connection of any utility to the site, shall be co-ordinated by them in liaison with The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea's Traffic Manager (Telephone [REDACTED]). This must take place at least one month in advance of the works and particularly to ensure that statutory undertaker connections/supplies to the site are co-ordinated to take place wherever possible at the same time. (I27A)

13 I27 Earth Moving

14 Thames Water recommends that the applicant should incorporate within their proposal, measures to protect the properties, by the installation, for example, a non return valve or other suitable device to avoid the risk of backflow at a later date on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions.

15 All basements should have suitable access and egress arrangements in the event of flooding. A cut and pump device should be installed in basements to ensure they are protected against the risk of sewer water flooding.

16 All removal of trees, hedgerows, shrubs, scrub or tall herbaceous vegetation shall be undertaken between September and February inclusive. If this is not possible then

a suitably qualified ecologist shall check the areas concerned immediately prior to the clearance works to ensure that no nesting or nest-building birds are present. If any nesting birds are present then the vegetation shall not be removed until the fledglings have left the nest.

- 17 If a work site is left dormant for two weeks or more during the demolition or construction phases, within the breeding bird season, a suitably qualified ecologist must check the site for the presence of breeding birds before works commence. Records of these checks must be maintained for inspection by the Local Authority. If breeding birds are located a suitable protection buffer zone must be established and Natural England and the Local Authority must be contacted and advice sought.
- 18 The use of diesel generators should be limited to emergency use and only for routine test purposes.
- 19 There are large water mains adjacent to the proposed development. Thames Water will not allow any building within 5 metres of them and will require 24 hours access for maintenance purposes. Please contact Thames Water Developer Services, Contact Centre on Telephone No: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for further information.
- 20 Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
- 21 I67A Construction Management



## **1.0 SITE**

- 1.1 The site is located in North Kensington within the Notting Barns Ward. The overall site is approximately 2.2 hectares. It is bound by Silchester Road to the north, Dulford Street and Walmer Road to the east and the houses within Verity Close, Bomore Road and Grenfell Road to the south and the underground viaduct to the west side of the site. For the purposes of this report, the site is split into two parts, the proposed Academy site to the west with Silchester Road to the north and the site of the existing leisure centre bound by Bomore Road, Walmer Road, Dulford Street and the properties in Verity Close to the east. The west side of the site includes the all-weather pitches, the playground, Lancaster Green and a car park. The east side of the site includes the existing Leisure Centre with 3 adjoining residential units, 28 parking spaces for the Leisure Centre staff and users.

### **1.2 Academy Site**

As existing on the west side of the site, there are 3 MUGA (Multi Use Games Area) courts that are fenced and are part of the existing leisure centre facilities and have an area of approximately 1,782 sqm. These courts front on to Silchester Road with a small set back of landscaping between at the back of the pavement. To the east of the football courts, there is a large surface car park (pay and display) which is in connection with the servicing of the existing leisure centre. This car park provides 80 pay and display car parking spaces, six disabled bays, two mini bus bays, one coach parking area, a bay for four motorcycles and two bicycle stands and is accessed from Silchester Road. On the eastern boundary of the western part of the site, there is a wall approximately 2m high which denotes the rear boundary of the properties in Verity Close. To the west boundary of the site there is a public footpath which runs south towards Bramley Road and the Latimer Road Tube station. On the boundary of the footpath is a wall approximately 2.5m in height rising to 3m from ground level. This wall marks the boundary of the site. Beyond this wall is the railway viaduct with businesses located in the archways. These are generally in use as vehicle workshops. The width of the space between the railway viaduct and the boundary wall to the site is approximately 4m.

- 1.3 Through the middle of the site there is an existing pedestrian route from Silchester Road, through the car park to Grenfell Road. There are a number of paths within the landscaping, linking the footpath from the western boundary through the site to both the adjacent residential Grenfell Tower and to the rear of the leisure centre. The landscape is generally made up of areas of undulating green space and mounds. The largest of these areas is commonly known as 'Lancaster Green,' located to the east of Grenfell Tower and to the south of the existing MUGA courts.



- 1.4 Grenfell Tower is located outside the planning application boundary to the south of the site and is a 23 storey residential tower which forms part of the Lancaster West Estate. The tower has a number of levels at its base in use as a boxing club and nursery as well as estate offices. At 1<sup>st</sup> floor level there is an existing walkway which connects to the 3 blocks to the south of Grenfell Tower, Barandon Walk, Testerton Walk and Hurstway Walk. The walkway also extends to the western boundary of the site and provides ramped access down to the footpath between Silchester Road and Bramley Road, known as Station Walk. At ground level there is a children's playground to the west of Grenfell Tower which is enclosed by railings on one side and a wall approximately 2.5m in height on its northern and western boundary. There are two existing sets of stairs leading from the walkway level of Grenfell Tower to the ground, to the west and north sides of the tower. The stair to the north of the tower is closed off but would lead directly to the playground if open. The other set of stairs to the western side of Grenfell Tower is a sweeping stair from the walkway level to ground level.

#### 1.5 **Leisure Centre Site**

The eastern side of the site is largely occupied by the existing leisure centre which has a footprint of approximately 4,650 sq.m. The entrance to the leisure centre fronts the corner of Bomore Road and Dulford Street and is set back from the street frontage with a car park providing 28 parking spaces for staff and users of the leisure centre which is also pay and display. On the south eastern corner of the site, there is a raised planter with a large London Plane tree. To the south of the car park of the leisure centre across Bomore Road is the Forland Medical Centre which is a single storey building approximately 4m in height at the back of the pavement. Moving to the east this meets the boundary wall to the rear gardens of the properties along Avondale Park Road which is approximately 2.5m in height and then the flank wall of No.44 Avondale Park Road which has no windows. Vehicular access has been blocked from Bomore Road to Avondale Park Road with a raised area of paving. Moving along the southern boundary of the site there are a number of 2 and 3 storey properties either facing the site or having the flank wall facing the site. On the north side of Bomore Road on the corner with Grenfell Road there is a large five and six storey residential block in an 'L' shaped configuration known as 'Treadgold House.' This block has an area of open space and car parking to the north of the block which bounds the leisure centre site with approximately 2.5m high railings with brick piers. There is an existing footpath from Bomore Road between the rear boundary of Treadgold House and the existing leisure centre that leads to the route through the site from Silchester Road to Grenfell Road. The residential block, Barandon Walk, is located on the western side of



Grenfell Road, set back from the street frontage by soft landscaping.

- 1.6 To the eastern boundary of the site is a 4 storey residential block fronting onto Dulford Street and Walmer Road known as Barlow House. This block is set back from the back of the pavement by approximately 5m. There is a boundary wall at the back of the pavement approximately 2m in height with private gardens before the main block. This block is of brick construction with windows and recessed balconies overlooking the main entrance and car park to the leisure centre.
- 1.7 The existing Leisure Centre ranges in height between approximately 4.8m to 10m across one and two storeys. The building is dominated by large areas accommodating the existing swimming pool and sports hall. As stated above, the entrance to the leisure centre is set back from the corner of Dulford Street and Bomore Road beyond the existing car park. The existing leisure centre provides the following facilities;
- 33m, 6 lane swimming pool
  - 15m teaching pool
  - 50 station gym
  - 6 Court multi use hall with ancillary accommodation.
  - 1 small multi use hall
  - 1 large workout studio
  - 2 squash courts
  - 3 small five a side pitches (west side of site)
- 1.8 To the north east corner of the leisure centre there is an existing street sweeper depot which has an open yard area enclosed by gates set back slightly from the face of the building. Directly adjacent to this are the Kensington Pool flats which are situated in a 3 storey block approximately 8.8m in height with windows facing north and south. This block is occupied by 3 x three bed short term/medium term accommodation for young adults who have been in the care of the local authority. Moving north there is a single storey flat roofed extension approximately 3m in height. This extension has obscured windows and doors on its north side. There is then a gap of approximately 3.4m before the flank elevation of 7 Verity Close which is 2 storey house with its gable end fronting the alley. 7 Verity Close does have a small window as existing on its southern elevation at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level facing the Pool flats. The gap between the Pool flats extension and the flank of Verity Close is as existing unused space running along the northern boundary of the leisure centre. From the main pool flats building to the flank elevation of 7 Verity Close is approximately 9m. On the Walmer Road, Dulford Street frontage there are locked double gates.
- 1.9 To the north of the leisure centre are the properties in Verity

Close. Verity Close is accessed from Dulford Street and consists of a mixture of houses and flats two storeys in height with additional accommodation at roof level. The properties are set in a cul de sac with 1-7 running north from the boundary of the leisure centre site. There is a playground against the southern boundary of Verity Close to the west of 1-7 and beyond the open space a terrace of flats 8-25 which run east to west. These properties have rear gardens with the main buildings approximately 6.4m from the boundary. From building to building behind these properties it is approximately 14m at the nearest point widening to approximately 17m at its widest point. The sports hall makes up the majority of the north elevation and the western elevation and is at its highest point is approximately 12m in height. The boundary of Verity Close onto the leisure centre site is an approximately 2m high wall, but there is extensive planting and trees along this boundary. 8 to 25 Verity Close have windows on the south elevation facing the site and on the western flank of the terrace also facing onto the site.

#### **1.10 Trees & Open Space**

There are 108 trees existing on the site of which 6 are considered to be of high quality. The most notable of these is the London Plane tree to the south eastern corner of the site in a raised planter. There is a group of 4 London Plane trees at the entrance to the car park off Silchester Road, and another in the middle of the site that are also considered to be of high quality. The remaining trees are of moderate quality and low quality. There are areas of existing dense planting and trees to the west boundary of the site and throughout the existing landscaping on "Lancaster Green" and the embankment next to Grenfell Road.

- 1.11 On the whole site as existing there is approximately 12,155 sq.m of existing public realm space. This does not include the buildings, car parks, MUGA games courts or private service areas such as the streetsweeper depot. An area of formal open space on the site has been designated and this includes the area known as 'Lancaster Green' and associated area. This area of formal open space is approximately 2089 sq.m.

#### **1.12 Topography**

The land slopes from north to south across the site. The northern part of the site is largely flat but drops approximately 2m across the southern half of the site towards Grenfell Road. The site of the existing leisure centre is largely flat.

#### **1.13 Conservation**

The site does not fall within a conservation area and there are no listed buildings in the nearby vicinity. Although the site is not



located in a conservation area, it is noted that the proposed extension of the Avondale Conservation Area is currently being consulted upon giving it some weight in the determination of the application. The extension of the conservation area would include the properties opposite Treadgold House along Treadgold Street, Grenfell Road and Bomore Road, but does not include any part of the site.

#### **1.14 Transport**

The nearest underground station to the site is Latimer Road, a few minutes' walk to the west on Bramley road. Buses run along Bramley Road and connect to the north to Ladbroke Grove. There are numerous bus routes along Ladbroke Grove which is approximately 10 minutes walk away. The site achieves a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) score of between 2 and 3.

#### **1.15 Site Specific Planning Documents**

The site is the subject of the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre Planning Brief (SPD) which was adopted by the Council on the 16<sup>th</sup> May 2011.

The SPD sets out the Council's guidance for the academy and leisure centre site, located in Notting Barns Ward in North Kensington. The SPD supplements policies contained in the Development Plan, in particular Policies CP2, CP3, CP9, CA4 and CK1 as well as Vision CV9 of the Core Strategy.

### **2.0 PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposals are for the demolition of the existing leisure centre and associated sports pitch facilities to facilitate a redevelopment to provide a new Leisure Centre of 9,570 sq.m (within use class D2), the construction of a new Academy of 12,749 sq.m (within use class D1) with associated facilities, the construction of a new residential block to provide 32 units (use class C3) with a basement car park, and the provision of hard and soft landscaping across the site with up to 35 on-site and on-street car parking spaces provided. The proposals will be explained individually in detail below.

#### **2.2 Academy**

The proposed academy building on the site would be located on the western side of the site fronting Silchester Road. The Academy would be a secondary school to accommodate 900 pupils aged 11-16 and 240 sixth formers with a specialism of entrepreneurship and the performing and creative arts, and a specialist unit for Autistic students.

- 2.3 The Academy footprint would be approximately 5,860 sq.m, with

a total floorspace of approximately 11,289.5 sq.m (GIA). The building would be 5 storeys in height including the lower ground floor level visible on the southern elevation of the building. Beginning with the northern elevation fronting Silchester Road the building will be explained in more detail. The building would be set back from the back of the pavement by approximately 2m and within this area soft landscaping is proposed. In the north west corner of the building a service yard area is proposed at ground floor level with the building above. The service area would be adjacent to the existing western boundary line of the site closing the existing footpath from Silchester Road to Bramley Road known as "Station Walk." The main frontage of the building would be approximately 91m along Silchester Road. Moving east from the proposed service area, the ground floor of the building is proposed to be constructed in masonry before changing to full height glazing to the north east corner as part of the entrance that returns on the eastern elevation. The first, second and third floors are to be clad in metal coloured façade panels. The majority of the façade is made up of the proposed cladding system with the windows and proposed vents set into the cladding creating a random appearance. The proposed louvred vents across the elevation would be pitched outwards from the external face of the building to allow air to circulate.

- 2.4 At fourth floor level the building would be set back by approximately 8m. This area is proposed to be used as a supervised terrace to the classrooms on the same level and includes a balustrade set in from the northern elevation. This provides 592 sq.m of external space. The fourth floor is proposed to be glazed and incorporates a venting stack/lightwell that allows for light and air to circulate the building. This storey would be approximately 5.5m in height including the glazed venting stack/lightwell to the building. The overall height of the building would be approximately 16.9m at its highest point not including flues. Moving east along the northern elevation the remaining 26m of frontage would be at 4 storeys on the building face with a sloped roof form from the supervised terrace area to the roof of the main entrance section.
- 2.5 The main entrance lobby section of the building would front both the northern elevation and the eastern elevation. This part of the building would be 4 storeys in height and would features full height glazing at ground floor level with a section of windows and louvre vents the same as the rest of the elevations but would have glazed curtain walling with coloured metal brise-soleil panels set at varying pitches. The surrounding panels would be the same metal coloured façade panels. This treatment continues onto the eastern elevation. The entrance lobby would be at ground floor level on this east elevation. The building would project out slightly and then continue to run south. The eastern elevation would be approximately 60m in length. Beyond the entrance



section, the building returns to the treatment of the northern elevation. In the projecting section there would be access doors to the bin stores, an emergency exit and enterprise pod which sits on the corner and would form part of the specialism of the Academy.

- 2.6 The southern elevations of the building are proposed to be clad in the same metal coloured façade panels as the northern and eastern elevation. On the southern side of the building there would be two projecting wings. These wings would enclose the proposed main play area at lower ground floor level. This would be sunken approximately 2m from the level of the public realm to the south, and would feature ramps and steps to create informal access and seating to the "amphitheatre" space. This would have an area of approximately 681 sq.m. At ground floor level to the south east corner of the building there is proposed to be a garden area that is for the specialist autism unit. In the north east corner of the courtyard area the building would project at lower ground and ground floor level and feature full height glazing. This area would be the main theatre hall space for the academy and features a terrace at ground floor level over-looking the "amphitheatre" space. The roof of this projection would provide an outdoor dining terrace at first floor level. This terrace would extend around the "amphitheatre" space and would expand again to form an informal terrace area to the south western corner of the building. The dining terrace is proposed to have a solid aluminium panel canopy with retractable sections for use in variable weather conditions. The dining terrace and terraces at ground and first floor would provide an outdoor floorspace area of 1404 sq.m.
- 2.7 The western wing of the building would provide the sports facilities for the Academy. A two storey element visible from the rear would feature the community entrance proposed for the Academy and a dance studio in a double height space. This is proposed to be constructed in masonry. The Main Sports hall building adjacent to this would be three storeys in height with masonry at ground and second floor and metal coloured panels above. On the roof of the Sports hall would be the proposed MUGA, which would be enclosed by steel mesh panels with weld mesh MUGA fencing behind it. The MUGA would be capped with two courses of the coloured metal panels used on the rest of the building. This treatment is continued on the western elevation of the sports hall with acoustic louvres set into the masonry and panelling. The MUGA and sports hall wing of the building would be approximately 11.4m in height, and the MUGA would provide approximately 594 sq.m of outdoor space.
- 2.8 The boundary wall of the site would be adjacent to the western elevation and would leave a narrow corridor which is proposed to be used for service and maintenance only and would be closed off

by the wing of the building. On the southern elevation of the MUGA there would be a staircase enclosure leading to the cycle store at lower ground floor level. This area is approximately 252 sq.m and has the capacity for 120 bicycles. The cycle store would be partially covered and enclosed by screening. This cycle store would project beyond the main sports hall wing section of the building and would extend approximately 18m from the building.

- 2.9 A fence would run along the southern boundary of the site meeting the eastern and western wings of the building securing the external space. This is proposed to be a double skin fence made up of perforated metal panels with a pattern to reflect the coloured metal cladding panels of the main Academy building. The fence is proposed to be layered with hedging either side and would vary with the change in ground levels across the site and ranges between 2.5m and 3.4m in height.
- 2.10 The southern half of the roof would largely be covered with photovoltaic panels set on frames angled to face the sun. These are proposed to the south of the main lightwell ventilation stack in the middle of the roof. There would also be two large plant enclosures and a kitchen vent extraction.
- 2.11 The Academy at its closest point would be approximately 16.4m away from the building face of Grenfell Tower. The main building would be about 43.6m away, and the corner of the MUGA at the closest point would be approximately 22m away from Grenfell Tower. The western flank of the building would be approximately 6m from the railway viaduct. On the eastern elevation the Academy building would be approximately 26m from the boundary of the properties in Verity Close with a pinch point of 16m at the corner of the eastern wing projection. On the northern elevation the Academy building would be approximately 18m away from the buildings to the north Whitchurch House and Blechynden House across Silchester Road.

## 2.12 **Leisure Centre**

The proposal involves the demolition of the existing leisure centre on the site and the redevelopment of a new leisure centre in the same eastern half of the site. The proposed leisure centre would have a footprint of 4,980 sq.m, providing approximately 9,570 sq.m of floorspace. The proposed leisure centre would be two storeys in height with each storey on average approximately 4.3m from floor to floor. The majority of the leisure centre would have a consistent height of approximately 12.5m, except for a proposed plant room set to the middle of the roof which would be 3.8m higher. Internally the proposed leisure centre building would have a basement, ground and first floor. The main sports hall would be sunken below ground level. The basement would



also accommodate the plant rooms and tanks for the swimming pools, and squash courts and changing facilities. At ground floor would be the proposed main entrances and lobby to the leisure centre together with the main swimming pool, teaching pool, leisure pool, changing facilities and ancillary café. At first floor level there would be further changing facilities, the fitness suite (gym), studios and treatment rooms and Spa. The proposed facilities to be provided are:

- 25m 8 lane swimming pool
- 20m x 10m teaching pool with mobile floor
- Leisure pool
- 250 pool spectator seats
- 8 court sports hall
- 120 station fitness suite with spin studio
- 2 studio spaces 200 sq.m and 130 sq.m
- 2 squash courts
- Health Suite
- Café (approx 80 covers) + outdoor seating terrace

2.13 The building footprint would be rectangular in shape with the south western corner removed creating an angled southern elevation. The southern elevation would front onto Bomore Road. The ground floor of the southern elevation would have glazed capped curtain walling looking down into the sunken sports hall from behind the spectator seating. At first floor level the building would step out by approximately 1.6m creating a colonnade supported by painted steel columns. The first floor would consist of aluminium curtain walling with transparent glazing and a brise soleil set 0.4m from the elevation face and would display vertical terracotta baguettes fixed to the curtain walling. This treatment would be carried around onto the western angled elevation, with sections of terracotta rainscreen cladding at ground floor level. The southern elevation would measure approximately 39m along the Bomore Road frontage.

2.14 On the western elevation the building would continue the treatment of glazing and brise soleil terracotta baguettes for approximately 30m and would also feature an escape stair access and an access to a multi-purpose space. The building would then step to the west by approximately 17m before running north west again. The stepped area would provide the main entrance to the leisure centre and would feature glazed curtain walling at both levels without the brise soleil. The entrance lobby would step to the south at ground floor level only providing an internal lobby and would feature an aluminium fascia. The entire western elevation would feature an extended canopy for the building created by setting the terracotta brise soleil 2.2m away from the main façade curtain walling and featuring a roof structure. The remaining section of the western elevation would feature the same treatment but would have a number of access points to the

café facilities and the leisure centre main foyer. There would also be an escape stair on this part of the elevation which would feature terracotta panel rainscreen cladding.

- 2.15 The north western corner of the building would be glazed at ground floor and this treatment would be continued on the south eastern elevation. The building would remain at 2 storeys for approximately 11m before stepping down to a single storey approximately 7.8m in height. The northern elevation would be located approximately 2.4m from the boundary wall with Verity Close and approximately 9m to the properties numbered 8-25 Verity Close. Just after the corner the building would step down to a flat roof with a height of approximately 5m. Moving south the building would then step back up after 4.4m of flat roof to a height of 6.8m which continues south for another 13.4m, before stepping up to the full height of the leisure centre (excluding the main plant room). The north west corner of the flat roof would feature an oval rooflight over the leisure pool. The ground floor of the northern elevation is proposed to be finished in facing brickwork with the elevations on the set back returns in terracotta rain screen cladding. The elevation is approximately 79m in length. Moving east along the elevation after approximately 46m the building would increase in height to approximately 7.6m in height. The remaining section of the elevation is set at this height but steps up after setbacks of approximately 6.6m to the south. This is the roof to the main swimming pool and proposes staggered rooflights. In the north eastern corner the building would be approximately 3m away from the flank elevation of 1 Verity Close which bounds the site.
- 2.16 The eastern elevation fronts on to Dulford Street and Walmer Road. Moving south, the elevation features the stepping of the roof to the swimming pool and would be clad in terracotta rainscreen cladding with glazed curtain walling at ground floor level allowing visibility of the swimming pool from the street. After approximately 23m the building would step out toward the street by approximately 2.2m with an escape stair tower which would be approximately 15m in height and clad in capped curtain walling. The remainder of the eastern elevation would then be facing brickwork until the corner with the southern elevation where the terracotta rain screen panels return at ground floor and glazed terracotta baguettes at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level.
- 2.17 The roof of the leisure centre would have a number of strip rooflights. There would also be a triangular shaped plant room on the middle of the roof 3.8m high that is enclosed by a profiled metal clad acoustic enclosure. There would be large areas of green roof to the southern side.
- 2.18 **Residential**



The proposed residential building would be located on the south east corner of the site, set against the eastern elevation of the proposed leisure centre. The proposed block is to provide 32 units of accommodation as follows:

8 x 3 bed apartments  
19 x 2 bed apartments  
5 x 1 bed apartments

This would be a 5 storey building with a recessed top storey and basement storey. As a result of the sewer the building would be raised up approximately 1m to allow the sewer to be accessed. The building would front both Walmer Road and Bomore Road around the existing tree.

