

**Consultation Statement Made Under Regulation 18(4)(b) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended)**

**Adoption of Planning Brief as a Supplementary Planning Document for the following site:**

- **Planning brief for North Westminster Community School, London W2**

## **1. Introduction**

1.1 In accordance with Regulation 18 (4) (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended) this statement sets out a summary of the main issues that were raised in the representations received during formal consultation on the following draft planning brief which was published as a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD):

- Planning brief for North Westminster Community School, London W2

1.2 This statement also shows how the main issues have been addressed in the revised SPD which the Cabinet Member for Built Environment agreed should be adopted on 17 March 2010.

## **2. Consultation Undertaken in Accordance with Regulation 17**

2.1 In accordance with Regulation 17 (1) (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 the City Council prepared a consultation statement for the draft SPD. This statement was published alongside the draft SPD during the public participation period. Copies can be obtained from the council using the contact details listed at the end of this statement.

2.2 The public participation on the draft SPD took place over a period of six weeks during March and April 2009. The draft SPD, sustainability appraisal report, consultation statement and statement of SPD matters were made available at the following locations:

- One Stop Services, 62 Victoria Street, SW1 (Monday - Friday, 8.30am- 7.00pm; Saturday, 9.00am - 1.00 pm)
- One Stop Services, 317 Harrow Road, W9 (Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, 8.00am – 5.00 pm; Tuesday, 8.00am – 7.00pm)
- One Stop Services, 91- 93 Church Street, NW8 (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday 8.00am - 5.00pm; Thursday 8.00am - 7.00pm; Saturday 9.00am - 3.00pm)
- Website: [www.westminster.gov.uk/environment/planning/ldf/spds/](http://www.westminster.gov.uk/environment/planning/ldf/spds/)

2.3 Press and Site notices were published and a letter inviting consultees to comment on the draft SPD was sent to the following groups and individuals:

- Relevant Councillors;
- Relevant Amenity Societies;
- Relevant Statutory Bodies including Greater London Authority; Government Office for London; Greater London Authority; Natural England; Environment Agency; English Heritage;
- Residents and businesses in the local area and their various representative organisations including the voluntary sector;
- Local Strategic Partnership;
- Local Area Renewal Partnerships;
- Other Council departments;

### **3. Statement of Representations Received**

3.1 Following the consideration by Council officers of the representations received during the public consultation period the draft planning brief was amended where appropriate to address the main issues raised. The revised brief was presented to the 26 January 2010 Planning Sub-Committee (Planning Briefs and Local Development Framework). It was accompanied by a covering report which had appended to it a detailed schedule of representations received which included a commentary by Council officers on the issues raised.

3.2 In accordance with the Sub-committee's recommendations the SPD was forwarded to the Cabinet Member for the Built Environment for him to:

- (a) note and consider the detailed schedule of representations contained in appendices B and C to the 26 January 2010 Planning Sub-Committee (Planning Briefs and Local Development Framework) report and endorse the officers' and Sub-committee's comments on and consideration of those representations and
- (b) resolve that the amended brief be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.

3.3 On 17 March 2010 the Cabinet Member for the Built Environment agreed that the amended planning brief be adopted as an SPD.

3.4 As stated above Regulation 18(4)(b) requires local authorities to set out a summary of the main issues raised in the representations, and how these have been addressed in the SPD. It is considered that the report to the Sub-committee, appendices B and C thereto and draft minutes of that meeting, satisfies this requirement. This report with appendices B and C sets out in detail the main issues raised through consultation and shows how they have been addressed in the amended SPD. A copy of this report and accompanying appendices are therefore attached as appendix 1 and should be considered as part of this statement.

- 3.5 By following the procedures outlined above the consultation on the preparation of the adopted SPD has conformed with the council's Statement of Community Involvement (2007) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004 (as amended). This is in line with the statutory requirements for producing an SPD and is in accordance with the council's duty as a Local Planning Authority.

#### **4. Further Information**

- 4.1 Copies of this statement, the adoption statement and Supplementary Planning Documents are available for inspection at the council's offices and on the council's website at

[www.westminster.gov.uk/environment/planning/ldf/spds/](http://www.westminster.gov.uk/environment/planning/ldf/spds/)

- 4.2 Hard copies can also be obtained by contacting:

**Write to:** City Planning, Westminster City Council, City Hall, 64  
Victoria Street, SW1E 6QP

**Telephone:** 020 7641 2513

**Fax:** 020 7641 3050

**e-mail:** [planninginformation@westminster.gov.uk](mailto:planninginformation@westminster.gov.uk)

# Appendix 1

## Planning Sub-Committee (Planning Briefs and Local Development Framework)

**Date:** 26 January 2010

**Subject:** North Westminster Community School, W2 - Revised Planning Brief for consideration and approval to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Built Environment that it be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.

### Summary

Subject to confirmation that the site is surplus to educational needs, the council intends