- 2.19 The main core entrance would be adjacent to the leisure centre on the southern elevation, set back from the back of the pavement by approximately 3m. The ground floor level of the recessed section of the block is proposed to include the bin store and core lobby for the block. Moving east the block would step out towards the pavement before turning north east to avoid the London Plane tree in the south east corner of the site before turning north and running parallel with the street frontage on Walmer Road. The lobby area would give access to the rear courtyard area between the proposed leisure centre and the residential block. The block is proposed to be constructed in masonry with anodized projecting bay/balcony windows at first, second and third floors across the elevations. These bays would project approximately 0.8m from the face of the building. On the east elevation at ground floor fronting Walmer Road, the block would be set back from the back of the pavement by approximately 1m. There would be 5 entrances to ground floor units on this frontage with linear sets of steps leading to the entrance points. The remainder of the set back area would feature railings to provide defensible space. The windows at ground floor would be large paneled windows with venting. The shoulder height of the building would be approximately 17m, and the recessed top storey would take the overall height to approximately 19.8m from ground level. The top storey would be set back from the main building line by about 1m with roof terraces proposed at roof level on the Walmer Road and Bomore Road frontage. The top storey would use a glazed cladding system incorporating sliding doors and vents. The main frame of the building is proposed to be constructed in a bronze metal finish.
- 2.20 All flats would have access from the rear, with external corridors at all levels featuring glazed balustrades alternating with mesh screens. The rear elevation is proposed to be rendered. There would be two lifts located in the courtyard and a stair tower. The remainder of the courtyard is proposed to incorporate a small amount of landscaping and vents to the basement car park below.

The basement storey is proposed to include 16 car parking spaces (including 2 disabled bays), 56 cycle parking spaces and 3 motorcycle spaces. The basement would be accessed from within the block by one of the main core lifts. The vehicular entrance would be to the north of the block at the corner of Walmer Road and Dulford Street and adjacent to the flank elevation of the leisure centre swimming pool elevation. The northern elevation of the block would feature a single window at each level.

- 2.21 The distance from the face of the residential block to the boundary wall with Barlow House would be approximately 14.5m, and from the face of the proposed residential block to the face of Barlow House, approximately 20m.

2.22 **Public realm**

The proposal is to establish 2 major through routes across the site, a north-south connection linking Silchester Road with Grenfell Road, and an east-west pathway between Station Approach and Bomore Road. The north-south link is proposed to be a shared or single surface space that accommodates both pedestrian and vehicular traffic (disabled parking, servicing and coach drop off only). It is proposed that for vehicular traffic, the route would be controlled through the use of retractable bollards located outside the Academy and at the junction with Grenfell Road and be one way running north to south. To the northern section of this link to the east of the Academy an open paved area is proposed in adoptable paving. This area is approximately 16m wide between the north eastern corner of the academy and the 3m wide planting strip running along the boundary with Verity Close. The open space would widen gradually, its widest point being approximately 24m. The main entrance to the school would open onto this space. Two existing trees would be retained next to the Academy. Adjacent to the planting strip along the boundary there would be 7 disabled parking spaces running south for users of the proposed Academy and leisure centre. These would be demarcated using drainage channels running adjacent to the planting strip set away by approximately 3.8m. An area for vehicles travelling through the site is also proposed to be demarcated with another drainage channel set approximately 5m. Concrete seating plinths are proposed just south of the entrance to the Academy.

- 2.23 The surface treatment would continue south and would link to Grenfell Road with lines of bollards proposed adjacent to the academy and to the junction with Grenfell Road. On the west side of the site a number of changes are proposed. The existing area of open space between the north-south link and Grenfell Tower is to be re-landscaped but would remain open space. The main route east-west would be treated in a similar material to the



north-south route and this treatment would continue to the boundary of the site and would join on to "Station Walk." Areas of green space are proposed to have concrete seating walls at low level on the perimeters. The existing wall around the playground to the west of Grenfell Tower is to be removed and landscaping and railings approximately 1.8m high are proposed in its place. The existing fire escape stair from the north side of Grenfell Tower and the sweeping stairway from the platform level to the west of the tower are to be removed as part of the landscaping works.

- 2.24 On the eastern side of the site landscaping improvements are proposed adjacent to Grenfell Road and to the north of Treadgold House to provide a useable green space to the west of the entrance to the leisure centre. A footpath is also proposed to run from Grenfell Road to the main east-west footpath area. An area of covered bicycle parking and landscaping is proposed on the northern boundary of Treadgold House to accommodate 30 Sheffield stands.
- 2.25 Two substations are proposed across the site. The substation of the Academy is proposed to be located to the south west corner of the Academy attached to the proposed bicycle store area. The substation for the leisure centre is proposed against the boundary of Verity Close to the north of the leisure centre service entrance as part of the landscaping.
- 2.26 78 trees are proposed to be removed from the site (120 existing) and 42 retained. As part of the landscape proposals 86 trees are proposed to be planted (128 total trees). All of the category A trees on the site are proposed to be retained. It is also proposed to plant approximately 147 smaller fruit trees across the site.

## 2.27 **Parking**

The application proposes 7 disabled parking bays on the north-south link for use by the Academy and Leisure Centre and 28 on street parking spaces are proposed on Dulford and Bomore Road. There would be 2 coach bays on Silchester Road to the north of the academy. These coach bays would displace 5 existing Borough residents parking bays which are proposed to be replaced on Silchester Road at various points. Overall there would be a loss of 83 spaces across the site. A drop off point is also proposed on Bomore Road for the leisure centre.

## 2.28 **Summary Proposed Floorspace Schedule**

Academy footprint	4192 sq.m
Academy floorspace	11289.5 sq.m
MUGA	594 sq.m
Leisure Centre footprint	5675 sq.m
Leisure Centre floorspace	9570 sq.m

Residential Footprint	799 sq.m
Residential Floorspace	3735 sq.m

## 2.29 Planning Obligations – Unilateral Undertaking

In accordance with policy C1 of the Core Strategy and policy 8.2 of the London Plan, the applicant has submitted a unilateral undertaking for the development. The heads of terms are to secure the following and are to be split between the residential block and the academy and leisure centre:

Health Contributions	£25,600
Contributions to Library Facilities	£7,828.40
Open Space Contribution	£21,213.33
Play Space Contribution	£1,567.50
Air Quality Contribution	£23,600
Training Contribution	£22,000
Construction Training Contribution	£38,750
Monitoring Fee	£4975.13
TFL Contribution	£350,000
CTMP Assessment	£2,800 per plan
Travel Plan	£1,000 per plan
Section 278 works to the highway	

Permit Free residential units.

- Informal crossings to be provided on all arms of a modified Bomore Road/ Walmer Road junction.
- An informal crossing of Bomore Road to be provided to link the east west route with Avondale Park Road.
- Vehicular crossover at corner of Dulford Street and Walmer Road.

## 2.30 **CIL**

The applicant has been advised that the scheme is CIL liable and has been made aware of the liability to pay the Mayor's CIL which has been in operation since April 2012. Mayoral CIL on developments in the Royal Borough is charged at £50 per square metre (GIA) on net additional floorspace. It excludes education and health uses, and is also net of floorspace reprovided, unless that floorspace was vacant for 6 of the preceding 12 months. The total CIL payment has been calculated at £172,950.

## 3.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 The original application for the erection of a swimming pool complex was approved in February 1970.



- 3.2 An application for listed building consent TP/75/0397 was refused in February 1977 for the demolition of the Silchester Road Baths building which previously occupied the Academy site. This was subsequently allowed at appeal in October 1980.
- 3.3 Following this an application for planning permission TP/83/01397 and listed building consent TP/83/01398 was submitted for the part demolition, alteration and extension of existing baths building to provide a dry sport leisure centre with parking for 3 coaches and 46 cars. These applications were approved in January and February 1984.
- 3.4 Again this was followed by another application for planning permission TP/84/01291 and listed building consent TP/84/01292 for the demolition of the old Silchester Baths and the development of a new dry sports/community centre linked to the rear of Kensington new pools, and development of a replacement outdoor 5-a-side football pitch, games court and additional parking. These applications were approved in November and December 1984.
- 3.5 In 1985 planning permission was sought under application TP/85/0213 for the erection of a leisure centre extension comprising sports halls, three squash courts and a club room, with associated alterations. This was approved in March 1985.
- 3.6 Outline planning permission was sought under TP/97/02723 for the construction of a two storey infill addition and replacement front reception lobby. This was approved in March 1998. This was followed by application PP/99/02277 for the construction of a two storey infill extension and replacement front reception lobby in February 2000.
- 3.7 As part of the proposed scheme an application was submitted under PP/12/02110 for the change of use of the former car park to street sweeper's depot, including a new entrance off Clarendon Road, the replacement of existing louvres and new steps. This proposal sought to reprovide the existing depot facilities provided on the leisure centre site within the vicinity and was approved in August 2012.

#### **4.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 4.1 The issues in the case are considered to be:
- 4.1.1 The principle of a new secondary school in light of current planning policies.
- 4.1.2 The principle of a new leisure centre in light of current planning policies.

- 4.1.3 The principle of a 32 residential units on the site and their requirements in light of current planning policies
- 4.1.4 The impact of the design of the new school, leisure centre and residential block on the character and appearance of the local area.
- 4.1.5 The impact of the proposal in terms of sustainability and climate change.
- 4.1.6 The accessibility of the development and uses.
- 4.1.7 The impact on the local environment on air quality, land contamination and biodiversity.
- 4.1.8 The impact on traffic, parking, pedestrian safety and servicing as a result of the development.
- 4.1.9 The effect the proposed works would have on the living conditions of nearby residents, including privacy, light, sense of enclosure and noise and disturbance.
- 4.2 The Core Strategy as adopted on the 8<sup>th</sup> December 2010 contains planning policies which have succeeded the majority of those in the Unitary Development Plan, and with the London Plan adopted July 2011 will form the primary planning policy framework through which development in the Royal Borough will be managed over the forthcoming decade.
- 4.3 The relevant policies against which to assess this proposal are contained within the Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework, as well as certain policies 'saved' from the Unitary Development Plan 2002 (as amended 28<sup>th</sup> September 2007).

The relevant Core Strategy policies are:

CV1 (Vision of the Royal Borough)  
 CO1 (Keeping Life Local)  
 CO2 (Fostering Vitality)  
 CO3 (Better Travel Choices)  
 CO4 (Engaging Public Realm)  
 CO5 (Renewing the Legacy)  
 CO6 (Diversity of Housing)  
 CO7 (Respecting Environmental Limits)  
 CV9 (Vision Latimer in 2028)  
 CP2 (North Kensington)  
 CP3 (Places)  
 CP9 (Latimer)  
 CA4 (Kensington Leisure Centre)  
 C1 (Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations)



- CK1 (Social and Community Uses)
- CT1 (Improving alternatives to car use)
- CR1 (Street Network)
- CR2 (Three-dimensional Street Form)
- CR3 (Street and Outdoor Life)
- CR4 (Streetscape)
- CR5 (Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways)
- CR6 (Trees and landscape)
- CR7 (Servicing)
- CL1 (Context and Character)
- CL2 (New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications)
- CL5 (Amenity)
- CH1 (Housing Targets)
- CH2 (Housing Diversity)
- CH3 (Protection of Residential Uses)
- CE1 (Climate Change)
- CE2 (Flooding)
- CE3 (Waste)
- CE4 (Biodiversity)
- CE5 (Air Quality)
- CE6 (Noise and Vibration)

The relevant 'saved' UDP policies are:

- CD26 (Improvement of land and buildings)
- H17 (Resist the loss of small self contained flats)
- TR20 (Resist the loss of off –street coach parking)
- TR21 (To support restrictions on coach movements in areas)
- TR32 (Pay and display off-street parking)
- TR44 (Loss of on-street residents' parking)
- SC7 (Education sites)
- SC8 (Shared community facilities/education facilities)
- LR4 (Multiple and/or shared use sports provision)
- PU3 (Land contamination)

4.4 Also for consideration is 'The London Plan' 2011. The relevant London Plan policies are:

- 2.18 (Green Infrastructure)
- 3.1 (Ensuring Equal Life Chances for All)
- 3.2 (Improving Health and Addressing Health Inequalities)
- 3.3 (Increased Housing supply)
- 3.4 (Optimising Housing Potential)
- 3.5 (Quality and Design of Housing Developments)
- 3.6 (Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation)
- 3.8 (Housing Choice)
- 3.12 (Negotiating Affordable Housing)
- 3.13 (Affordable Housing Thresholds)
- 3.14 (Existing Housing Stock)
- 3.17 (Health and Social Care Facilities)
- 3.18 (Education Facilities)

- 3.19 (Sports Facilities)
- 4.12 (Improving Opportunities for all)
- 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions)
- 5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction)
- 5.6 (Decentralised Energy in Development Proposals)
- 5.7 (Renewable Energy)
- 5.9 (Overheating and Cooling)
- 5.10 (Urban Greening)
- 5.11 (Green Roofs and Development Site Environs)
- 5.12 (Flood Risk Management)
- 5.13 (Sustainable Drainage)
- 5.17 (Waste Capacity)
- 5.18 (Construction, Excavation and Demolition Waste)
- 5.21 (Contaminated Land)
- 6.1 (Strategic Approach)
- 6.2 (Providing Public Transport Capacity)
- 6.3 (Assessing the Effects of Development on Transport Capacity)
- 6.9 (Cycling)
- 6.10 (Walking)
- 6.13 (Parking)
- 7.1 (Building London's Neighbourhoods and Communities)
- 7.2 (An Inclusive Environment)
- 7.3 (Designing Out Crime)
- 7.4 (Local Character)
- 7.5 (Public Realm)
- 7.6 (Architecture)
- 7.14 (Improving Air Quality)
- 7.15 (Reducing Noise and Enhancing Soundscapes)
- 7.18 (Protecting Local Open Space)\*
- 7.19 (Biodiversity and Access to Nature)
- 7.21 (Trees)
- 8.2 (Planning Obligations)

The following guidance documents have also been given weight, as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Interim London Housing Design Guide (August 2010, MOL)

### National Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework has also been taken into account. The relevant paragraphs are listed here below:

- 14 (presumption in favour of sustainable development)
- 17 (Core Planning Principles)
- 32 (Transport)
- 35 (Sustainable Transport Modes)
- 39 (Parking Standards)
- 47 (Delivering high quality homes)
- 50 (Deliver a wide choice of high quality homes)
- 56 (Requiring Good Design)



57 (High Quality and Inclusive design for all)  
 58 (Quality of development)  
 61 (Integration of new development)  
 65 (Buildings which promote high levels of sustainability)  
 69 (Healthy, inclusive communities)  
 70 (To deliver social, recreational and cultural facilities)  
 72 (Sufficient choice of School Places)  
 73 (Access to high quality open spaces)  
 74 (Existing open space)  
 75 (Protect and enhance public rights of way)  
 93 (Reductions in greenhouse gas emissions)  
 94 (Mitigate and adapt to climate change)  
 95 (Low carbon future)  
 96 (decentralised energy supply)  
 97 (Renewable and low carbon energy)  
 100 (Flood risk)  
 101 (Flood risk site specific sequential test)  
 109 (Contribute and enhance the natural and local environment)  
 110 (Minimise pollution)  
 114 (Biodiversity and green infrastructure)  
 118 (Biodiversity)  
 121 (Land contamination)  
 123 (Noise and impacts from development)  
 124 (Air Quality)

#### Supplementary Planning Guidance

Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre SPD  
 Transport SPD  
 Air Quality SPD  
 Noise SPD  
 Access SPD  
 Planning Obligations (Section 106) SPD  
 Trees and Development SPD  
 Designing out Crime SPD

## 4.5 **Site Allocation**

Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy states that the Council will ensure opportunities for change in North Kensington deliver the widest possible regeneration benefits commensurate with the scale of development. This policy links into policies CV9 and CP9 which the spatial polices for the Latimer area specifically and the site allocation and designation for the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre within policy CA4 which is detailed below in full:

The Council will require development on the site to deliver, in terms of: -

#### **Land use allocation:**

**a.** a new academy with a minimum gross internal floor area of 10,000sq.m, including its own internal sports facilities to deliver the national curriculum but excluding external sports pitches;

- b.** a refurbished or relocated sports centre on site, with equivalent sports facilities to the existing centre, including a swimming pool and other facilities identified through a demand assessment, built in a way that is flexible for the future;
- c.** open space in the form of external sports facilities for the school, which should be shared with the sports centre;
- d.** a Combined Cooling, Heating and Power (CCHP) plant or similar, of a suitable size to serve the site with the potential to contribute to the heat and energy demand of the wider community as part of a district heat and energy network;

**Principles:**

- e.** green turf, planting and landscaping at the external sports facilities to contribute to the visual amenity of the surrounding properties;
- f.** improvements to the legibility and permeability of the street network in the area, through a new road connecting Grenfell Road and Lancaster Road;

**Infrastructure and Planning Obligations:**

- g.** improved public transport infrastructure;
- h.** other contributions as identified in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and site specific Supplementary Planning Documents.

The land designation for a new Academy and Leisure Centre on the proposed site is therefore part of the policy framework of the borough and has been adopted following an examination in public and the document was found sound. In land use terms it is therefore acceptable for an Academy to be located in this location. This policy is further supported by the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre Planning Brief (SPD) which was adopted by the Council on the 16<sup>th</sup> May 2011.

#### 4.6 **Principle of Academy**

There is an established need to provide a co-educational, nondenominational school in the north of the borough. In accordance with policy CA4 above the Academy is required to have a floorspace of 10,000 sq.m (Gross Internal Area). The floorspace of the proposed academy is approximately 11,289.35 sq.m across 5 floors. The Academy also proposes its own internal sports facilities provided in a sports hall on the west side of the proposal. Therefore this is considered to comply with policies CA4(a) and CK1 of the Core Strategy, 'saved' policy SC7 of the UDP and policy 3.18 of the London Plan. There is the provision for a MUGA pitch on the roof of the proposed sports hall to the western wing of the building. This has an area of 594 sq.m. There are a number of facilities within the academy that are proposed to be for community use at certain times. These are: a business area with entrepreneurship pods, supported by a



dedicated team, a sports hall and sports facilities including a Multi Use Games Area; a dance studio and changing facilities, theatre and performing arts area; a TV and sound studio and learning resources centres and ICT facilities. The provision of open space in the form of the external MUGA for the academy, whilst not directly shared with the leisure centre does provide additional facilities external to the academy in accordance with policy CA4(c). This provision is supported further by the other facilities that will be available for community use supported by the planning brief paragraphs 23.2.3 and part of objective 3 in 4.2.1 and 'saved' policies SC7, SC8 and LR4 of the UDP and 3.17, 3.18 and 4.12(E) of the London Plan.

#### **4.7 Replacement Leisure Centre**

The proposal includes the demolition of the existing leisure centre and a replacement leisure centre built on the same part of the site. The proposal includes equivalent and improved facilities from the existing leisure centre including a new swimming pool, training pool, leisure pool and other facilities as described in the proposal section of the report. The proposed leisure centre is supported by the site specific policy CA4(b) in the Core Strategy and CK1 of the CS, 'saved' policies SC8 and LR4 of the UDP and policy 3.19 of the London Plan.

#### **4.8 Principle of Residential**

The proposal also includes a new residential block providing 32 homes on the site. The site specific policy makes no requirement for housing to be on the site, but the SPD does state that there may be an opportunity for additional housing to be built on the site provided this does not compromise the other objectives of the brief. The principle of the residential units on site is acceptable and is in accordance with policy CH1 of the CS.

#### **4.9 Housing Mix**

The residential block proposed provides 32 dwellings across the following mix:

8 x 1 bed units  
19 x 2 bed units  
5 x 3 bed units

Policies CH1 and CH2 of the CS and policy 3.8 of the London Plan are relevant. Policy CH2 states that the Council will a. require new residential developments to include a mix of types, tenures and sizes of homes to reflect the varying needs of the Borough, taking into account the characteristics of the site, and current evidence in relation to housing need.

- 4.10 The Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) (SHMA) states that for private housing demand is 20% one and two bed units and 80% larger three and four bedroom dwellings and this is supported by paragraph 35.3.10 of the CS; however it does state in paragraph 35.3.11 that it would be unrealistic to expect all housing schemes to comprise dwellings built to these exact ratios and that the characteristics of the site should be taken into consideration. The proposal provides 84% of one and two bed properties and 16% of three beds. The applicants have submitted a Housing Needs Assessment (Rev.A, Taylor Young, August 2012) with the application to demonstrate the need. Whilst the proposed unit mix is not in accordance with the SHMA, the proposed mix is appropriate for the area, taking into account the characteristics of the site including the size of site, the ability of the site to provide amenity space for larger units, the saleability of large units in this area, the housing need, and the purpose of the housing to cross subsidise the leisure centre. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policy CH2(a).
- 4.11 The units have been designed to meet the criteria set out in lifetime homes providing level access to all units, parking with disabled parking. The proposed block is therefore in accordance with policy CH2(b)(i). The proposed floor to ceiling heights for all the units is 2.5m in accordance with the London Housing Design Guide (Interim Edition, August 2010)(LHDG). The one bed units proposed are all above 50 sq.m in floorspace, the two beds are 70 sq.m or above and the 3 bed units are 86 sq.m or above. These are in accordance with the space standards set out in the London Plan, the Interim London Housing Design Guide LHDG and the Access SPD and therefore are in accordance with policy CH2(b)(ii). The proposed residential block includes over 10% of larger units that can be adapted for Wheelchair use. The block provides level access and lifts to all floors. 12 of the two bed units provide the floorspace set out in the Access SPD and therefore the proposal complies with policy CH2(b)(iii).
- 4.12 In accordance with the LHDG and policy CH2(h) of the CS the proposed residential units provide outdoor amenity space in the form of balconies at first to third floor level and roof terraces at fourth floor level. The ground floor flats do not provide private outdoor amenity space, but the courtyard area provides some amenity space to these flats. In addition there is open space within the leisure centre and academy site and Avondale Park is in the close vicinity. The units are therefore considered to comply with policy CH2(h) of the CS and the LHDG. In summary the residential units are considered to comply with policies CH1 and CH2 of the CS and policies 3.4, 3.5 and 3.8 of the London Plan and guidance in the LHDG and the Access SPD.
- 4.13 **Residential Block – Affordable Housing**



The residential block is proposed to provide 32 units of accommodation over a floorspace of 3459 sq.m (GEA). Policy CH2 states that the Council will require developments to provide affordable housing at 50% by floor area on residential floorspace in excess of 800sq.m gross external area. This policy is supported by policy 3.12 and 3.13 of the London Plan in relation to affordable housing.

- 4.14 As the proposed development is 3735 sq.m (GEA) it is over the 1,200 sq.m affordable housing threshold that requires on site provision in accordance with CH2(k). The proposal as submitted, includes no affordable housing and therefore a viability assessment has been required to demonstrate that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing has been provided. The applicants have submitted a Viability Assessment (prepared by Drivers Jonas Deloitte, August 2012). This has been independently assessed on behalf of the Council and concludes that no affordable housing can be provided as the money from the private sale of the units estimated at £7.8 million is to cross subsidise the development of the leisure centre. The report therefore has concluded that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing has been provided in accordance with policy CH2 of the CS and policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the London Plan, and paragraph 5.6.3 of the SPD

#### 4.15 **Loss of Housing**

As part of the redevelopment of the leisure centre the three existing social housing 3 bed units for short-medium term accommodation are to be removed and not reprovided. Policy CH3 of the CS and 'saved' policy H17 of the UDP are relevant in this case. Policy CH3 states that the Council will ensure a net increase in residential accommodation. To deliver this the Council will resist the net loss of both social rented and intermediate affordable housing floorspace and units throughout the Borough. The applicants have submitted a housing needs assessment which has been reviewed by the Director of Family and Children's Services. There is no objection to the loss of these units as the model of care does not reflect the needs of the users and does not deliver a wholly successful transition to independent living for the occupants. The department of Family and Children's Services have no plans to re-provide similar accommodation. These units are therefore considered surplus to requirements and there is no need for their re-provision. 'Saved' policy H17 of the UDP resists the loss of existing, small, self-contained flats of one or two habitable rooms. In this case the flats are larger than this and are also of poor quality. The loss is in accordance with this policy. The loss of the three units is therefore considered to be acceptable in this case in accordance with policy CH3 of the CS, 'saved' policy H17 of the UDP and policy 3.14 of the London Plan.

#### 4.16 **Design Considerations – Academy**

The location of the proposed academy to the west of the site meets the aspirations of the SPD and should minimise future disruption for existing residents by keeping footfall primarily to Lancaster Road which joins with Ladbroke Grove some 300m north of the site. The overall development is designed to be read as a series of inter-related buildings, bonded by an intricate network of public spaces, both hard and soft landscaped. The layout would succeed in creating a new civic quarter for North Kensington. The academy has been arranged in a ribbon formation; designed to maximise the available space whilst minimising the impact on the surrounding townscape. The result of this would be a relatively slender building which would wrap the northern and western perimeter of the site and create a sunken playspace in the central courtyard. The main entrance to the School will be on the eastern elevation, via a new connection designed to be capable of use by vehicles and pedestrians. This new connection would link Lancaster Road/Silchester Road to Grenfell Road and would improve permeability.

4.17 The proposed academy would also provide an additional entrance to the school on the southern elevation. This access would double as the community entrance for the public to allow for certain facilities such as the roof-top MUGA to be accessed outside of school hours.

4.18 The academy building would have an outward looking aspect that would seek to engage with the wider area. The use of glass is notable on both buildings and would help to provide views into the buildings from outside. This is manifested in the form of enterprise pods in the school, in line with the Academy's specialism in entrepreneurship. An enterprise pod would be used as landmarking on the ground floor of the southeast corner of the school, overlooking the open space. This would be successful in both adding legibility and promoting active edges.

4.19 The main school cycling park would be located at the south west corner of the building with access into the school via an internal entrance within the bike shed. By positioning an entrance in this location, the amount of unnecessary footfall travelling between the bike shed and the main entrance should be reduced.

#### 4.20 **Academy Height and Bulk**

There is no clear and consistent building height in this area, which is characterised by post-war housing estates landmarked by tower blocks. The academy has been designed sympathetically to maximise the use of the available land whilst minimising the impact on the wider area. The school would be five storeys in



height plus basement level visible from the rear, with a maximum height 16.6m (11.2m to third floor level). This is considered to be acceptable in keeping with guidance in the planning brief paragraphs 5.1.8 and 5.5.3. The set-back at fourth floor level is taller than other storeys (5.3m in height) to maximise solar gain. The set-back is supported as it makes for a more comfortable streetscene on Lancaster Road. The southern elevation would feature a series of terraces at ground and first floor level to add to the volume of usable space by using the massing of the building to create usable pockets of open space. The academy's sports hall would be a large bulky element; however, it would be positioned along the western elevation parallel to the railway line and sunk to lower ground floor level to minimise its visual impact. This response is supported as it ensures that the building's ribbon design is not interrupted. The height and bulk of the proposed academy is overall considered to be acceptable, as it would sit comfortably within the streetscape and is of a scale that would not dominate the surrounding buildings. This is considered to be in accordance with the planning brief and policies CL1 and CR2 of the CS and policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

#### **4.21 Academy Design and Architecture**

The design and architecture of the scheme is assessed against policies CL1 and CL2 of the CS and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan as well as the planning brief for the site. Policy CL1 states that the Council will require all development to respect the existing context, character, and appearance, taking opportunities available to improve the quality and character of buildings and the area and the way it functions, including being inclusive for all. This is further supported by policy CL2 which states that the Council will require new buildings to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, taking opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings and the area and the way it functions.

- 4.22 The academy is designed as a layered series of ribbons. For this reason, a strong horizontal emphasis has been sought and has been achieved successfully in the facade treatment. The way in which this layering has been proposed results in a firm masonry base, constructed using reconstituted stone, supporting three storeys of a powder-coated metal cladding system in a number of shades in rectangular panels and a plate glass curtain wall on the top floor set back. One of the key characteristics of the academy building would be the use of ventilation grilles as part of the facade treatment. These have been designed to project a half-metre from the face of the building and are discretely covered by aluminium louvres. The grilles have been positioned below the and in some cases within the fenestration and correlate directly to the function of the inside space. This has resulted in an almost random series of projections which create a dynamic,

almost ephemeral quality to the facade which adds texture.

- 4.23 The entrance lobby for the main school building would be a glazed space incorporating the enterprise pods and reception area. On the upper floors, a louvre detail has been added to be primarily a decorative feature. The entrance itself is somewhat understated and may eventually be embellished with window decals, signage and lighting. The enterprise pods in the main lobby, whilst internal features, would be highly visible from the outside and would make up a key part of the building's visual interest and legibility.
- 4.24 The community entrance to the school would be positioned on the south side of the building next to the sports hall. This entrance would feature a panelled perforated metal wall with sliding doors. Securing a good design for this entrance is important as it will become a focal point for local residents using the school's out-of-hours activities. The principle of a separate community entrance and indeed, the use of panelled walls is supported but this entrance has not been fully considered at this stage and requires further detail. A condition is recommended to ensure that this entrance works with the architecture of the building to ensure that the entrance is legible, attractive and does not detract from either the surrounding public realm or the school building itself. Entrances on the school's eastern and south eastern elevations are primarily outward-opening. These will effectively open into a public footpath and will not be acceptable in any circumstances. As such, a condition is recommended to secure the details of all openings on the academy (Condition 4).
- 4.25 Terraces and roof spaces have been appropriately designed into the scheme and these have the potential to be interesting spaces for users of the school. In many cases, most notably, next to the dining area, the outdoor space would be covered by a large canopy with solid aluminium panels and projecting canopy sections. To ensure that this space, together with the other terraces enhance the building as much as possible, a condition is recommended requiring full details of the layout and materials of these spaces and their boundary fencing (Condition 4).
- 4.26 The single largest usable roof space in the school would be the rooftop MUGA on the western wing of the building. The appearance of this space looks to incorporate the panelled design of the main facade and replaces glazing in the main building for an architectural mesh. The MUGA is an important part of the academy as it needs to be sympathetic in design terms to the main building but provide functionality to its use. The proposed design is appropriate in the scheme but further details are required in terms of the materials to be used for the mesh fencing to ensure that this does not affect the appearance of the building or result in undue noise or light pollution which will be considered



separately. A condition is therefore recommended to request details and material samples to be submitted (Condition 4).

- 4.27 The boundary treatment to the north of the academy would be formed of a 3m wide area herbaceous shrubbery acting as defensible space for the school. This approach is supported as it will add provides a reasonable set back and defensible space from the back of the pavement whilst still retaining good visual links with the street. A more traditional boundary fence is proposed to the south of the school. This runs the entire length of the facade from the community entrance in the west to the edge of the S.E.N department in the east, a stretch of around 150m. This fence will provide an important vista for many using the footpath running east-west past the school and has been designed to reflect the architecture of the Academy. The proposed fence is intended to be constructed using a double-skin of perforated metal panels, rectangular in shape to reflect the cladding used on the school. On either side of the fence, hedging is proposed to soften the appearance of the fence which is in principle acceptable.
- 4.28 The fence would have a maximum height of 3.4m reducing to a minimum of 2.5m. This would appear large, particularly to those using the east-west route. However the addition of the hedging would help to reduce its apparent scale. In principle a fence in this location is accepted as it is required by the academy to fulfil a security function; however, a condition is recommended to secure the details of the boundary treatment as it is vital to the appearance of the academy and the working of the public realm areas (Condition 6).
- 4.29 The overall design, architecture and appearance of the proposed academy are considered to be acceptable. The metal panels and louvre projections would provide significant visual interest. The building has been designed to be functional, robust and attractive. The academy is a building of a civic scale and though different to the surrounding context in its appearance, the scale, bulk, footprint and building lines have been carefully considered on a tight site. The design and architecture of the academy building are therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with policies CL1, CL2 and CR2 of the CS, policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and points 5.1.4 and 5.1.10 of the planning brief, subject to the recommended conditions related to materials and details (Conditions 4 and 6).

#### 4.30 **Design Considerations – Leisure Centre**

The new Leisure Centre would be located broadly on the site of the existing centre. This too, would be accessed via the new connection but would feature multiple entrance points along the south facade where a new, extended area of public realm is proposed. This space would feature a (broadly) east-west

pedestrian link that will run south of both the leisure centre and academy. To the east of the leisure centre, a new residential apartment block is proposed. This would wrap the eastern edge of the site on Dulford Street and provide an active edge on this elevation. The proposed layout seeks to reintroduce the historic street network into this part of the borough. This original streetscape was lost with an array of post war development and therefore, its reintroduction is welcomed by the Council and matches the ambitions of the Planning Brief and Core Strategy Policy CR1.

4.31 There are access points to the leisure centre and school via the new north-south connection. The school and its entrance have a good relationship with Lancaster Road and likewise, the Leisure Centre is considered to respond positively Bomore Road, where the main entrance to the leisure centre will be clearly visible.

4.32 The leisure centre's main foyer area would be located on the south east elevation of the building. However, an additional access would be located on the south west elevation to ensure that there will be a greater level of activity along the new shared surface link. The use of a dual entrance is supported as it adds much needed legibility to the area and provides passive surveillance to the public realm and paths. The main swimming pool would be at the east of the leisure centre building located to the east of the leisure centre building; this too would feature a large glass curtain wall which would act as a clear landmark for the centre.

#### 4.33 **Leisure Centre Height and Bulk**

The proposal makes would appear as an attractive semi-permeable, two-storey structure, 12.3m in height which is modulated in such a way that it would not look oppressive from any angle and would step down towards Verity Close to the north. For the majority of the development the use of brise soleil on the upper floor provides verticality to the structure which would add both visual interest and solidity to an otherwise glazed area. The overhang at first floor on the south-west facade level would provide a sheltered walkway 2.5m wide around the building edge at ground floor level.

4.34 The eastern facade would mostly site behind the residential development, but an area of 23m (contains the main pool) would be visible from Dulford Street. It would feature an attractive stepping profile at roof level which as well as improving the centre's relationship with Verity Close to the rear, would also present a more visually stimulating facade to the street. The majority of the proposed leisure centre would have a consistent height. This has been achieved by the sinking of the main sports hall to match the height of two storeys. The stepping down to the north of the building would have no worse of an impact than the



existing leisure centre on the amenity of the Verity Close residents. The roof does feature a plant room which adds some further modulation to bulk of the building. The height and bulk of the leisure centre responds to the surroundings appropriately and is considered to be in accordance with policies CL1 and CR2 of the CS and policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

#### **4.35 Leisure Centre Design and Architecture**

The design and architecture of the leisure centre is also assessed against policies CL1, CL2 and CR2 of the CS and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan as set out above. The existing Leisure centre is not located in a conservation area and therefore permission is not required for its demolition.

- 4.36 The leisure centre is characterised by the use of a vertical brise soleil on the upper floor which will be constructed using glazed terracotta 'baguettes', spaced at different widths around the facade. This treatment would ensure that an element of activity from the upper floor is visible for passers-by giving the building legibility and showing its function. The proposals show the baguettes in a neutral taupe style colour that sits comfortably on the site; however a more dynamic colour could enliven the facades for a civic scale building such as this. It is also important that this reflects and sits comfortably with the proposed materials and colour for the academy.
- 4.37 The leisure centre would use a glass curtain wall along most of the western and southern elevation at ground floor level, affording views into the cafe and reception area as well as the leisure pool. This would help to give the centre a character and illustrate its function in accordance with the policy. The main entrance is located on the southern elevation and whilst understated, the solid canopy and glazed upper floor achieved by a large interruption of the brise soleil would provide a good focal point.
- 4.38 Whilst the majority of the ground floor of the south-western facade would be glazed, a series of treatment rooms and an emergency stairwell would break up the elevation. These solid areas would be clad using a terracotta rainscreen cladding and would be an important feature of the ground floor as they would sit in a prominent location. As the leisure pools would be visible from the pedestrian routes around the site, the addition of a feature rooflight is strongly supported. This elliptical structure, faced in metal has the potential to add interest and assist wayfinding in the area.
- 4.39 The north and east elevations are to be constructed using brick. Although this building is civic in nature, these elevations would face the rear of residential properties and courtyards and therefore brick is suitable. The plant room at roof level would

form part of the overall design and would help to add interest and break up the consistent roof height. Whilst not visible from many locations at street level, in elevated views this enclosure would be visible. The proposal is to clad this plant in a profiled metal acoustic enclosure which is in principle acceptable. The overall design and architecture of the leisure centre is calm and fits into the context of the surroundings. Subject to a recommended condition requiring further details of the rooflights, entrance areas and materials to be submitted (Condition 5), the proposal is considered to be in accordance with policies CL1, CL2 and CR2 of the CS and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.

#### **4.40 Design Considerations – Residential Block**

The residential development would broadly follow a traditional mansion block design around the south east corner of the site. There would be a single core on the southern elevation, in a slightly recessed court yard. This would add definition to the entrance whilst ensuring that the block remained subordinate to the leisure centre. The eastern elevation would achieve an active edge by providing access to five raised-ground floor apartments. No communal garden would be included to the rear of the residential block. Instead, this area has a landscaped path between two large vents to the basement car park. The design of the main core would feature a lobby, but the elevator and stair core would not be within this space, instead they would be in a semi-external space behind to the north of the lobby. Details of this space should be made subject to a condition (Condition 3). It is considered that overall the building responds adequately to the site and its constraints and is considered to be in accordance with policies CR1, CR2, and CL1 of the CS and point 5.2.5 in the KALC planning brief.

#### **4.41 Residential Height and Bulk**

The residential element of the scheme, located at the south-eastern boundary of the site would be five storeys in height (including a set-back storey) and with a basement car park level. The properties would feature a bronzed anodised balcony/winter garden which would oversail the ground floor from first to third floor level in a series of eight discrete projections running along the east and south facades. This would create a good vertical rhythm. The block would be close to the street frontage with a 1m area of defensible set back from the back of the pavement which is acceptable and creates an active frontage to the block.

- 4.42 The set-back at fourth floor would provide a lightweight pavilion, helping to reduce the bulk and scale of the building. This recessed top storey would also help the building to sit comfortably with the leisure centre as the main shoulder height of the block would sit just above the height of the leisure centre. There is no



predominant height in the surrounding area with a mix of four and five storeys located close to the site. It is considered that four storeys with a recessed fifth storey are appropriate for the scale of the area. The location of this block also helps to integrate the scheme as a whole into the neighbourhood in accordance with objective 6 (para. 4.2.1) of the planning brief. The height and scale of the residential block is therefore considered to be acceptable in accordance with policies CL1, CL2 and CR2 of the CS.

#### **4.43 Residential Design and Architecture**

For the residential block again policies CL1, CL2 and CR2 of the CS are relevant and policies 3.4, 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. The residential block would have a strong vertical rhythm achieved by using a series of cantilevered bays rendered in bronzed anodised metal which form balconies and in some cases, bay windows off internal spaces. This produces a facade that reflects a contemporary version of a terrace of properties in the borough.

- 4.44 The ground floor of the residential block would be raised by 1m from pavement level on the eastern elevation. Raised ground floors are a traditional feature of residential properties in the Royal Borough as this provides a level of privacy for properties close to the highway. An area of defensible space is proposed to be enclosed by railings and include linear steps to the ground floor units to provide activity to the street frontage which is appropriate.
- 4.45 Level access would be provided on the southern elevation by the main entrance to the block next to the bin store making it inclusive to all as the ground floor flats are also acceptable from the rear. The main entrance would be set back from the building line of the proposed leisure centre which is acceptable giving it a subservient appearance. The design and elevations of the residential block would have the appearance of a row of town. The recessed top storey is to be clad to match the bay projections which is appropriate and would give the top storey a lightweight appearance which is acceptable.
- 4.46 To the rear of the block, the design is appropriate for the layout of the block in this difficult site. The open corridors with glazed balustrades and mesh screens at each level to access the units are a satisfactory design approach, given the limited views of this area. The block would have two lift cores, both within the rear external area. One of the lifts in the courtyard provides access to the basement level which is acceptable. Further work is required to find an appropriate solution to the location of the car park vents, to improve their relationship with the open space and with nearby dwellings. This can be made the subject of a suitable

condition (Condition 3).

#### 4.47 **Design Considerations - Public Realm**

The public realm proposals are considered under policies CR3, CR5 and CR6 of the CS 'saved' policy CD26 and policies 2.18 and 7.5 of the London Plan. Policy CR6 in particular states that the Council will require the protection of existing trees and the provision of new trees that complement existing or create new, high quality green areas which deliver amenity and biodiversity benefits.

4.48 The public realm and landscaping would bond much of the site together. A new network formed out of a series of contracting green spaces is proposed. Broadly, the public realm would form two corridors across the site, running north-south and east-west. These spaces would provide a good mix of hard and soft landscaping and have been designed to best reflect the surrounding uses. As proposed, the public realm would come forward in a single phase following the construction of the school and leisure centre. This will ensure that it best reflects the buildings and will not interfere or be disrupted by construction.

4.49 The proposal would replace the existing space known as Lancaster Green and replace it with a slightly larger space of 1044sqm (29sqm larger). This space would be flatter and would connect to the green space in front of the leisure centre, over the new north-south link. The proposed space would nearly double the amount of useable open. An element of subtle undulation is still proposed, mainly as a result of the change in levels across the site, with the north-south link located in a shallow gully, 500mm below the rest of the green space. This would be shallow enough to ensure those on the path would have good sightlines across the site and beyond.

4.50 Lancaster Green has traditionally been used for seating by residents. The new space would include secluded areas for residents on the area adjacent Grenfell Tower. The use of the green space is likely to increase due to its new formation. The area in front of the leisure centre would be heavily used due to the proposed outdoor sports facilities. It is proposed that this space, including the hard landscaped area be used for table-tennis, exercise facilities or similar uses. As these structures will shape the character of the public realm, they will need to be attractive and add to the legibility of the area. The hard landscaped areas along the east-west link are designed to improve legibility and paths have been designed to follow desire lines.

4.51 Limited information has been submitted with regards to the materials to be used in hard landscaped areas throughout the site. The quality of all of these spaces will contribute to the success of



this scheme and a condition is therefore recommended requiring details of all hard and soft landscaping materials and treatment (Condition 6).

- 4.52 Within the adopted Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre Planning Brief Supplementary Planning Document there is an objective to re-establish the historic street grain by providing a new high quality north south street linking Silchester Road to Grenfell Road and providing access to both the Academy and the Leisure Centre. The street network in this area is badly fractured by 1960s housing estate developments. At present there are no north-south streets within an extensive area between Bramley Road and St Mark's Road.
- 4.53 There has been considerable opposition from the local community to a new road with full vehicle access and as a result this approach has not been taken forward. The route has instead been designed as a local shared surface street dominated mainly by pedestrians and cyclists. This space if detailed correctly will be a highly attractive space that should be well used by pedestrians and cyclists accessing both the academy and the leisure centre. The activity created by the users of both the academy and leisure centre should create a safe environment through passive surveillance until the leisure centre closes each night.
- 4.54 The northern part of the route would be the main entrance gateway to the proposed academy. The 7 disabled parking bays have been designed to be as subtle as possible, not detracting from the palette of materials. There would be two sets of retractable bollards set on the north-south route to control vehicular access through the space. The first set would be located where the route narrows between the academy building and the planting. The second set of is proposed at the junction with Grenfell Road. It is envisaged that a self managing system of retractable bollards will be used, with the users of the disabled spaces for the academy and leisure centre and servicing registering with either operation, and being issued with an access card to be allowed access. A plan of how this is managed is to be recommended to be secured by condition (Conditions 6 and 8). There would also be four large benches also located along the connection. These will form part of a recommended landscape condition (Condition 6).
- 4.55 The subtle undulations in the southern section of the route would create a safe and inviting area surrounded by the new Lancaster Green. The quality of the shared surface connection will contribute to the success of the scheme as it glues together the three key components (school, leisure centre and open space). The landscaping proposed is functional, fit for purpose, and of a high quality. The proposed public realm changes are therefore acceptable subject to recommended conditions to require the

details and materials for the landscaping to ensure that the high quality proposed is delivered. The proposed landscaping is therefore considered to be in accordance with policies CR3, CR5, CR6 and CA4 of the CS and policies 2.18 and 7.5 of the London Plan.

#### 4.56 **Open Space**

When assessing the open space of the site policy CR5 is relevant and states that the Council will protect, enhance and make the most of existing parks, gardens and open spaces, and require new high quality outdoor spaces to be provided. To deliver this the Council will resist the loss of existing Metropolitan Open Land, public open space, private communal open space and private open space where the space gives visual amenity to the public. The spaces around the site are not classified as public open space and therefore in this instance CR5 (i)(iii) are not relevant.

- 4.57 On the site as existing there is approximately 12,155 sq.m of public realm, excluding the buildings (5,033 sq.m), the car parks (2,762 sq.m) and the existing MUGA courts (1,782 sq.m) and service areas (2,449 sq.m). The open space is divided between hard landscaping (6,711 sq.m) and soft landscaped areas (5,444 sq.m). Many of these spaces are of poor amenity value and are not easily useable; the majority are undulating boundary treatments areas, with exceptions such as Lancaster Green, and adjoining land. These exceptions are considered to be formal open space and have an area of 2089 sq.m. The proposed scheme provides an increased amount of useable formal open space giving an increased area of 2,197 sq.m. When looking at the figures for public realm overall, there is a decrease to 11339 sq.m (a loss of 816 sq.m). Within this public realm figure there is an overall gain in hard landscape (7168 sq.m (increase of 457 sq.m)) and a reduction in soft landscape (4171 sq.m (reduction of 1273 sq.m)). It is clear from this that there is an overall loss of public realm space but an increase in the amount of formal open space. The loss of public realm on the site is largely as a result of the new buildings proposed on the site. Whilst it is accepted that there is a loss of public realm across the site, the improvements and increase in the useable open space would provide benefits to the community in qualitative terms as well as quantitative terms, providing improved amenity space. The remaining areas of hard and soft landscaping proposed as part of the public realm would also enhance the space around the site. It is considered that there would be no loss of formal open space in accordance with policy CR5 of the CS, policy 7.18 of the London Plan, and paragraph 4.2.1(objective 3) of the SPD.

#### 4.58 **Trees**

Policy CR6 relates to trees and landscape. This is also supported



by policies 2.18, 5.10 and 7.21 of the London Plan. As part of the submission a Tree Survey BS5387 (BJ Unwin & Churchman Landscape Architects, May 2012) has been submitted and the proposals have been assessed by the Council's Arboricultural Officer.

- 4.59 In January 2011 The Council's Principal Arboricultural Officer surveyed the trees on the site using the guidelines in *BS5387 – Trees in Relation to Construction*. The results of the two have been compared. Trees in this version of the British standard are graded as either A, B or C – A's are the best quality trees with the longest lifespan and B's and C's are poorer specimens with shorter useful life expectancies. In general it is desirable to retain A and B category trees and it is recommended that C's are not treated as an impediment to development. There is an additional category 'R' which is for trees which should be removed whether the development goes ahead or not due to their poor or dangerous condition.
- 4.60 There is very little material difference between the applicant's tree survey and that of the RBKC's Principal Arboricultural Officer. The site actually contains few good trees – the best being the London Planes around Silchester Road and the specimen to the south east of the sports centre. The area was actually overplanted with trees and they were not thinned out as they should have been and this has resulted in many specimens suppressing one another. Although on the face of it a large number of trees would be felled (78) it is not considered that the impact would be significant because once the 86 proposed new trees are established, the impact would be mitigated fairly rapidly. The species to be used for the new trees is recommended to be secured by condition (Condition 6).
- 4.61 In the north on Silchester Road the street trees (T18-T21 in Unwin Report) would be some 6m from the frontage of the school. These are closer than the ideal but as the trees are regularly pruned and the building not residential the situation is considered acceptable. The best tree on the site is T122, in the south east corner. A residential building would be sited 8m from its trunk. This attractive spreading tree and crown would have to be pruned to allow construction and by necessity there would need to be an on-going programme of pruning which would affect the shape of this tree.
- 4.62 The 42 retained trees would need to be protected against damage during the construction phase and this matter is addressed in the arboricultural report. Subject to conditions relating to the protection of the trees (Conditions 18 and 19), the scheme is considered to comply with policy CR6 of the CS and policies 2.18, 5.10 and 7.21 of the London Plan.

#### 4.63 **Existing MUGA Games Courts**

The existing MUGA courts on the site have a site area of approximately 1,782 sq.m. These courts are operated by the Leisure Centre and are supposed to be booked and paid for, but because they have been broken into and damaged, they are generally left open and are used as playspace. They are not considered to be open space or open community playspace for the purpose of the policies. The Westway Sports centre is located 300mm from the current pitches. The Council has agreed to fund the re-provision of these pitches at the Westway Sports Centre. This work has already been carried out and provides a replacement 1406 sq.m of MUGA floorspace. This reprovision is considered to be acceptable. In addition to this the MUGA proposed as part of the academy will also be available for community use providing a further 594 sq.m of external sports space. This actually results in an overall increase in the provision of facilities of 218 sq.m, but not all located on the site. A condition is recommended to require a community use plan to allow use of the academy MUGA for the community to mitigate this loss on site and this is in accordance with paragraphs 5.3.13, 5.3.12, 4.2.1(objective 3) of the site SPD and policy 3.19 of the London Plan.

#### 4.64 **Existing Playspace/playground**

As part of the proposals the playground to the west of Grenfell tower is to be improved. This involves the redesign of the playground with reprovided equipment or improved in quality to make a more coherent play space, and the removal of the boundary walls that enclose the playground. The proposals show the existing playspace to be retained in almost the same location only in a more suitable configuration to provide ease of access for the nursery and crèche operations in Grenfell Tower. There is no loss of play space and therefore the proposals comply with policy CR5 of the CS, policy 3.6 of the London Plan and paragraphs 4.2.1(objective 3) 5.3.8 of the planning brief.

#### 4.65 **Transport**

The application has been assessed in regard to policy CT1, CR2, CR3, CR4 and CR7 of the CS, 'saved' policies TR20, TR21, TR32 and TR44 of the UDP, and policies 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 6.10 and 6.13.

#### 4.66 **Residential Car Parking / Car Park Access**

The applicants have confirmed that the residential development will be permit free in accordance with CT1 (c). An undertaking to this effect is required in the Unilateral Undertaking. A revised plan of the residential block's basement car park has been



submitted. This incorporates two disabled bays and three motorcycle bays. This is acceptable and satisfies CT1 (d) and the Transport SPD.

- 4.67 More detail of the proposed car park access ramp has been submitted. Its central section (10m long) would be very steep with a gradient of 1:6. Transition gradients of 1:12 would be provided on 3m lengths at either end of the ramp. The profile of the proposed ramp does not adhere to the Council's standards set out in the Transport SPD. This detail is required to be changed and is recommended to form part of the conditions for the residential block (Condition 3).

4.68 **Loss of Off-street Parking**

Under Council policy CT1 (e), car parking in non residential developments should only be provided to satisfy an essential need. For most non residential uses, including schools and leisure centres, the only spaces considered to be essential are for blue badge holders. The provision of seven disabled spaces on the north south link is appropriate and satisfies CT1 (e).

- 4.69 The loss of the existing car parks would significantly reduce the supply of parking in the area. Under the Development Plan, there is no policy to retain non-residential off street parking. New public car parks are resisted under CS Policy CT1 (I). The KALC SPD advises that "the loss of non-residential parking is supported by the Council as a way of reducing the impact of car use and therefore a significant reduction in car parking at this site to make way for the proposed school will be accepted". The proposal includes new on-street parking and 7 disabled parking spaces within the site to provide some parking.

4.70 **On-street Parking**

The applicants propose that additional visitor bays be provided on street to compensate for the removal of off-street visitor parking from the site. This is acceptable in principle. A total of 28 potential spaces are identified, 13 on Bomore Road and 15 on Walmer Road. The realisation of a proportion of these spaces would depend on widening the carriageway on Bomore Road (by moving the northern kerb line north) and changing the layout and the traffic priority at the Walmer Road/ Bomore Road junction. Detailed proposals to modify the road layout must be worked up following any planning approval – a payment would be required on execution of the undertaking to carry out the required design work. The changes would then be implemented under a S278 agreement. This is to be secured in the Unilateral Undertaking.

4.71 **Bicycle Parking**

Bicycle parking around the site for visitors is acceptable. The detailed design of the external cycle racks and shelters have been submitted and these are acceptable. The lack of secure bicycle parking for leisure centre staff is an issue. A condition is therefore recommended to ensure that staff cycle parking is provided. Subject to this condition the proposal is in accordance with CT1 (f) (Condition 5).

#### **4.72 Coach Parking Proposals**

The Addendum Transport Assessment states that the proposed leisure centre would attract an average of five minibuses daily, mostly associated with local schools. The Academy would not generate regular coach traffic. However the Addendum TA advises there would be coach trips associated with infrequent excursions for pupils at the Academy and also the arrival of visitors for extracurricular activities such as musical / theatrical performances and sporting events. It is proposed to accommodate the anticipated demand on a c. 26m long coach bay situated on the south side of Silchester road / Lancaster Road, just west of the junction with the north south route. This would accommodate two full size coaches or three minibuses.

4.73 The applicants have identified how the five residential parking spaces could be reprovided, only one of these proposed spaces is acceptable and therefore four of the proposed additional parking bays on Walmer Road would be designated as residential parking to address the loss of residential parking on Silchester Road. This results in fewer spaces provided for the academy and leisure centre, leaving 31 spaces in total (including the 7 disabled spaces).

4.74 The applicants confirm that bus arrivals would be scheduled so as not to conflict with one another. Coach traffic to the site would be managed by a Coach Management Plan. The applicants propose that such a plan be developed pursuant to a condition or obligation. It should be possible to satisfy the bulk of the site's coach parking requirements on the proposed coach parking bay. Maximum dwell times would be required to ensure that the bay is available for arriving buses to load and unload passengers. Should the bay be fully occupied, further coaches could load and unload on the north south link without unduly impacting on pedestrian or vehicular traffic. The coach management plan would be required to identify where on the north south link coaches would stop to load and unload passengers visiting the leisure centre. The north south link must be designed to allow this. This necessary function of the street should not be unduly constrained by the placement of street furniture or planters. Given the importance of this issue, it is recommended that the



Coach Management Plan must be agreed prior to implementation by a recommended condition (Condition 7).

#### 4.75 **Walking**

Under CT1 (g), new development is required to improve the walking environment. Under CT1(h) new development is required to incorporate measures to improve road safety. Under CT1(j) new development is required to contribute to improving access to public transport facilities. In line with these policies a review of the footways surrounding the site and of the footways connecting the site to nearby bus stops and Underground stations has been undertaken using an assessment framework. The following interventions are necessary and must be funded in full by the development:

- Informal crossings should be provided on all arms of a modified Bomore Road/ Walmer Road junction
- An informal crossing of Bomore Road should be provided to link the east west route with Avondale Park Road.
- A vehicular crossover at the corner of Dulford Street and Walmer Road for the residential car park.

These changes are to be secured by Unilateral Undertaking.

- 4.76 It is noted that the latest landscape plan shows table tennis tables positioned on the east west pedestrian/cycle route directly on the desire line. This would prevent pedestrians from taking the most direct route and should be rectified on a revised landscape plan subject to a recommended condition (Condition 6).

#### 4.77 **Section 258 application: extinguishment of public rights of way over land held for planning purposes.**

The footprint of the proposed academy extends over an existing footpath linking Station Walk to Silchester Road parallel to, and just east of, the railway viaduct. This footpath is required to be extinguished for the development to proceed. A Public Path Extinguishment Order was made on 10 August 2012 to extinguish footpaths across the site. The Director of Transportation and Highways authorised the making of the order as he is satisfied that alternative footpaths will be provided. The order will be confirmed by the Council if no objections to it were received during the consultation period which ended on 7 September. At the time of writing the report 1 objection had been raised to this.

#### 4.78 **Trip Generation**

TRICS data (tool for measuring numbers of trips and trip rates) for a similar school in Islington indicate that the proposed Academy would generate 92 vehicular trips in the am peak (08:00 and 09:00) and 41 trips in the pm peak (18:00-19:00). This volume of

trips would have no significant impact on the wider network. However, as previously highlighted, student drop offs at the beginning of the school day have the potential to be disruptive if they are not properly managed. Accordingly a school traffic management plan must be agreed prior to occupation.

- 4.79 Trip data from a 1995 TRAVL survey of the existing leisure centre is included in the addendum TA. This data indicates that the existing facility generates a high number of vehicular trips. The Addendum TA does not attempt to estimate the number of vehicular trips that would be generated by the extended leisure centre base on the 1995 data. Instead it argues that the reduction in parking availability should significantly curtail the number of vehicular trips to the leisure centre. This is accepted.
- 4.80 The addendum TA estimates that the 32 unit residential development would generate 12 vehicular trips in the peak hour (08:00 – 09:00). In the context of this borough, this is likely to be an overestimate. Cumulatively, the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the surrounding highway network so long as school traffic can be appropriately managed.
- 4.81 All proposed uses would generate a high proportion of walking trips (or walking trips to public transport). Accordingly a financial contribution to upgrade footways (as set out above) is essential.

4.82 **Public Transport Impact Assessment**

Based on the experience at Chelsea Academy, the originally submitted TA estimated that a total of 632 students and staff would come to school by bus. The Addendum TA includes an alternative estimate (614 persons) based on a TRICS survey of another similar school (in Islington). The alternative estimate is not materially different to the original estimate, increasing the estimates' validity. The TA estimates that the Academy would generate in excess of 1,200 bus trips daily and 530 in the peak hour (15:00 – 16:00). In addition the extended leisure centre and the residential development would generate further bus trips. However, the TA does not provide bus trip estimates for these uses. The number of bus trips generated by these uses should be moderate; nevertheless they would augment the significant number of bus trips generated by the school.

- 4.83 If the estimated number of bus trips were added to the existing bus network, there would be a material impact on the network at peak times with increased overcrowding on busier services likely. The Addendum TA suggests that the bus trip estimate presented therein is likely to be an overestimate given that the school would have a priority admissions area covering the part of the Borough north of Holland Park Avenue. Much of this would be within walking distance of the school.



- 4.84 Part of the rationale behind the establishment of the Academy is to ensure that more local RBKC pupils are educated within the Royal Borough than at present. Pupils could potentially transfer to the Academy from five local primary schools situated within 1km of the site. Currently these pupils travel either out of the Borough or to Holland Park School. Such pupils could potentially take up 144 of the 180 spaces available in every year group. This would result in a reduced travel distances to school for many students.
- 4.85 Moreover, given that the proposed Academy would be located in a densely populated residential area not currently served by a secondary school, there are grounds for assuming that a higher proportion of students would walk or cycle to school than is typical. Given the circumstances, it is reasonable to assume that the number of daily bus trips generated by the school would be somewhat lower than the TA's estimate of 1200. However, a considerable number of bus trips would be generated in any event. There will always be a proportion of students and staff that will travel to school by bus. Additionally the other uses will generate bus trips. Reasonable mitigation would be required to satisfy policy CT1 (j).
- 4.86 TfL have requested that an additional school day only return journey on either route 452 or 52 be funded for a period of five years (costing £350,000). Such mitigation would be consistent with policy CT1 (j). The Academy would take several years to become fully occupied. Accordingly the full impact of the development on the local bus network would not materialise for a number of years. An appropriate trigger for the contribution might be two years following first occupation at which point the school building would become 50% occupied. This would provide two years to establish emerging travel patterns to the school allowing impacts on the bus network to be identified and quantified and to devise targeted mitigation. An audit of the eleven bus stops that could potentially be used by students and other travelling to and from the site using an assessment framework similar to that of PERS has been undertaken. The bus stops were all found to be of good quality and well maintained. No further work on audit bus stops is required.
- 4.87 **Servicing**

Revised servicing trip estimates have been provided within the Addendum TA. It is estimated that the school would generate five servicing trips daily. This estimate is based on TRAVL and TRICS surveys and is accepted. This level of servicing could be accommodated on the north-south route without undue impacts. A condition is recommended to secure a servicing management plan to ensure that servicing traffic does not conflict with school

traffic at the beginning and end of the school day (Condition 32).

- 4.88 A planter is proposed near leisure centre's servicing entrance. Before the commencement of the development tracking diagrams are required to demonstrate how service related manoeuvring would take place (Condition 32). This is to be secured by a recommended condition.

4.89 **North-South Route**

Given that the proposed street would be privately maintained, the use of an exposed aggregate concrete surface treatment is acceptable. However the street's construction must be to adoptable standards and must be capable of taking heavy vehicular loads. The proposed street would be highway, and open to public passage. Accordingly detailed engineering drawings of the proposed street including technical specifications of all materials and street furniture must be agreed prior to implementation to be secured by a recommended condition (Condition 13).

- 4.90 Vehicular passage along the street would be controlled by physical barriers. A traffic management plan incorporating procedures for the control of the barriers must be worked up in conjunction with the highway authority. A condition is recommended to require a traffic management plan is submitted (Condition 8).

- 4.91 In transportation terms the proposal generally reflects the KALC SPD and is acceptable. Subject to conditions and obligations to ensure that the scheme is in accordance with policies CT1, CR1, CR2, CR3, CR4 and CR7 of the CS 'saved' UDP Policies TR20, TR21, TR32 and TR44, the Transport SPD 2008 and London Plan Policies 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.9, 6.10, 6.13.

4.92 **Sustainable Urban Drainage and Flooding**

The applicants submitted a flood risk assessment with the application (Curtins Consulting, April 2012) which has been assessed in conjunction with the Environment Agency. A number of issues were identified with the management of surface water runoff from the site and the compliance of the development with Policy 5.13 – Sustainable drainage of the London Plan, which states that "development should utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) unless there are practical reasons for not doing so, and should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates". The London Plan is supported by Policy CE2 of the CS and the emerging Surface Water Management Plan. A revised FRA prepared by Curtins Consulting (Ref: LO1023 Rev C, dated 6



August 2012) was submitted and included further development of the surface water drainage scheme that addressed the concerns previously raised. Several SuDS are proposed in the FRA: green roofs, shallow depression, shallow swales, porous tarmac and drainage blankets and tanked systems. Only the tanked system, the swales and surface depressions have been taken into account in the drainage design. However further details of the proposed mitigation methods are required and a condition is recommended to require a detailed drainage strategy be submitted (Condition 20). Subject to the recommended conditions the scheme is considered to comply with policy CE2 of the CS and policies 5.12 and 5.13 of the London Plan.

#### 4.93 **Air Quality**

The applicant has submitted an Air Quality assessment (MLM, June 2012) with the application which has been assessed by the Director of Environmental Health. Conditions are recommended requiring a low emissions strategy, evidence in relation to the proposed combustion plant, a risk assessment for each phase of the development and a Construction Environmental Management Plan to be submitted (Conditions 16 and 17). Subject to these conditions the development is considered to comply with policy CE5 of the CS, policies 7.14 and 5.18 of the London Plan and the Air Quality SPD.

#### 4.94 **Contamination**

The applicants have submitted the following documents with the application; Preliminary Contamination Assessment REV1, (MLM Environmental, Aug 2012) and Phase 2 Geo-environmental Assessment REV1, (MLM Environmental, Aug 2012). These documents have been assessed by the Director of Environmental Health. Conditions are recommended to secure a site investigation and remediation strategy (if necessary) following groundworks and demolition of the leisure centre (Conditions 21, 22 and 23). Subject to these conditions the proposal is considered to be in accordance with 'saved' policy PU3 of the UDP, policy 5.21 of the London Plan and paragraph 5.8.1 of the Planning Brief.

#### 4.95 **Ecology / Biodiversity**

Policy CE4 of the CS relates to biodiversity and states that the Council will protect the biodiversity in, and adjacent to, the Borough's Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and require opportunities to be taken to enhance and attract biodiversity. The site is not located in a site of nature conservation importance. The applicant submitted an Ecological Assessment (Taylor Young, MLM, May 2012) and a Bat Survey Report (MLM, August 2012) and a Breeding Bird Survey (MLM, August 2012). These

documents have been assessed by the Ecology Officer. The surveys submitted have been carried out in accordance to Natural England's standing advice. No evidence of bats was recorded on site. Breeding birds have been identified on site, but suitable mitigation is proposed within the Breeding Bird Survey Report (8 June 2012).

The invasive species survey identified two areas of Japanese knotweed lying outside the site boundary. In order to ensure there are no invasive species issues during construction a precautionary survey must be undertaken immediately prior to demolition. It is noted that the mitigation for the breeding birds is not noted on the landscape plans; this information is to be secured by condition. Further comments are made in relation to the proposed specification and coverage of the green roof, the lighting around the site and biodiversity enhancements which are the subject of recommended conditions (Conditions 6 and 5). Subject to the recommended conditions, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with policy CE4 of the CS and policies 5.11 and 7.19 of the London Plan.

#### **4.96 Environmental Health – Noise and Nuisance**

Policy CE6 of the CS relates to noise and vibration and is supported by policy CL5 in respect of amenity. Policy CE6 states that the Council will carefully control the impact of noise and vibration generating sources which affect amenity. The Council will require new noise and vibration sensitive developments to mitigate and protect occupiers against existing sources of noise and vibration. This is supported by the Planning Brief paragraph 5.5.2.

- 4.97 The applicant has submitted a Noise Assessment (Max Fordham, Rev C, August 2012). This document has been assessed by the Director of Environmental Health. The applicant has not yet determined the final plant requirements. The noise report provides indicative plant requirements and noise mitigation. It will be necessary to condition that noise reports are submitted to confirm that noise emitted from the installed plant and equipment will comply with the Council's noise emission criteria (Condition 24).

#### **4.98 School Activity Noise Assessment:**

The current noise from the use of the existing all weather pitches affects the residents of Grenfell Tower. The document provides information as to the levels of noise that may occur as a result of the proposal. It is important that a pre-commencement condition is recommended to carry out a further assessment of these noise levels to ensure that there are no harmful increases to noise and vibration to the residents of Grenfell Tower. It is noted that a complaint of the existing situation is that the MUGA courts



are broken into at night and cause noise and disturbance to residents in unsociable hours. The academy play areas will be secured when the academy is closed and the MUGA and other facilities available to the community will have secure controlled access and be closed at a designated time. A condition is recommended to control the opening hours of the MUGA on the academy (Condition 30).

#### 4.99 **Leisure Centre Activity Noise Assessment**

The noise report considers noise from the internal activities in the Centre including from the dance studios and sports hall. The report has adopted the requirements of section 8.6a of the Noise SPD to assess noise as from places of entertainment. It is considered that noise from permanent facilities such as these that are likely to be used on a daily basis and part of a new building development should be provided with adequate sound insulation to provide practicable inaudibility at sensitive facades from noise sources such as these. It is expected that due to the tonal nature of breakout noise, principally low frequency, and therefore tonal, that noise at residential facades should be -15dBA below lowest LA90. Further information is required in terms of the facade construction and plant enclosure regarding this noise break out. A condition is recommended to secure this information (Conditions 24, 25, 26 and 27).

#### 4.100 **Residential Noise Impact**

The existing measured noise levels indicate that the area is suitable for residential dwellings. There does not appear to be any necessity for acoustically designed glazing, standard thermal double glazing is sufficient. Further information is required in terms of the expected internal noise levels. This information is to be secured by a recommended condition (Condition 27).

- 4.101 In summary it is considered that in terms of the noise levels from the academy, leisure centre and residential units further information is required to mitigate against harm to the neighbouring buildings and the buildings themselves as outlined above. This information is to be secured by the recommended pre-commencement conditions. Subject to these conditions being complied with, the proposals are in accordance with policy CE6 of the CS, policy 7.15 of the London Plan and the Noise SPD. As stated in paragraph 5.5.2 of the planning brief planning conditions are being suggested to control and minimize noise and disruption (Conditions 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30).

#### 4.102 **Energy/Sustainability**

Energy and Sustainability is considered within policies CA4 and CE1 of the CS and policies 5.2, 5.3, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.9 of the London

Plan. In particular policy CA4(d) states that the Council will require development on the site to deliver a Combined Cooling, Heating and Power (CCHP) plant or similar, of a suitable size to serve the site with the potential to contribute to the heat and energy demand of the wider community as part of a district heat and energy network. This policy is supported by policy CE1.

- 4.103 In fact, it is proposed It is proposed that the Academy and Leisure Centre feature gas-fired absorption heat pumps as the primary heat source with boilers backing up the heat pumps. The academy would also feature photovoltaic panels at roof level. The residential part of the scheme would have photovoltaic cells and combination boilers.
- 4.104 A Combined Heat and Power and Heat Network appraisal of Viability (Max Fordham, May 2012) was submitted with the application. This statement set out the justification for the exclusion of CCHP from the scheme. The report concludes that CCHP or CHP is not viable to Lancaster West Estate or the wider network area as this would not be a commercially viable option for an operating ESCO and would not result in best value for tenants of the Lancaster West Estate, and significant amounts of heat produced by the energy centre would be lost in distribution due to the arrangements of plant and pipework in the Estate. The applicants have also submitted an Energy Statement (Max Fordham, Issue 3: August 2012) in support of this statement and which proposes the alternatives to CCHP or CHP.
- 4.105 These documents have been assessed by the Council's Sustainability Officer who is satisfied that CCHP or CHP for the wider network is not viable at this stage. However, the option of including a CHP system only for the leisure centre has proved feasible. The applicant has however rejected this option based on the incompatibility with the proposed cooling systems. The proposed energy sources are considered to be acceptable and for each building a pre-assessment has been submitted in terms of BREEAM and the Code for Sustainable Homes. These documents show that a rating of 'excellent' can be achieved for both the academy and leisure centre, and that the proposed residential units can achieve code level 4. From 2013 the rating required is code level 5 for the residential but at the present time the proposal is in accordance with policy CE1. The applicants have demonstrated that the option of CHP or CCHP is not viable as the costs of operation are disproportionate to the emissions savings which are achievable. The applicants have suggested a suitable energy scheme for each of the buildings. Despite the absence of CHP and subject to conditions to ensure the sustainability levels are met (Conditions 14 and 15), the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this instance and in accordance with policy CE1 of the CS, and policies 5.2, 5.3, 5.7 and 5.9 of the London Plan, but is not in accordance with policy CA4(d), policy 5.6 of the London



Plan.

#### 4.106 **Waste**

Policy CE3 of the CS and policies 5.17 and 5.18 relate to waste from operation and waste during construction. Policy CE3 in particular states that Council will meet the waste apportionment figure as set out in the London Plan and will ensure that waste is managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy, which is to reduce, reuse or recycle waste as close as possible to where it is produced. To deliver this the Council will require provision of adequate refuse and recycling storage space which allows for ease of collection in all developments; require that development proposals make use of the rail and the waterway network for the transportation of construction waste and other waste; and require applicants for major developments to prepare and implement Site Waste Management Plans for demolition and construction waste.

4.107 It is clear from the plans that adequate spaces have been provided for the servicing of waste. For the academy and leisure centre, both of these are located close to the north-south link. The residential block provides a bin store access next to the lobby which the residents could also access from the rear courtyard of the block. Further information is required in relation to waste management for the site which is recommended to form part of a condition (Condition 32).

4.108 The applicants have submitted a Construction and Waste Management Plan (Leadbitter Group), dated May 2012, in accordance with policy CR3(e). Only limited information is contained within the report regarding the management of dust and no reference is made to fine particles (PM10) or emissions from plant and vehicles. A risk based assessment of the air quality impacts (dust and emissions) of demolition and construction must be undertaken based on the Mayor's best practice guidance and the appropriate mitigation measures should be detailed in a construction management plan or environmental management plan. This should include monitoring proposals and protocols. As stated in the air quality section of this report a condition is recommended to secure this information (Conditions 16 and 17) in accordance with policies CE3 and policies 5.17 and 5.18 of the London Plan.

#### 4.109 **Crime**

As stated in the planning brief for the site the police advise that there is no correlation between the location of schools and the volume of crime. The application has been subject to Secure By Design criteria and the guidance in the Designing out Crime SPD and is acceptable, in accordance with policy 7.3 of the London Plan and the aforementioned SPD.

#### 4.110 **Access**

The proposal concerns two buildings that are civic in nature and therefore are required to be fully accessible and inclusive to all in accordance with policies CL1 and CL2 of the CS, policies 3.1, 3.2 and 7.2 of the London Plan and the Access SPD.

- 4.111 The design of each of the buildings has been carefully considered to ensure that each is inclusive to all. Lifts would be provided in both the academy and leisure centre for access. The different levels of terracing and outdoor space are also fully accessible for the academy. All new pathways, entrances and access routes have been designed with gradients below 1 in 20 and regular landings in accordance with BS8300:2009.

- 4.112 In the leisure centre the changing areas, WCs, circulation routes and spectator seating are designed in accordance with accessibility guidance. In the residential building all the flats would be accessible from a sloped access and the basement car park. The proposals are therefore considered to comply with policies CL1 and CL2 of the CS, policies 3.1, 3.2 and 7.2 of the London Plan and the Access SPD.

#### 4.113 **Amenity**

In terms of amenity policy CL5 of the CS is relevant. The Council will require new buildings to achieve high standards of amenity. It is stated in the reasoned justification for this policy in paragraph 34.3.47 of the CS that in considering development proposals, the Council will not be seeking to ensure that they meet any particular minimum or maximum standard.

#### 4.114 **Academy – Sunlight and Daylight**

The proposed academy would be located in a tight urban site surrounded by residential properties. To the north the properties of Whitchurch House and Blechynden House are directly located across the road, to the east the properties in Verity Close and to the south Grenfell Tower. The applicants have submitted a Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment (GVA, June 2012) and an addendum report (GVA, Rev1, August 2012). The report assessed all windows at all levels in Barlow House, all windows to 25-43 Verity Close, all windows to 8-24 Verity Close and all windows of 4-7 Verity Close. The report also assessed the windows at all levels in Whitchurch House and Blechynden House.

- 4.115 These reports indicate that there would be no material impact in terms of sunlight or daylight or overshadowing to Grenfell Tower given its location in relation to the proposed academy building. Whitchurch House also would not have a noticeable reduction in



sunlight and daylight. From the windows tested only 1 out of 12 had a reduction in daylight which would not be materially noticeable and given the proposal is in an urban setting is acceptable. Blechynden House also to the north features habitable rooms at ground, first and second floor level. Of the windows facing the site only two ground floor windows would have a noticeable reduction in daylight; however this is only marginally over the threshold for a noticeable impact and would not materially worsen the conditions in the rooms. This is as a result of the existing situation where there is currently no building opposite and therefore the increase is always going to show a loss, but this is minimal. The majority of the rooms would also exceed the BRE guidelines in terms of the daylight into the rooms. The properties to the east in Verity Close (25-43) would not have a noticeable reduction in daylight with the proposed development in place. There would be no loss of sunlight to these properties.

#### **4.116 Leisure Centre – Sunlight and Daylight**

The leisure centre would largely be located on a similar footprint to the existing building and therefore it is unlikely to result in a worsening condition. The properties in Verity Close (8-24) would not notice a reduction in daylight or sunlight as a result of the development. This is largely due to the stepping down of the building to the north. The properties in Verity Close (1-7) closer to Bomore Road/Dulford Street would also not notice a reduction in daylight and would continue to receive good levels of sunlight. There would be no change to the existing sunlight conditions. The existing condition for sunlight and daylight will not change for the properties along Bomore Road and Treadgold House in relation to the proposed leisure centre due to the location of the blocks.

#### **4.117 Residential Block – Sunlight and Daylight**

The residential block would be located in the south east corner of the site and would sit across from the properties in Barlow House to the east and a surgery building on Bomore Road to the south. The residential block would be about 20m from the face of Barlow House. As Barlow House currently faces an open space area, the difference between the existing condition in the results of the sunlight and daylight assessment and the proposed condition appear worse than actual as a result of the scheme. Of the windows tested 32 of the 84 windows on the western elevation of Barlow House would fall below the BRE guidance; however of the 32 windows, 21 already fall below the guidance as a result of the existing situation given the recessed balconies on the properties. In the results there would be a noticeable loss in the remaining windows but this is as a result of the existing condition where there is no building opposite; however this loss would not materially worsen the conditions given the existing situation.

The proposed building is 20m away, which is an acceptable street width in this part of the Borough. Furthermore, as these units are dual aspect it is considered that there would be no material loss of amenity by reason of loss of sunlight or daylight to occupiers of these residential units.

#### **4.118 Residential Block – Sunlight and Daylight Levels**

As regards the light conditions for the units within the block, the report shows that all of the units in the development will receive sunlight and daylight levels that meet the BRE guidance. In terms of sunlight and daylight it is therefore considered that all of the buildings are in accordance with policy CL5(a).

#### **4.119 Academy – Privacy**

The main considerations in terms of privacy are to the properties to the north of the academy in Whitchurch House and Blechynden House. Both of these properties have windows facing the development. In this instance there would be mutual overlooking largely confined to the academy opening hours. The proposed roof terrace to the academy is proposed to be controlled use only for teaching and would again be confined to the academy opening hours. The distance from building face to building face at the closest point is approximately 18m which is a normal distance for buildings to be separated across a street. There would be no material loss of privacy to the properties to the east in Verity Close or Grenfell Tower given the distances and the operation of the building.

#### **4.120 Leisure Centre – Privacy**

There would be no impact on the levels of privacy of the surrounding properties from the proposed leisure centre. It would occupy much of the same footprint as the existing centre, and no windows would overlook any of the surrounding properties in the proposed centre.

#### **4.121 Residential – Privacy**

To the south of the proposed residential block there would be no overlooking as the building to the south is a single storey surgery with no windows. It is also considered that there would be no harmful overlooking of Barlow House from the new residential units as these buildings are set an adequate distance apart (20m) and any loss of privacy would be mutual. This is supported by the reasoned justification in paragraph 34.3.49 of the CS which states that a distance of about 18 metres between opposite habitable rooms reduces inter-visibility to a degree acceptable to most people. The scheme is therefore in accordance with policy



CL5(b) as there would be no harmful loss of privacy to the surrounding properties as a result of the development.

#### 4.122 **Sense of Enclosure**

Sense of enclosure is dealt with in paragraph 34.3.40 of the Core Strategy. The scheme would not cause any harmful enclosure to any nearby property. The proposed academy and residential blocks would front on to streets where there is no existing building, but the buildings would be set far enough away to avoid harm.

#### 4.123 **Noise Associated with Development**

The proposal has been assessed in relation to traffic, noise and parking on the amenity of the surrounding residents. The proposal involves a loss of parking and therefore vehicular movements will be reduced around the site. The removal of the large surface car park off Silchester Road will result in less vehicle movements in the site and as a result less noise and disturbance. There will be some noise associated with the uses, however this is considered to be acceptable and is subject to further conditions as set out in the noise section of the report.

- 4.124 Having regard to policy CL5 and the reasoned justification, there would not be a detrimental impact on the surrounding residents from the proposed development in terms of a loss of daylight or sunlight, loss of privacy or sense of enclosure so as to materially worsen the existing conditions or put unacceptable burden on the adjacent occupiers.

### 5.0 **PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 1,610 addresses were notified of the proposal in the surrounding area, 5 site notices were erected around the site and the proposal was advertised in the local press. The first consultation period ran from 25<sup>th</sup> June to 20<sup>th</sup> July 2012. A second round of consultation was also made which ran from 22<sup>nd</sup> August to 5<sup>th</sup> September 2012. The applicant has submitted a Statement of Community Involvement (London Communications Agency, May 2012) in support of the application. This document outlines the consultation carried out separate to the statutory application consultation and is appropriate for an application of this scale.
- 5.2 At the time of writing the report 259 written representations had been received. This consisted of 252 objections to the proposals including an objection from the Ward Councillors, 2 letters of support and 3 letters of comments. The support letters stated the following points;

**Strongly support the proposals for an 8 lane 25m**

competition pool, the 20m teaching pool, and the splash area, and believe this is the format which will offer the best solution to range of Leisure Centre users. Although we would have preferred both pools closer together to ease supervision of swimmers during galas, we recognise that there have been other considerations, and appreciate efforts to adjust plans to help ensure sight lines between the two pools.

**5.3 Great proposal for local community.**

5.4 The objections are submitted on the following grounds;

**5.5 The proposed facilities within the leisure centre include the provision of a smaller main swimming pool. The community believes that this is an inappropriate legacy, especially in the year of the London Olympics.**

The size of the proposed pool is an appropriate replacement for the existing swimming pool and is in accordance with the Amateur Swimming Association design requirements. An Olympic sized swimming pool is not considered to be appropriate in this location, and would result in the leisure centre covering the majority of the site.

**5.6 We are reassured that the pool will be suitable to host County level competition. We note the Amateur Swimming Association's "Pool Design Requirements 25m by 8 Lanes" contained at Annex G of the Statement of Community Involvement. The pool design within the planning application has not been worked up in detail. We would like to see, as a condition of planning permission that certain aspects of this guidance be met, namely:**

- Provision of notice boards for Clubs,**
- Storage for Clubs, and**
- Access to meeting rooms.**

**We note that the ASA guidance looks for 250 spectator seats. It was not clear from the planning application how many seats will be provided.**

Leisure Services have stated that a pool which meets Sport England and Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) standards was needed. The ASA also wrote to the Council and are fully supportive of the plans including ancillary facilities like those exactly described above. In order to have galas of a county standard there are certain minimum requirements for example the number of seats. These will be 250 spectator seats provided in the main pool. The new eight lane 25 metre pool 20 metre training pool and a leisure pool will provide the optimum mix of water facilities in the new leisure centre. It would mean a pool



that can provide for teaching at all levels, for fitness swimming, fitness training such as aqua aerobics, distance swimming at all standards and competitive.

- 5.7 **Chelsea and Westminster Swimming Club is aware of large unmet demand for swimming in London. Westminster City Council, who have five public pools, finalised a swim audit in 2010 which confirmed the situation in their borough. Despite minimal advertising (notice boards at Leisure Centres and a website) we have 20 applications for each swimmer vacancy. Because of the demand from other users we have only been able to achieve marginal increases in pool time and then late into the evening and at high cost. The new Leisure Contractor, GLL, has indicated to us and to other sports clubs, both at a quarterly meeting between Westminster City Council and Sports Clubs and at a meeting of Kensington Leisure Centre users on 28 March (GLL's Aquatics Manager and GLL's Development Director respectively), that their preferred method of delivering sports to children and young people is through the so-called "Barnet Model".**

The operation and allocated time for swimming groups is not a material planning consideration. Leisure Services are aware of how successful Chelsea and Westminster Swimming Club (CWSC) are and want to support them in their ambitions.

As a summary the "Barnet Model" is a model developed by GLL with Barnet Council and they have rolled it out at a number of other sites.

The club is run by the operators of the leisure centre (GLL) and acts as follows:

- Swimming club that runs across Barnet
- Swimming Club have no hire fees to pay
- Centre pay coaches (club don't employ)
- There is a committee
- Head Coach sits on the committee
- Club is separate to Leisure Centre
- Centre operates learn to swim and collects all swimming subscriptions
- Centre feeds swimmers into the Club (pathway for excellence)
- Head Coach is employed by the centre and has autonomy on the club
- Centre can track all attendances

GLL have been managing RBKC centres since April 2011 and the current contract ends 31 March 2017. Therefore, the new centre in North Kensington will operate as it does now and there are no plans to run a different swimming club to CWSC. Leisure Services will not be introducing GLL's Barnet model at the new Kensington Leisure Centre.

- 5.8 **None of the local neighbourhood residents concerns have been taken into account about the North-South link. The following issues have been raised at length: this will be used as a cut through creating noise, particularly in the evenings. It will also make it unsafe for the many nursery and school aged children who live in the area.**

The proposed north-south connection has been developed as a shared surface space as discussed in the body of the report. This link will be capable of, one way vehicular movement from Silchester Road to Grenfell Road, but this would be for servicing of the proposed academy and leisure centre, disabled parking for both facilities, and coach/minibus drop-offs. Any vehicular access would be controlled by the use of retractable bollards which would remain up. These servicing and coach drop-offs would be relatively infrequent and would not materially increase noise and disturbance given the existing car park located on the site. Any noise and disturbance from pedestrians would not be materially worse than the existing situation and the route through the site. The shared surface is designed in such away to ensure any vehicles that do travel through the space, do so at a slow speed given the dominance of pedestrians on the link. The amount of vehicles will be limited as outlined above and is unlikely to be dangerous.

- 5.9 **There is no justification for the link to be trafficked on the grounds of safety at night. There is no precedent in K&C for having an access point that is closed during the day and open at night and the residents have no wish to have one.**

Vehicles will not have free access on to the link, and vehicles will only be able to pass through the site if for servicing, coach/minibus drop offs or the use of the disabled spaces. Outside the hours of the academy and leisure centre this route will not be accessible.

- 5.10 **People will no doubt believe they can get access even when it is closed which will increase the traffic flow through the area.**

As stated above, access will not be possible beyond the hours of the academy and leisure centre. Therefore the traffic flow through the area will not increase.

- 5.11 **Concerns about the management and use of the north-south route across the site. This route should only be used for access to and servicing of the Leisure Centre and Academy and for use by emergency vehicles. It should not be available at anytime as a through route for motor**



**vehicles but should be designated as a cycling and pedestrian thoroughfare.**

As discussed above this is the Council's intention. The submission of a traffic management plan for this link is a recommended condition (Condition 8).

- 5.12 **The opening of this route will inevitably lead to a high level of usage, especially at peak periods as drivers seek to avoid delays on other parts of the road network. Vehicle movements will create conflicts with residents within the area and may also be a danger to students arriving at school during the morning peak period.**

As discussed above the link would be controlled access only, and therefore could not be used as a cut through.

- 5.13 **It is recognised that efforts have been made to design the road so that vehicle speeds can be controlled, but in reality, drivers seeking to avoid delays elsewhere will not be discouraged from using this route.**

As above.

- 5.14 **The new route will also result in the loss of further green space.**

The proposed route largely follows the existing route through the large hard surfaced car park down the paved area to Grenfell Road. The link is being widened slightly to achieve a more civic space worthy of the buildings and an improved pedestrian environment.

- 5.15 **The academy will create a natural amphitheatre with all the noise of a school directed towards Grenfell Tower. Such noise will undoubtedly be detrimental to the amenities of residents. Residents have raised the need to provide double glazing to mitigate against external noise, the presence of the academy would seemingly reinforce this need for those residents within Grenfell Tower, Verity Close, Whitchurch, Blechynden, Grenfell and Barandon Walks.**

There are concerns raised in relation to the noise from the academy. This is likely to be concentrated at certain points of the day, largely at playtime (recess). As discussed in the body of the report, conditions are recommended to secure further noise survey information to show that there would not be harmful. It is also pointed out that the noise from the playgrounds and terraces excluding the proposed MUGA would not be accessible beyond the opening and closing times of the academy. It is pointed out that

the Council has allocated funds to refurbish Grenfell Tower, replacing the existing windows and heating system. This application has currently been submitted (PP/12/03163) and if approved would significantly reduce noise levels experienced in Grenfell Tower. Mitigation is not sought for the other blocks mentioned as there would not be a material impact in terms of noise.

- 5.16 **Concerned at the noise levels for residents at Nottingwood House directly to the south east of the leisure centre. The inner courtyard of Nottingwood House is a horseshoe shape which captures sound generated from the surrounding area causing it to reverberate and amplify which is made worse by the single glazing on all windows for each residence.**

There would be no material increase in noise levels to the properties in Nottingwood house from the proposed leisure centre over the existing.

- 5.17 **The noise from the existing MUGAs on Silchester Road is very intrusive for residents on the estate and is a particular issue in the evenings. It is therefore essential that the use of the new raised MUGA that is being constructed as part of the Academy has controlled hours of use. A condition limiting its use to the hours of 8:30-18:30 Monday-Friday and 10:00-18:30 at weekends should be employed to achieve this.**

The proposed MUGA located on the roof of the western wing of the academy is to be available for community use. This will have a secure controlled access unlike the existing MUGA courts which can be broken into well past the official hours of operation. It would be unreasonable to set the hours of operation to 18:30 on weekdays given that this would allow community use for a few hours only beyond the hours of the academy. A condition is recommended to restrict the community use of MUGA to 22:00 which is as in the existing situation. A Community use plan is also required as part of a separate condition to be submitted and agreed (Condition 31).

- 5.18 **The existence of an Academy will mean more youths will congregate around the area, creating more tension, unease and crime. Just look at the Westminster Academy built on Harrow Road, the streets surrounding the Academy weekdays and many weekends are populated by youths loitering around; and many of the locals avoid the area as they feel unsafe. That will also happen in this area if this plan goes ahead. It is probable that the lack of a boundary will attract problem gangs. The school is likely to become a honey pot for rival gangs.**



Whilst crime is a material planning consideration, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed scheme will lead to an increase in crime and anti-social behaviour in the area as stated in the SPD.

- 5.19 **The academy has a capacity of 1140 students, yet only very limited open space is included within the boundary of the school. This comprises a terrace, small playground and MUGA. It is clear that this level of recreational space is grossly insufficient for the needs of so many children. The limited capacity of such spaces means that children are likely to occupy these spaces on a 'rota' basis meaning that noise emanating from these areas is likely to be present throughout most of the school day.**

The academy proposals provide approximately 3,271 sq.m of outside space including the MUGA. BB98 (Building Bulletin) offers guidance for size requirements for new secondary schools. Urban (confined) sites have differing guidance than more generous sites (particularly in the provision of playing fields) and the guidance has been a determinant for the design of the Academy. As with many urban sites, the proposal is derogation from the requirement as there is no way it can be fully met. In particular it does not meet the requirements for external playing fields but this is noted in the BB as a likely derogation in urban sites. Provision is however made in the MUGA and the informal kick about area at lower ground level.

- 5.20 **The location of the MUGA on the 3rd floor of the academy is likely to be detrimental to the amenities of residents as a result of the visual impact of floodlighting for the facility.**

The proposed floodlighting for the MUGA is subject to a recommended condition. As discussed above, as the MUGA will have a secure access point, the use of the MUGA will be controlled and will not be in use later than the current MUGA courts are supposed to be open to. Therefore the situation is to be no worse than existing.

- 5.21 **The proposed leisure centre would have its main entrance on its western frontage, there are concerns that this arrangement would lead to additional impacts upon the residents of Treadgold House.**

The main entrance to the proposed leisure centre is a considerable distance from Treadgold House at approximately 35m at its nearest point. There is an existing path that runs around the boundary of Treadgold House which is used in connection with the existing leisure centre. The proposed leisure centre entrance is likely to result in higher levels of pedestrian movements on this

route; however further landscaping is proposed against the boundary of Treadgold House to provide a buffer for noise and disturbance. It is not considered that there would be a material increase in noise disturbance from the proposed leisure centre.

- 5.22 **There is widespread concern within the community about the impacts of the construction should the planning application be approved. There are particular concerns in relation to: noise during construction, dust generation, vibration, traffic flows, particularly HGVs, management of contaminated land or materials within the site.**

As part of the planning obligations for the site the applicant is required to submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan which would include the traffic flows of HGVs etc. Associated with the build. As discussed in the body of the report a Construction Environmental Management Plan is recommended to be required by committee (Conditions 11, 12 and 17). This plan would seek to mitigate the dust generation, vibration, nuisance and disturbance to the surrounding properties.

- 5.23 **This large scale project being so close would cause a far greater disturbance and would destroy the residential aspect to this neighbourhood.**

The replacement leisure centre is located on the footprint of the existing leisure centre and would cause no further impact on the residential aspect than the existing. The proposed residential block and the academy building both sit on the street frontages and are of an appropriate height, scale and bulk that would not have an adverse impact on the residential aspect of the neighbourhood.

- 5.24 **The building of more residential units on Bomore Road will increase the density of residential occupation to undesirable levels and impact adversely on the local environment.**

The proposed residential block would provide 32 units of accommodation. This would not increase the density levels of the area to undesirable levels.

- 5.25 **The presence of large secondary school will further change the nature of this area for the worse, making it generally much busier, noisier and more crowded. It is currently a tranquil backwater. The presence of the proposed school will change its character dramatically.**

Half of the overall site is occupied by a large public building in the form of the existing leisure centre. The remaining half has been assessed as part of the adopted planning brief and is considered



appropriate in this location. Mitigation for many of the impacts of the proposed academy fall within recommended conditions. The character of the area is likely to change; however this is considered to be acceptable.

**5.26 The proposed site to build the new Academy at the heart of Lancaster West Estate is just not suitable**

As stated in the body of the report the land designation for a new Academy on the proposed site is part of the policy framework of the borough in the Core Strategy and has been adopted following an examination in public and the document was found sound. This policy is further supported by the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre Planning Brief (SPD) which was adopted by the Council on the 16<sup>th</sup> May 2011.

**5.27 The plans contain too many variables to be left to later 'officer' decisions or further applications.**

When considering an application of this scale there are many variables that are often left to later decisions which are controlled through the use of planning conditions which is acceptable.

**5.28 Security issues on the estate must be resolved before any planning permission and be integrated into any application and permission.**

The existing security issues on the estate do not form part of the application; however the application proposed for Grenfell Tower and surrounding areas submitted does take these issues into consideration, but this has no bearing on this current application and has not been determined.

**5.29 The Council failed to consult properly in creating the core strategy policy that it is relying on for this application.**

As above, the correct procedures were followed in the adoption of the policy CA4 of the Core Strategy.

**5.30 There is too much variance from the various consultation documents and even the Core Strategy; and there have been too many promises and assurances made by or on behalf of the Council that are not fulfilled in this application.**

The proposals largely accord with the planning brief for the site apart from CA4(d) with the omission of the CCHP plant which has been justified.

**5.31 There have been no notices up at the all weather pitches.**

Five site notices were erected around the site for the first round of consultations.

- 5.32 **The community considers that the proposals will reinforce the feeling of social segregation within Lancaster West as the development is strongly opposed by the community.**

The proposed academy will not cause a further feeling of social segregation of the area and is more likely to create more of a community with children from the local area able to go to school within the vicinity of their homes. There is no evidence to suggest that this will occur. The introduction of the residential block within the scheme provides private units in an area mainly occupied by social housing. This will assist in creating a mixed and balanced community.

- 5.33 **The leaseholders of Grenfell Tower are opposed to the proposals as they feel that the development will have a detrimental effect upon the value and saleability of their properties.**

This is not a material planning consideration in the determination of the application.

- 5.34 **The plans breach Core Strategy policies on open spaces and residential amenity.**

As discussed in the body of the report there is no harmful loss of amenity as a result of the proposals and the loss of open space is limited but is balanced against the holistic good of providing a new secondary school and replacement leisure centre facility.

- 5.35 **The sports centre is fine and should be left as is. The development will be an enormous disruption for all the disabled and non-disabled people that are using the sport centre now. Despite its age it is still very much the leisure centre to go, if you live in the area. A lick of paint, updating certain aspects and maybe extending certain areas of the building; and it will serve the community for many years and what is more be a money making business.**

The proposed replacement leisure centre is the subject of the application. The existing facility is not adequate to meet the needs of modern facilities, is poorly accessible and expensive to maintain. The proposed leisure centre will provide excellent facilities for the future.

- 5.36 **The leisure centre is a lifeline for many people, including**



**partially disabled and middle aged. Its loss is immeasurable and the wait of three years for a new one is likely to result in many elderly users being highly incapacitated.**

The loss of service is unfortunate and regrettable; however the closure is for a temporary period. The complete closure of the centre and rebuild in one development is much faster than rebuilding whilst keeping the existing centre operational. Those affected by the service closure include, clubs and other local voluntary groups, schools and colleges, individuals (members and casual use), other RBKC Services (for examples, Leisure Services' Active for Life programme and Youth Services sports development activities) and GLL Staff. With the assistance of the building contractors Leadbitters and a planned exit, each of these groups are being looked at with the aim of supporting them through this time of upheaval and loss of service. For examples, current members will be able to transfer to other GLL run venues in neighbouring boroughs and all existing staff will find employment at their other GLL sites for the duration of closure. In addition, Leisure services have consulted with current and potential users of a new leisure centre. For example, one of the Public Realm Scrutiny Committee's Working Group key recommendations is that the borough's leisure facilities "meet the needs of people with restricted mobility and other disabilities, throughout the centre not just parts of it." They spoke at length with user groups including those representing local disabled people and also disabled people. Also, the Kensington and Chelsea Community and Physical Activity Network (CSPAN) have a dedicated sub-group for disabled people and disability issues. Again the new leisure centre has been a key agenda item at its meetings. Local organisations such as Action Disability Kensington and Chelsea have been invited to our public consultations events. We are proud to support local clubs such as Emperors Swimming Club, who teach swimming to disabled people regardless of age or disability. Leisure Services also work closely with local organisations like Age Concern and Open Age who work with our older local residents in providing opportunities. For example, Open Age established in 1993, is a user led charity working across Kensington, Chelsea and Westminster enabling older people, from 50 to over 100 years of age, to sustain their physical and mental fitness, maintain active lifestyles and develop new and stimulating interests. The charity provides a wide range of physical, creative and mentally stimulating activities to enable older people to develop new skills, fulfil their potential, and encourage social interaction, thus helping reduce loneliness, isolation and depression. Over 200 weekly activities are provided from more than 50 sites, which include the Positive Age Centre in North Kensington, the Open Age Hubs in North Westminster as well as local community centres, sheltered housing, church halls and libraries.

- 5.37 **Playfiveaside objects on the grounds of the Loss of sports facilities for all ages. Currently there are 3 pitches outside and an indoor hall we use all these facilities across Monday-Sunday for various programmes. Our Wednesday programme features children trying to get back into netball and stay fit. Our Monday evening programme features netball and football for adults. Finally on Thursday nights we run competitive leagues. With Westway the only close by location operating at full capacity it is a loss of business as we cannot easily transfer all out bookings and over 200 people will be affected by this change. Each one of our members will be relocated and look to play elsewhere not necessarily with us and no suitable alternative in place. This not only damages our business but also wastes all the money originally spent into marketing the venue and attracting customers to come and play. All that is needed is a slight revamp there is no need for demolition and restructure.**

As discussed in the body of the report, the 3 MUGA pitches have been provided at the Westway sports centre (2 pitches) and the MUGA for community use as part of the academy. There is no loss of MUGA floorspace. The proposed leisure centre includes a sports hall which can be used. The loss of these facilities in the construction period is unfortunate, but is essential.

5.38 **Loss of squash courts**

Two squash courts are reprovided in the proposed scheme at basement level.

5.39 **Potential loss of boxing club (from base of Grenfell Tower)**

This does not relate to the current application as Grenfell Tower is not included. It is pointed out that the current application submitted for Grenfell Tower which has not yet been determined includes the reprovion of the boxing club.

5.40 **Inferior disabled access to the main and secondary halls with proposed lift-only provision (currently there is both ramped and lift access, and much better ramped access could easily be provided in the existing leisure centre.)**

The proposed leisure centre will have improved access facilities over the existing as a brand new facility.

5.41 **The closure of the sports facility for two years during re-development will mean the destruction of a number of established clubs and informal groups and deprive residents and workers of health giving sports facilities.**



**The existing sports centre could be refurbished and added to without closing and for much less money.**

Refurbishment on the scale of providing a like-for-like facility would still involve closing the leisure centre for up to twelve months. New builds therefore provide a more cost effective construction option. The Council wants to see minimum disruption to the service and to local residents' lives. Therefore, strong assurances are being sought from the appointed building contractor Leadbitters, about the centre reopening as soon as possible. The Council want to continue to support the local voluntary sector and to have a thriving affiliated sports club scene. Whilst the new centre is being built we will work closely with clubs and the operator in order to programme their present level activities into the new facilities.

- 5.42 **The proposed construction programme would mean that there would be no continuity of service and the community would face a lengthy time period when no dedicated leisure facilities were available to the residents of north Kensington, resulting in lengthy journeys to other locations.**

Discussions are well under way with our centre operator GLL on how they can assist current users. GLL operate in London with thirteen other local authorities including Westminster and Hammersmith and Fulham. Three centres are approximately a mile away from Kensington Leisure Centre. These include Phoenix Fitness Centre and Janet Adegoke Swimming Pool which is 1 mile away to the east, Porchester Centre is 1.1 miles away to the north, and the Jubilee Sports Centre which is 1.2 miles away the north). Additionally the new Holland Park School facilities are only 0.7 miles to the south. GLL has experience in handling leisure centre redevelopments and in keeping disruption to service users to a minimum. The most recent example of this is in the London Borough of Lambeth and the new Clapham Leisure Centre. Chelsea Sports Centre will remain open during any refurbishment or rebuilding of Kensington Leisure centre. GLL will also be considering how to facilitate travel to proposed alternative centres.

- 5.43 **There is a lack of access to the site for emergency vehicles. There is concern that the opening of Grenfell Road to all traffic will inhibit emergency vehicle access to Grenfell Tower and Grenfell, Barandon, Testerton and Hurstway Walks.**

The site is required to be fully accessible for emergency vehicles as required by building regulations. As discussed above the vehicle movements on the north-south connection will be limited and will not inhibit emergency vehicles movement.

- 5.44 **There is currently no need for an academy in the local area, and if there were a need a more suitable alternative would be to upgrade existing schools, sixth form colleges etc. Instead of disrupting a community**

There is an established need to provide a co-educational, nondenominational school in the north of the borough. This site is considered to be appropriate for a new school facility and the land has been allocated in the Core Strategy for this use. This was based on an evidence base of education provision in the Borough and was found to be sound in the examination of the document.

- 5.45 **The local consultation exercise by K&C has singularly failed to address the concerns of local residents. The proposed changes will have a major effect on what is a high-density social housing area and I for one find the Council's badly organised public-relations driven exercise has failed in addressing issues of serious concern to local residents.**

The concerns of the residents from various consultation events have been taken into consideration in the submission of the Statement of Community Involvement for the application.

- 5.46 **Why the school could not be built on the land by Sainsbury's at the northern end of Ladbroke Grove, which is very well served by buses and a 10 minute walk from Ladbroke Grove Tube. It's a brownfield site – no one's grass and trees and play and parking areas would be destroyed; no one's leisure centre pulled down; no one's environment spoilt by the daily influx of well over a thousand extra people and many cars. No one's life would be affected forever for the worse.**

As above, the proposed site was allocated for a new secondary school.

- 5.47 **The application is premature, all of the Council's projects in North Kensington should be co-ordinated and not ad-hoc; e.g. the Freston Road, re-arrangement of Grenfell Tower, Kensal Gasworks, the proposal to turn Latimer Road School into flats.**

The site itself is a site of Strategic Importance to the borough. The application has to be assessed on its merits regardless of the timing.

- 5.48 **Provision has not been made to include the boxing club**



**and much needed facilities for other sports using Kensington Leisure Centre such as Gymnastics.**

The proposed leisure centre does not propose facilities for the boxing club as the intention is for this provision to remain in use at Grenfell Tower. Provision has been made for Gymnastics in the proposed leisure centre, however a gymnastics specific space with foam pits is not proposed.

- 5.49 **Loss of flexibility of space within the sports centre. The proposed building is inflexible in terms of space so as not to suit many of the existing clubs, but also as a building and the potential for future alteration and addition.**

The space provided by the proposed leisure centre has been designed in a way to be more flexible than the existing centre. As suggested there is limited scope for alterations and additions; however any proposals would be assessed on their own merits.

- 5.50 **No good argument for the location- there are 8 better sites within half a mile - with which opening could be achieved within timescale.**

As above the proposed site was allocated for a new secondary school within the Core Strategy.

- 5.51 **RBKC have not satisfactorily argued that the breaking of so many planning guidelines is warranted instead of using other sites.**

As above the proposed site was allocated for a new secondary school within the Core Strategy.

- 5.52 **The Council own a purpose built school two hundred yards away, the ex Latimer Road School, that they are proposing to turn into luxury flats; this negates their reasoning for building on the open space of Lancaster Green and its environs and shrinking land available for future sports provision.**

As above the proposed site was allocated for a new secondary school within the Core Strategy.

- 5.53 **No provision of permanent large youth club and community hall facilities; proposed shared use of the sports space means depriving users of sports facilities.**

The proposals do not result in a loss of sports facilities in the borough. The leisure centre has a sports hall for use, as does the academy for community use. There is no loss of this provision.

- 5.54 **Councillors and Officers must justify and quantify their**

**statements that there is extensive support for the school on this site. Indeed the assertion should be independently assessed by a court of law.**

As above the proposed site was allocated for a new secondary school within the Core Strategy.

- 5.55 **RBKC has failed to do a proper environmental assessment, including that it is environmentally unsustainable to demolish perfectly good swimming pools and sports hall; the existing buildings can be adapted to better energy conservation.**

A screening opinion for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was submitted in March 2012 to assess the need with a more detailed plan for the development. This was assessed in conjunction with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 and in this case was not deemed to be an EIA development for the purposes of the EIA regulations.

- 5.56 **Possible loss of funding or missed deadlines is not a planning reason for granting permission.**

The planning application has been assessed on its merits. Funding and missed deadlines are not material planning considerations.

- 5.57 **The community feels that the development of the academy brings no real benefits to the community and that it is being imposed upon it without proper discussion or public involvement, especially during the earlier stages of the project when the site was identified within the Council's emerging LDF Core Strategy.**

As above, the proposed site was allocated for a new secondary school within the Core Strategy and was found sound at the examination in public, and was adopted. The location of the school is therefore policy compliant.

- 5.58 **Chelsea Academy now needs additional classroom space which has led to a further reduction in the amount of recreational space within the school. It remains a possibility that similar developments would be likely at the proposed north Kensington academy.**

This is not a material consideration in the determination of the current application.

- 5.59 **The application states that the academy's educational**



**focus will be in the creative arts and entrepreneurship. While this is not a planning matter, the community believes that the focus of such a major facility (if developed) should be on the attainment of high educational standards in general rather than a 'watering down' to creative subjects.**

This is not a material planning consideration in the determination of this application.

- 5.60 **The community believes that it is not necessary at this time to instigate redevelopment of the leisure centre and that the inclusion of such plans is an attempt to deflect attention from the unacceptable impacts that would arise from the construction of the academy. The proposal would mean that any new leisure centre would be the third such building in the area in the past 50 years and that this does not represent a prudent use of Council resources.**

The application before the Council has been assessed on its merits and complies with development plan policies and site specific guidance contained in the SPD

- 5.61 **The mature trees and green area are absolutely of great importance to the local area. The area has a need for such spaces to provide an option for the older residents to walk and relax, for families to enjoy the outdoors without going far, nesting for birds and breeding areas for squirrels.**

The Local Planning Authority is in support of these comments. In the body of the report it is considered that the proposed landscaping to the site will improve the environment for the users of the space. The open space will be much more useable and of high amenity value and quality.

- 5.62 **The building of a school on the land at Lancaster Green will destroy a very valuable and well used area of pleasant green space in a locality which is densely populated and otherwise lacking in grass and trees. It will basically destroy the current green, pleasant and tranquil nature of the area, and leave many people without a heart lifting view, and space to sit and walk and play. Those most affected will be the residents of the flats immediately adjacent to the area, but many other local residents.**

As above.

- 5.63 **Loss of established trees. Trees are not disposable. Planting new young stock is not a replacement for established planting many decades old. This includes those along Bomore Road/Walmer Road and any on**

**Silchester Road removed for coach parking. The majority of the trees are to be removed plus most of the shrubs; this massive loss is not acceptable.**

As discussed in the body of the report, although there is a loss of a substantial amount of trees to the site, these are largely of low quality. It is proposed that a large proportion of new trees are to be planted as part of the proposals. The application has been assessed by the Council's Arboricultural Officer who is satisfied with the proposals.

**5.64 Loss of established habitat. The existing habitat is mature and home to an interesting variety of wildlife.**

The application has been assessed by the Council's Biodiversity Officer and Natural England. There is no evidence of bats on the site, and breeding birds have been provided for in the documentation. A condition is recommended to secure the required mitigation to protect the wildlife present on site (Condition 6).

**5.65 Turning Lancaster Green from a peaceful space for residents into a busy thoroughfare with 1200 academy pupils plus staff and deliveries and school events, moving the entrance to the sports centre and its 1000 plus users to Lancaster Green; disrupting peace at Treadgold and Barandon and Grenfell Tower Flats. Opening Lancaster Green up to encourage foot/cycle traffic across it in all directions.**

Lancaster Green is a public open space and therefore is open to all. The proposal has been designed to ensure that the space is active to provide safety to the users. Whilst there may be an increase in the number of users of the space, this is not a negative impact in terms of the area.

**5.66 Poor quality proposed landscaping.**

The proposal includes a high quality level of landscaping that would be a significant improvement over the existing situation. A condition is recommended to ensure this high quality is achieved (Condition 6).

**5.67 The academy and leisure centre have multiple entrances along the southern edge of both structures. These will completely dominate the green-space/ open-space and will have a serious negative impact on residential amenity in that whole area. As a consequence, Lancaster Green will no longer have any residential amenity value as the open space appears to be designed and laid out to serve the needs of academy and leisure centre users rather than**



## **local residents.**

As above. In addition the proposed landscaping remodels much of the unusable space in the existing situation to high value useable amenity space, which would be open to residents of Grenfell Tower.

### **5.68 The proposed development will reduce the amount of open space available within the Lancaster West estate.**

As discussed in report there is no loss of formal open space including Lancaster Green and surrounding area. There is an overall loss of public realm with an increase in hard landscaping. This loss is limited and there is sufficient remaining, and is balanced against the holistic good of providing a new secondary school and replacement leisure centre facility and creating more useable amenity space of high quality.

### **5.69 The plans disregard the Secretary of State's Guidance on Open Spaces.**

Paragraph 74 of the NPPF relates to Open Space provision. In this proposal there is no loss of formal open space, there is an increase in accordance with this guidance, and the replacement would be better provision in terms of quality.

### **5.70 The plans breach The London Plan and disregard the Mayor of London's Guidance on provision of open space and play space.**

Policy 7.18 of the London Plan advises Local Planning Authorities to resist the loss of protected open space. To begin with the area of green space on the site is not protected open space. The majority of the green space on the site forms soft boundary treatments. There are some areas of useable open space that could be classified as pocket parks (Table 7.2, London Plan, pg.234). The proposal looks to improve these pocket park areas, by landscaping them and increasing the size to create more useable space. It is acknowledged that there is a loss of public realm overall from the site which includes the un-useable boundary treatments as discussed above. The proposals therefore do not disregard the guidance.

### **5.71 Parking in the area will diminish; together with an overcrowding of the current public transport during peak times.**

No objection is raised to the loss of parking proposed as this would result in more visitors to the leisure centre walking or using other transport modes.

- 5.72 **Not convinced that the parking spaces that will be created kerb side in Walmer Road and Bomore Road are sufficient to meet the demand from Leisure Centre users. Whilst they are sufficient to replace the spaces in the car park at the front of the current Leisure Centre they take no account of the loss of car parking from the rear of the current Leisure Centre. There is also no provision on site for parking coaches. The additional coach movements that this will generate on quiet residential streets is unacceptable and an alternative means of providing for coaches must be sought.**

As above, the level of parking proposed is considered to be at an acceptable level for a leisure centre. 2 Coach parking bays are provided on Silchester Road. These bays allow the coaches to be on the main transport network around the site. There is likely to be a number of coach movements through the site resulting in some movements on streets to the south of the site, but this would be limited.

- 5.73 **The KALC Transport Assessment reviews car use of direct leisure centre employees and of services, but does little to explain why the proposals achieve an "appropriate balance between new development and car parking provision" (London Plan 6.13). The Core Strategy Acknowledges that the Leisure Centre facilities are "very popular" whilst the Transport SPD acknowledges that provision must be made for "those with special mobility needs".**

No objection is raised to the loss of parking proposed as this would result in more visitors to the leisure centre walking or using other transport modes.

- 5.74 **We do not believe that the parking spaces proposed (7 spaces to serve both the Academy and Leisure Centre and 21 dedicated on-street spaces) are sufficient, and would urge the Council to review the provision. We would be very happy to work with the Transport Consultants to help identify the likely needs of families using the centre particularly after school. 1. Families, particularly with younger children, can find public transport difficult, and might be considered to have "special mobility needs". None of our weekdays sessions, even for 4 year olds, start before 18.00 and sessions continue through to 21.00. Although environmental arguments are understood, parents priorities will be to get children home quickly on a school night, and at an hour when bus and tube frequencies are reduced. . This will apply to other Centre users, including families who access after school swimming lessons and those pursuing other sports.**



**2. Teenagers are wary of travelling on their own on public transport after the evening rush. They also have to juggle dinner, homework and sleep so their parents are likely to pick them up by car particularly in the winter.**

**3. It is difficult to access North Kensington by either bus or tube from many part of the borough, particularly the south.**

**4. On Club night we can have as many as 8 staff and 2 volunteers. We would expect them to use cars in the same proportion as evening Leisure Centre staff. Several use motorcycles, yet there was no mention of motor-cycle parking in the proposals.**

**5. The Pool is being built to County competition standard and will be used for galas. Visiting teams, whether schools or Clubs are likely to bring coaches or mini-buses, and spectators may drive. The report is unclear about the provision for coach parking.**

**6. The Transport Assessment does not appear to consider after-school community use at the Academy, although this is a growing trend. (For example, class and meeting rooms and even music practice rooms are for hire at the new Pimlico**

**<http://www.pimlicoacademythevenue.org/>)**

**Academy**

**Some**

**activities may generate significant parking.**

No objection is raised to the loss of parking proposed as this would result in more visitors to the leisure centre walking or using other transport modes. Coach parking and drop-off points have been proposed.

- 5.75 The new residential development on the corner of Bomore Road and Walmer Road has an underground car park but that its capacity is insufficient to cater for all the properties in the block. In order to prevent additional parking stress in the surrounding streets I would ask that the development be designated as permit free such that residents of it would not be entitled to apply for residents' parking permits.**

The units in the proposed residential block are subject to a permit free obligation. The Council's parking standards allow of only a percentage of parking spaces for the overall total.

- 5.76 The construction of the academy will result in the loss of the Silchester Road car park which provides car parking for leisure centre users and residents. The community objects to the loss of this car parking and wishes to see appropriate reprovion of car parking spaces.**

No objection is raised to the loss of parking proposed as this would result in more visitors to the leisure centre walking or using other

transport modes. Coach parking and drop-off points have been proposed.

- 5.77 **There will be a loss of sunlight/daylight to many surrounding homes. Completely unacceptable also, in an era of saving energy this is very serious consideration to have in mind.**

As discussed in the amenity section of the report, there will be no harmful loss of sunlight or daylight to the surrounding buildings that would materially worsen the existing situation.

- 5.78 **The proposed building structures will overlook the residents of Grenfell Tower and will have a loss of sunlight and daylight.**

There will be no material loss of sunlight or daylight to Grenfell Tower.

- 5.79 **The design of the building is unacceptable and completely out of keeping with the rest of the area. The site is just too small for the school alone.**

The designs of all the buildings have been carefully considered in the body of the report are acceptable. The blocks have appropriate height and bulk to mitigate against any impact to the surrounding buildings and create new street frontages. The architecture in the area is varied but is largely residential housing. The architectural approach for the proposed academy and leisure centre as civic buildings is appropriate. The site has been allocated for the provision of an academy and is considered to be an appropriate size.

- 5.80 **The site is too small and will result in a poor education experience. The proposal crams the school into a very tight space and even has to close off Station Walk.**

The size of the academy and its facilities are in accordance with BS98 and the SPD. The closure of station walk is unfortunate but is necessary as the area left between the building and the boundary wall would create a dangerous space. The decision was therefore taken to close this footpath.

- 5.81 **The academy should be a centre of excellence but will be cramped and inadequate - the councillors will be tarred with this bad proposal forever.**

The size of the academy and its facilities are in accordance with BS98 and the SPD

- 5.82 **The proposed architecture for all three buildings is of poor**



**quality and is unbelievably ugly, and out of keeping. It does not deliver landmark quality buildings as stated by the Council.**

As discussed in the body of the report, the architecture of the academy and leisure centre is acceptable for two buildings of a civic scale. The details and materials for each building are to be secured by recommended planning conditions to ensure the buildings are of a suitable high quality when constructed (Conditions 3, 4 and 5).

- 5.83 The general scale of development of the school is too large for the site. The need to construct a five storey building would seem to validate this assertion. The estate is already densely developed with little open space and these open areas are further undermined by this proposal.**

The scale of the academy building has been carefully considered to ensure that the appropriate floorspace is provided whilst not detrimentally harming the surrounding properties and fitting in with the surroundings in terms of height and bulk.

- 5.84 The community reaffirms its belief that the proposed site is too small to accommodate an academy of this scale; this is evidenced by the fact that the proposed academy is a five storey building with a major element of its recreational provision to be sited at third floor level. The community believes that it will be overwhelmed by this proposal and that there will be severe negative impacts upon the existing community.**

The size of the academy and its facilities are in accordance with BS99 and the planning brief. The proposed site was allocated for a new secondary school within the Core Strategy and was found sound at the examination in public, and was adopted. The location of the school is therefore policy compliant.

- 5.85 The local infrastructure cannot cope with the influx of students. It will create traffic chaos that will threaten pupils and local residents safely.**

There is no evidence to suggest that the local infrastructure cannot cope with the development. The impacts on transport have been considered in the body of the report and the mitigation measures have been identified to be included as recommended conditions or obligations.

- 5.86 The proposal is one of a number of major development proposals and recently completed schemes in north Kensington and its immediate surroundings, including Imperial Wharf, Westfield, Shepherd's Bush and White**

**City. It is felt that the interrelationships between these development proposals have not been fully considered so that their impacts can be managed in the most effective way and to ensure that they deliver the widest possible benefits to their communities.**

As above, the impacts on transport have been considered in the body of the report and the mitigation measures have been identified to be included as recommended conditions or obligations.

- 5.87 The Counter's Creek sewer is already believed to be at or near capacity and a major development of this type cannot be accommodated.**

Further work is required in terms of drainage and Thames Water has recommended conditions to ensure that the development is properly mitigated against in terms of sewer capacity.

- 5.88 The proposals will affect business seriously in the arches as it will be difficult for vehicles and customers to go in or out with vehicles as there will be lorries loading and unloading materials all day long and the fact that there will be heavy machinery everywhere, as well as power and water cuts.**

The construction of the buildings and the impact is not a material planning consideration, however recommended conditions require Construction Traffic Management Plans to be submitted (Conditions 11 and 12), which will provide details of all construction vehicle movements to limit the impact on surrounding residents and businesses.

- 5.89 It will adversely impact upon the Grenfell Crèche and Nursery.**

The proposals will have no impact on the Grenfell Crèche or nursery in the long term as the works to the playground will provide better facilities arranged to be close to these operations.

- 5.90 Loss of street cleansing depot.**

As part of the proposed scheme an application was submitted under PP/12/02110 for the change of use of the former car park to street sweeper's depot, including a new entrance off Clarendon Road, the replacement of existing louvres and new steps. This proposal sought to reprovide the existing depot facilities provided on the leisure centre site within the vicinity and was approved in August 2012.

- 5.91 Concern with out-of-hours use of school facilities by, say,**



**K&C college. This will cause noise, congestion and parking problems in the immediate area.**

A condition is recommended to require a community use plan be submitted in relation to the facilities that will be available to the local community to be assessed (Condition 31).

- 5.92 **I note that there is a stopping up order for the footpath that runs on the west side of the site from Silchester Road towards Latimer Road station. This is a key north-south route for residents and whilst its closure during construction is understood there must be provision for its reinstatement once the construction has been completed.**

The loss of this route is unfortunate, but is necessary to ensure the safety of the residents. Alternative routes are being provided which are equally as direct as this footpath.

- 5.93 **The specialism of expressive arts and inclusion of theatre space will result in performances and the associated noise of audiences leaving and clearing up late into the evening is unacceptable. The associated travel movements, their spilling out onto Lancaster Green, into a currently generally peaceful area for residents, is not acceptable. Given the layout of the site it is not feasible for them to be restricted solely to go from the school to the road as at other schools.**

A condition is recommended to require a community use plan be submitted in relation to the facilities that will be available to the local community to be assessed (Condition 31).

- 5.94 **Poor transport links according to government guidelines and the Council's own assessment and there is no disabled access to the station.**

The transport links are considered in the body of the report.

- 5.95 **Loss of car park for visitors to residents, traders on Portobello Market, customers for Portobello Market, sports centre users, coaches of users to the sports centre, emergency vehicles during Notting Hill Carnival, and minibuses. There is a shortage of suitable car parking in the area.**

The site is required to be fully accessible for emergency vehicles as required by building regulations. As discussed above the vehicle movements on the north-south connection will be limited and will not inhibit emergency vehicles movement.

- 5.96 **The proposed coach parking provision is inadequate- there**

**are often five or six full size coaches present at once here currently.**

This is considered in the transport section in the body of the report.

- 5.97 **The arrival and departure of over 1100 students will undoubtedly create significant impacts on the existing community. While a reasonable network of public transport exists, it is still likely that many parents will choose to drop off or collect their children by private car adding to congestion, noise and pollution around the immediate area.**

This is considered in the transport section in the body of the report. The majority of children will walk or cycle to school, although it is accepted that there will be a limited amount of drop-offs. These will not result in harmful levels of congestion or noise.

- 5.98 **It is likely that an increased number of bus and coach journeys will be made to and from the proposed academy. The loss of the existing car park on Silchester Road will mean that buses and coaches will park and wait on street causing congestion, noise and pollution.**

This is considered in the transport section in the body of the report. Two bays are proposed to be provided for coach parking. In addition coaches can wait off street on the north-south link if dropping off only.

- 5.99 **Additional traffic from surrounding areas already uses Bramley Road and St Mark's Road as short cuts and rat runs and there is an additional concern that the creation of a new through route via Grenfell Road will lead to an increase in rat running that will create additional, noise, pollution and create road safety risks for students and residents, specifically young children, elderly and the disabled.**

As discussed earlier, the north-south link is to be controlled vehicle movements only in a southerly one way direction. This will not result in an adverse increase in traffic levels.

- 5.100 **Loss of three social housing units (the swimming pool flats). This planning application claims that this is mitigated by proposed provision in the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower.**

The loss of the existing social housing provision on site is discussed in the body of the report and is considered to be



acceptable as this type of housing provision is no longer appropriate. The changes to Grenfell Tower are not linked to this application.

- 5.101 **Not meeting social housing provision in private developments; this application contains 35 flats for sale; established requirements are that 25% of those should be social housing i.e. 9 units. The council is failing to meet this.**

The provision of affordable housing in the proposed residential block has been addressed in the body of the report.

- 5.102 **Loss of promised CHP plant to provide affordable heat and power to the estate.**

The loss of the CHP is regrettable as this forms a part of the proposals for the overall heat network for the borough and is disappointing and conflicts with the site specific policy. However the applicants have demonstrated that a CCHP or CHP system is not viable for the scheme. Suitable alternatives have been put forward in the application to provide energy to the leisure centre, academy and residential block

- 5.103 **There is a significant risk of anti-social behaviour by students at the beginning and end of the school day. Many schools put in place procedures to encourage children to leave the school site quickly at the end of the day, but such measures mean that children are likely to congregate in areas just beyond the school perimeter (e.g., around Grenfell Tower and near Verity Close) causing nuisance to nearby residents.**

There is no evidence to suggest that there will be an increase in anti-social behaviour in the area as a result of the academy.

- 5.104 **There is also previous evidence of gang related activity within the general area and it is likely that such problems may increase with the addition of a large group of young people to this general area.**

There is no evidence to suggest that there will be an increase in anti-social behaviour or gang related activity in the area as a result of the academy.

- 5.105 **Sport England Comments**

**Sport England questioned the strategic need for a new four court sports hall within the academy as well and a new eight court sports hall in the adjacent leisure centre.**

The application submitted has been assessed on its merits including sports facilities to both buildings. The leisure centre and academy need to be considered independently. Clearly within any new school there is a need to provide new sports facilities in accordance with the guidance. The size has been designed accordingly taking into consideration the confined nature of the site. First and foremost this is for the school so whether there is a strategic need is less of a consideration; one would not design the school without such facilities. The leisure centre provision has been designed to the brief which has been developed with the Council's Leisure Services and the leisure provider. The provision of playing courts is a standard aspect of a leisure centre development and forms an integral part of the development.

**5.106 There will be no Continuity in sports provision.**

There are three centres approximately a mile away from Kensington Leisure Centre. These include Phoenix Fitness Centre and Janet Adegoke Swimming Pool which is 1 mile away to the east, Porchester Centre is 1.1 miles away to the north, and the Jubilee Sports Centre which is 1.2 miles away the north). Even closer is Westway, 5 mins walk from the site. Additionally the new Holland Park School facilities are only 0.7 miles to the south. The leisure provider, GLL has experience in handling leisure centre redevelopments and in keeping disruption to service users to a minimum. Chelsea Sports Centre will remain open during the rebuilding of the leisure centre. GLL will also be considering how to facilitate travel to proposed alternative centres. We want to continue to support our local voluntary sector and have thriving affiliated sports club scene. Therefore, we will work closely with clubs and the operator in order to programme their present level activities into the new facilities.

**5.107 Sport England request the provision of sports facilities free of charge to the local community.**

A condition is recommended to request a community use plan for the academy outlining the available facilities of the proposed academy for community use (Condition 31).

**5.108 Ward Councillor's Additional Comments**

**We would like to see a commitment that the Council, the Aldridge Foundation and Greenwich Leisure will continue to work with residents once the development is completed and the Academy and Leisure Centre both up and running, to assess the effectiveness of the measures to mitigate the effects of these developments, to rectify any outstanding problems that may remain and to address any unanticipated issues that may emerge.**



This is not a planning consideration in the determination of the application; however conditions have been recommended to mitigate against any amenity harm during construction and once the buildings are in operation.

- 5.109 **Much has been made of the successful development of the Chelsea Academy on an equally constrained site within a highly residential area, but the effects of the Kensington Academy on the residents of Grenfell Tower will be significantly more severe and this is not a useful comparator.**

The application has been assessed on its own merits in terms of the site and its impacts and no comparison has been made in relation to the recommendation.

- 5.110 **Grenfell Tower rises far above the proposed Academy, which will face the Tower, with an outdoor amphitheatre-style playground directly opposite. A rooftop second floor Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) will also be sited directly opposite the Tower. These two play areas will cause significant problems for Grenfell Tower residents, including noise nuisance and floodlight intrusion, particularly during the winter months.**

**Consequently, we urge the planners to require the Applicant to:**

- **include a roof on the MUGA**
- **restrict the hours when the MUGA can be used to exclude evenings and weekends**
- **ensure that all floodlighting is directional to eliminate light intrusion into the dwellings**
- **install acoustic fencing around both play spaces**
- **and "green" the playground, for example by planting ivy or similar on all the walls to reduce the incidence of sound ricocheting from one side to the other and upwards to the Tower.**

The application does not include a roof to the proposed MUGA and has been assessed in this way. Subject to the recommended conditions there would be no material worsening of noise levels. As discussed in the body of the report, there would be controlled access to the MUGA and restricted hours preventing any disturbance from floodlights or noise as a result of the use, any worse than existing.

- 5.111 **We have the strongest objection to the loss of informal outdoor play space and ask the planners to identify some**

**open space that can be set aside as an informal outdoor play space for the Under 15 resident children of the Estate.**

As discussed in the body of the report, the informal playspace discussed in the form of the existing play courts is not actually informal, and is so only because of vandalism resulting in the spaces remaining open. These areas do form part of the leisure centre and are supposed to be booked and paid for. It is inappropriate to label these as informal play space areas. The proposal includes areas to be used for informal play. The new open space to the west of the leisure centre is for this type of activity.

- 5.112 The plans for Lancaster Green should be revisited to identify some dedicated private open green space for the residents of Grenfell Tower.**

Further details for the landscaping have been recommended by condition and this will be taken into consideration (Condition 6).

- 5.113 We wish to see the commitment to eight units of new social rented accommodation in Grenfell Tower written into the planning permission to be assured that this will happen.**

Any proposed units to Grenfell tower are not connected to the current application and cannot be linked for the purposes of determining this application.

- 5.114 The plan for the additional residential element is excessive and out of scale with the rest of the development. If permission is granted, then it should be reduced by at least one storey, since it is higher than the Leisure Centre. It should also be set further back from the road since the block will overlook living and bedrooms in Barlow House opposite, reduce sunlight and daylight and block out the afternoon sunshine that residents of the ground floor dwellings enjoy in their gardens.**

As discussed in the body of the report, the height, scale and footprint of this residential block is acceptable and there would be no material worsening of amenity conditions to the residents of Barlow House.

- 5.115 The road safety and traffic mitigation measures at the junction of Lancaster Road and Silchester Road must be revised and improved.**

This is the subject of a recommended condition (Condition 13).



## **6.0 AAP Comments**

- 6.1 The scheme for the proposed Academy, leisure centre and residential block with associated landscaping was presented to the Architects Appraisal Panel (AAP) twice at pre-application stage. The comments of these panels are appended to the report. The first panel was on the 11<sup>th</sup> January 2012, and the following points were raised;

- The scheme required further work in terms of the contributions of the public realm, especially regarding the north-south link.
- The panel supported the ribbon form of the academy.
- The entrance of the academy could do more to reinforce the new north-south route.
- The panel felt the designs for the leisure centre were under developed and uneasy on the site.
- The panel suggested the leisure centre should front the new north-south link.
- The proposed new housing should address the street.
- The panel were also concerned that the position of the existing sewer was unreasonably driving the designs, and that work should be carried out to explore the possibility of building over or relocating the sewer.

- 6.2 Following this panel, further work was carried out to the site layout especially in relation to the leisure centre which changed its footprint to address the north-south route and the sewer was proposed to be relocated to the boundary of the site. This altered the residential block to front Bomore Road and Walmer Road. Further work to the north-south link was also carried out.

The scheme was then presented a second time in 11<sup>th</sup> April 2012. The following points were then raised.

- The panel were happy with the diversion of the sewer alleviating shortcomings of the earlier scheme's layout.
- The panel were supportive of the design progression most notably the leisure centre.
- The housing was considered to be in a suitable location but had an uncomfortable relationship with the leisure centre.
- Concerns were raised about the boundary fence to the academy.
- Further work required in terms of the north-south link.
- Panel also noted the elevational treatment of the 3 buildings was not flowing as well as it could be.

- 6.3 These comments have been addressed. As discussed in the body of the report the designs are much calmer and sit within the area appropriately. Further work has been carried out to the boundary fence and this now reflects the architecture of the academy. The north-south route has also been refined further and will make an attractive space of high quality for pedestrians

and cyclists.

## **7.0 CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 In conclusion, the principle of the proposed academy on the site with a floorspace of 11289.5 sq.m and with its own sports facilities complies with policies CA4(a) and CK1 of the Core Strategy, 'saved' policy SC7 of the UDP and policies 3.17 and 3.18 of the London Plan. The provision of open space in the form of the external MUGA for the academy is also in accordance with policy CA4(c). This provision is supported further by the other facilities that will be available for community use in accordance with the KALC SPD paragraphs 23.2.3 and part of objective 3 in 4.2.1 and 'saved' policies SC8 and LR4 of the UDP, and policies 3.18(E), and 3.17 of the London Plan.
- 7.2 The proposal includes equivalent and improved facilities from the existing leisure centre. The proposed leisure centre is also supported by the site specific policy CA4(b) in the Core Strategy and is in principle considered to be acceptable.
- 7.3 The proposed 32 private unit residential block on site is also acceptable. The development provides a suitable mix for the characteristics of the site, and it has been shown that no affordable housing could reasonably be provided on site. The units are in accordance with lifetime homes standards and those set out in the London Housing Design Guide and Access SPD. The proposed residential block is therefore in accordance with policies CH1 and CH2 of the CS and policies 3.12 and 3.15 of the London Plan, and paragraph 5.6.3 of the SPD.
- 7.4 The loss of the 3 existing social housing units on site has been assessed in terms of housing need. These units are considered surplus to requirements and there is no need for their reprovision. The loss of the three units is therefore considered to be acceptable in this case in accordance with policy CH3 of the CS and 'saved' policy H17 of the CS.
- 7.5 The academy has been carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with its surroundings. The building has been designed to be functional, robust and attractive. The academy is a building of a civic scale and though different to the surrounding context in its appearance, the scale, bulk, footprint and building lines, it is acceptable. The design and architecture of the academy building is therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with policies CL1, CL2 and CR2 of the CS, policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and points 5.1.4 and 5.1.10 of the planning brief, subject to the recommended conditions related to materials and details.
- 7.6 The overall design and architecture of the leisure centre is calm



and fits into the context of the surroundings. Again this provides a functional and robust building for the future. Subject to a number of recommended conditions requiring further details, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with policies CL1, CL2 and CR2 of the CS and policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.5 of the London Plan.

- 7.7 In terms of the proposed residential block, it is considered that the height, bulk, scale, footprint and building line are appropriate, providing an enhancement to the existing street scene by creating a new street frontage. Subject to the recommended conditions the residential block is on balance considered to be in accordance with policies CL1, CL2 and CR2 of the CS and policies 3.4, 3.5, 7.1, 7.4 and 7.5 of the London Plan and paragraph 5.6.2 of the SPD
- 7.8 The proposed public realm will create a high quality environment with useable amenity space and an improved pedestrian environment. Subject to recommended conditions to require the details and materials for the landscaping to ensure that a high quality is delivered, the proposed landscaping is considered to be in accordance with policies CR3, CR5, CR6 and CA4 of the CS and policies 2.18 and 7.5 of the London Plan.
- 7.9 In transportation terms the proposal generally reflects the KALC SPD and is acceptable in principle. It is considered that the positive benefits of the overall scheme outweigh the minor issues raised by transportation in relation to the scheme. It is suggested that conditions and obligations are recommended to remove the main objections on transportation grounds and ensure that the scheme is in accordance with policies CT1, CR1, CR2, CR3, CR4 and CR7 of the CS 'saved' UDP Policies TR20, TR21, TR32 and TR44, the Transport SPD 2008 and London Plan Policies 6.1, 6.3, 6.9, 6.10, 6.13, and as a result the scheme is on balance acceptable.
- 7.10 In terms of trees, it is acknowledged that a large number of trees are being removed from the site, the majority being of poor quality. The proposal includes an increased number of trees being replanted across the site which will lead to improvements in the environment. There are some concerns in relation to the larger trees on site but none of these concerns put forward in relation to trees would outweigh the benefits the proposals would provide, and therefore on balance the scheme, subject to conditions relating to the protection of the trees, is considered to comply with policy CR6 of the CS and policies 2.18 and 7.21 of the London Plan.
- 7.11 Whilst it is accepted that there is a loss of public realm across the site, the improvements and increase in the useable open space would provide benefits to the community in qualitative terms as well as quantitative terms, providing improved amenity space.

The remaining areas of hard and soft landscaping proposed as part of the public realm would also enhance the space around the site. It is considered that there would be no loss of formal open space in accordance with policy CR5 of the CS, policy 7.18 of the London Plan, and paragraph 4.2.1(objective 3).

- 7.12 The MUGA pitches removed from site would not result in a loss of sports provision in the borough. Work has already been carried out to provide a replacement 1406 sq.m of MUGA floorspace at the Westway Sports Centre. In addition to this the MUGA proposed as part of the academy will be available for community use providing a further 594 sq.m of external sports space. Subject to a condition to require a community use plan to allow use of the MUGA for the community, to mitigate this loss on site the proposals are in accordance with paragraphs 5.3.13, 5.3.12, 4.2.1(objective 3) of the site SPD.
- 7.13 In terms of the noise levels from the academy, leisure centre and residential units, further information is required to mitigate against harm to the neighbouring buildings and the buildings themselves as outlined above. This information is to be secured by the recommended pre-commencement conditions. Subject to these conditions being complied with, the proposals are in accordance with policy CE6 of the CS, policy 7.15 of the London Plan and the Noise SPD. As stated in paragraph 5.5.2 of the planning brief.
- 7.14 Looking at amenity and having regard to policy CL5 and the reasoned justification, there would not be a detrimental impact on the surrounding residents from the proposed development in terms of a loss of daylight or sunlight, loss of privacy or sense of enclosure, so as to materially worsen the existing conditions or put unacceptable burden on the adjacent occupiers.
- 7.15 With regards to the sustainability aspect of the site, the applicants have demonstrated that the option of CHP or CCHP is not viable as the costs of operation are disproportionate to the emissions savings which are achievable. Suitable alternatives have been put forward, and subject to conditions requiring levels of building sustainability to be met, the proposal is considered to be on balance acceptable in this instance, and in accordance with policy CE1 of the CS, and policies 5.2, 5.3, 5.7 and 5.9 of the London Plan, but is not in accordance with policy CA4(d) and policy 5.6 of the London Plan.
- 7.16 Further comments are made in relation to the proposed specification and coverage of the green roof, the lighting around the site and biodiversity enhancements which are the subject of recommended conditions. Subject to the recommended conditions, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with policy CE4 of the CS and policies 5.11 and 7.19 of the London



Plan.

- 7.17 No objection is raised to the development in terms of Air Quality subject to recommended conditions requiring a low emissions strategy, evidence in relation to the proposed combustion plant, and a Construction Environmental Management Plan to be submitted. Subject to these conditions the development is considered to comply with policy CE5 of the CS, policies 7.14 and 5.18 of the London Plan and the Air Quality SPD.
- 7.18 In conclusion, subject to the recommended conditions the proposal is considered to be acceptable overall and any objections to the scheme can be successfully mitigated against. The proposals are on balance considered to be in accordance with the guidance contained in the KALC SPD and site specific policy CA4 contained in the Core Strategy. The proposals are also in accordance with policy 3.18 of the London Plan which states that proposals for new schools should be given positive consideration and should only be refused where there are demonstrable negative local impacts which substantially outweigh the desirability of establishing a new school and which cannot be addressed through the appropriate use of planning conditions or obligations. In this case the benefits of a school and replacement leisure centre outweigh any minor material impacts that the proposal may have.
- 7.19 In conclusion, the proposal is considered to accord with the Development Plan policies as contained in London Plan, Core Strategy and Saved UDP.

## **8.0 EQUALITIES**

- 8.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 places a duty on public authorities to have due regard in all that they do to the following 3 aims:
- To eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
  - To advance Equality of Opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person's who do not share it;
  - To foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristics and person's who do not share it.

An equalities assessment was carried out at pre-application stage and a further equalities assessment is attached with this report. The main considerations relate to the flexibility of the leisure centre to be able to accommodate the needs of different religious groups/multi faiths, and the disabled parking provision.

## **9.0      RECOMMENDATION**

**(1) Grant Planning Permission subject to a Planning Obligation under S.106 to secure Contributions (apportioned between the residential and non-residential elements) to Health £25,600, Library Facilities £7,828.40, Play space £1,567.50, Open Space Contribution £21,213.33, Air Quality £23,600, Training Contribution £22,000, Construction Training Contribution £38,750, Monitoring Fee £4975.13, Construction Traffic Management Plan £2,800 (per plan), Travel Plan £2,000 (per plan), Transport £350,000, public access to the public domain areas, adherence to local procurement code, Provision of informal street crossings, section 278 works and a permit free agreement for the residential block.**

**(2) DELEGATE to the Executive Director, Planning and Borough Development the authority to issue the planning permission following completion of a S.106 Agreement.**

**JONATHAN BORE  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND BOROUGH DEVELOPMENT**

### **List of Background Papers:**

**The contents of file PP/12/01833 save for exempt or confidential information in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.**

**Report Prepared By:      EJG  
Report Approved By:     AJF/JB  
Date Report Approved:**

**PSC/EJG.REP**

14/09/2012 17:01:57



**Demolition of existing leisure centre and associated sports pitch facilities to facilitate redevelopment to provide a new Leisure Centre of 9,570 sqm (within use class D2), the construction of a new Academy of 12,749 sqm (within use class D1) with associated facilities, the construction of a new residential block to provide 32 units (use class C3) with a basement car park and the provision of hard and soft landscaping across the site with up to 35 on-site and on-street car parking spaces provided. (Major Application)**

### **SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR DECISION**

You are advised that this application was determined by the Local Planning Authority with regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Development Plan policies, including relevant policies contained within the Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework, the London Plan, as well as policies 'saved' from the Unitary Development Plan, and was considered to be in compliance with the relevant policies. In particular, the following policies were considered:

#### **Core Strategy adopted 8 December 2010**

CO1	Strategic Objective One: Keeping Life Local
CO2	Strategic Objective for Fostering Vitality
CO3	Strategic Objective for Better Travel Choices
CO4	Strategic Objective for An Engaging Public Realm
CO5	Strategic Objective for Renewing the Legacy
CO6	Strategic Objective for Diversity of Housing
CO7	Strategic Objective for Respecting Environmental Limits
CP02	North Kensington
CP03	Places
CP09	Latimer
CA4	Kensington Leisure Centre
C1	Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations
CK1	Social and Community Uses
CT1	Improving alternatives to car use
CR1	Street Network
CR2	Three-dimensional Street Form
CR3	Street and Outdoor Life
CR4	Streetscape
CR5	Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways
CR6	Trees and landscape
CR7	Servicing
CL1	Context and Character
CL2	New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications
CL5	Amenity
CH1	Housing Targets
CH2	Housing Diversity
CH3	Protection of Residential Uses
CE1	Climate Change
CE2	Flooding
CE3	Waste

CE4	Biodiversity
CE5	Air Quality
CE6	Noise and Vibration

**'Saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan adopted 25 May 2002**

CD26	Environmentally Poor Land
H17	Resist the Loss of Small Self-Contained Flats
TR20	Resist the Loss of Off-Street Coach Parking
TR21	Coach Movement Restrictions
TR32	Pay and Display Parking Spaces
TR44	Resist the Loss of On-Street Residents' Parking
SC7	Local Education Authority Proposals
SC8	Purpose-Built Education Facilities
LR04	Sports and Recreation Facilities
PU03	Contaminated Land Information

**London Plan Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London adopted July 2011**

2.18	Green infrastructure: the network of open and green spaces
3.1	Ensuring equal life chances for all
3.2	Improving health and addressing health inequalities
3.3	Increasing housing supply
3.4	Optimising housing potential
3.5	Quality and design of housing developments
3.6	Children and young people's facilities
3.8	Housing choice
3.12	Negotiating affordable housing on individual schemes
3.13	Affordable housing thresholds
3.14	Existing housing
3.17	Health and social care facilities
3.18	Education facilities
3.19	Sports facilities
4.12	Improving opportunities for all
5.2	Aggregates
5.3	Sustainable design and construction
5.6	Decentralised energy in development proposals
5.7	Renewable energy
5.9	Overheating and cooling
5.1	Urban greening
5.11	Green roofs and development site environs
5.12	Flood risk management
5.13	Sustainable drainage
5.17	Waste capacity
5.18	Construction, excavation and demolition waste
5.21	Contaminated land
6.1	Strategic approach
6.2	Public transport capacity and safeguarding for transport
6.3	Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
6.9	Cycling
6.1	Walking



- 6.13 Parking
- 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
- 7.2 Geological conservation
- 7.3 London's canals and other rivers and waterspaces
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.5 Public realm
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.14 Improving air quality
- 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
- 7.18 Protecting local open space and addressing local deficiency
- 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
- 7.21 Trees and woodlands
- 8.2 Planning obligations

The material circumstances of the case, including site history, location, and impact on amenities were considered.

In conclusion, the principle of the proposed academy on the site with a floorspace of 11289.5 sq.m and with its own sports facilities complies with policies CA4(a) and CK1 of the Core Strategy, 'saved' policy SC7 of the UDP and policies 3.17 and 3.18 of the London Plan. The provision of open space in the form of the external MUGA for the academy is also in accordance with policy CA4(c). This provision is supported further by the other facilities that will be available for community use in accordance with the KALC SPD paragraphs 23.2.3 and part of objective 3 in 4.2.1 and 'saved' policies SC8 and LR4 of the UDP, and policies 3.18(E), and 3.17 of the London Plan.

The proposal includes equivalent and improved facilities from the existing leisure centre. The proposed leisure centre is also supported by the site specific policy CA4(b) in the Core Strategy and is in principle considered to be acceptable.

The proposed 32 private unit residential block on site is also acceptable. The development provides a suitable mix for the characteristics of the site, and it has been shown that no affordable housing could reasonably be provided on site. The units are in accordance with lifetime homes standards and those set out in the London Housing Design Guide and Access SPD. The proposed residential block is therefore in accordance with policies CH1 and CH2 of the CS and policies 3.12 and 3.15 of the London Plan, and paragraph 5.6.3 of the SPD.

The loss of the 3 existing social housing units on site has been assessed in terms of housing need. These units are considered surplus to requirements and there is no need for their reprovision. The loss of the three units is therefore considered to be acceptable in this case in accordance with policy CH3 of the CS and 'saved' policy H17 of the CS.

The academy has been carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with its surroundings. The building has been designed to be functional, robust and attractive. The academy is a building of a civic scale and though different to the surrounding context in its appearance, the scale, bulk, footprint and

building lines, it is acceptable. The design and architecture of the academy building is therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with policies CL1, CL2 and CR2 of the CS, policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and points 5.1.4 and 5.1.10 of the planning brief, subject to the recommended conditions related to materials and details.

The overall design and architecture of the leisure centre is calm and fits into the context of the surroundings. Again this provides a functional and robust building for the future. Subject to a number of recommended conditions requiring further details, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with policies CL1, CL2 and CR2 of the CS and policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.5 of the London Plan.

In terms of the proposed residential block, it is considered that the height, bulk, scale, footprint and building line are appropriate, providing an enhancement to the existing street scene by creating a new street frontage. Subject to the recommended conditions the residential block is on balance considered to be in accordance with policies CL1, CL2 and CR2 of the CS and policies 3.4, 3.5, 7.1, 7.4 and 7.5 of the London Plan and paragraph 5.6.2 of the SPD

The proposed public realm will create a high quality environment with useable amenity space and an improved pedestrian environment. Subject to recommended conditions to require the details and materials for the landscaping to ensure that a high quality is delivered, the proposed landscaping is considered to be in accordance with policies CR3, CR5, CR6 and CA4 of the CS and policies 2.18 and 7.5 of the London Plan.

In transportation terms the proposal generally reflects the KALC SPD and is acceptable in principle. It is considered that the positive benefits of the overall scheme outweigh the minor issues raised by transportation in relation to the scheme. It is suggested that conditions and obligations are recommended to remove the main objections on transportation grounds and ensure that the scheme is in accordance with policies CT1, CR1, CR2, CR3, CR4 and CR7 of the CS 'saved' UDP Policies TR20, TR21, TR32 and TR44, the Transport SPD 2008 and London Plan Policies 6.1, 6.3, 6.9, 6.10, 6.13, and as a result the scheme is on balance acceptable.

In terms of trees, it is acknowledged that a large number of trees are being removed from the site, the majority being of poor quality. The proposal includes an increased number of trees being replanted across the site which will lead to improvements in the environment. There are some concerns in relation to the larger trees on site but none of these concerns put forward in relation to trees would outweigh the benefits the proposals would provide, and therefore on balance the scheme, subject to conditions relating to the protection of the trees, is considered to comply with policy CR6 of the CS and policies 2.18 and 7.21 of the London Plan.

Whilst it is accepted that there is a loss of public realm across the site, the improvements and increase in the useable open space would provide benefits to the community in qualitative terms as well as quantitative terms, providing



improved amenity space. The remaining areas of hard and soft landscaping proposed as part of the public realm would also enhance the space around the site. It is considered that there would be no loss of formal open space in accordance with policy CR5 of the CS, policy 7.18 of the London Plan, and paragraph 4.2.1(objective 3).

The MUGA pitches removed from site would not result in a loss of sports provision in the borough. Work has already been carried out to provide a replacement 1406 sq.m of MUGA floorspace at the Westway Sports Centre. In addition to this the MUGA proposed as part of the academy will be available for community use providing a further 594 sq.m of external sports space. Subject to a condition to require a community use plan to allow use of the MUGA for the community, to mitigate this loss on site the proposals are in accordance with paragraphs 5.3.13, 5.3.12, 4.2.1(objective 3) of the site SPD.

In terms of the noise levels from the academy, leisure centre and residential units, further information is required to mitigate against harm to the neighbouring buildings and the buildings themselves as outlined above. This information is to be secured by the recommended pre-commencement conditions. Subject to these conditions being complied with, the proposals are in accordance with policy CE6 of the CS, policy 7.15 of the London Plan and the Noise SPD. As stated in paragraph 5.5.2 of the planning brief.

Looking at amenity and having regard to policy CL5 and the reasoned justification, there would not be a detrimental impact on the surrounding residents from the proposed development in terms of a loss of daylight or sunlight, loss of privacy or sense of enclosure, so as to materially worsen the existing conditions or put unacceptable burden on the adjacent occupiers.

With regards to the sustainability aspect of the site, the applicants have demonstrated that the option of CHP or CCHP is not viable as the costs of operation are disproportionate to the emissions savings which are achievable. Suitable alternatives have been put forward, and subject to conditions requiring levels of building sustainability to be met, the proposal is considered to be on balance acceptable in this instance, and in accordance with policy CE1 of the CS, and policies 5.2, 5.3, 5.7 and 5.9 of the London Plan, but is not in accordance with policy CA4(d) and policy 5.6 of the London Plan.

Further comments are made in relation to the proposed specification and coverage of the green roof, the lighting around the site and biodiversity enhancements which are the subject of recommended conditions. Subject to the recommended conditions, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with policy CE4 of the CS and policies 5.11 and 7.19 of the London Plan.

No objection is raised to the development in terms of Air Quality subject to recommended conditions requiring a low emissions strategy, evidence in relation to the proposed combustion plant, and a Construction Environmental Management Plan to be submitted. Subject to these conditions the development is considered to comply with policy CE5 of the CS, policies 7.14 and 5.18 of the London Plan and the Air Quality SPD.

In conclusion, subject to the recommended conditions the proposal is considered to be acceptable overall and any objections to the scheme can be successfully mitigated against. The proposals are on balance considered to be in accordance with the guidance contained in the KALC SPD and site specific policy CA4 contained in the Core Strategy. The proposals are also in accordance with policy 3.18 of the London Plan which states that proposals for new schools should be given positive consideration and should only be refused where there are demonstrable negative local impacts which substantially outweigh the desirability of establishing a new school and which cannot be addressed through the appropriate use of planning conditions or obligations. In this case the benefits of a school and replacement leisure centre outweigh any minor material impacts that the proposal may have.

In conclusion, the proposal is considered to accord with the Development Plan policies as contained in London Plan, Core Strategy and Saved UDP.

The full report is available for public inspection at the Planning Information Office, Ground Floor, Town Hall, Hornton Street, London, W8 7NX.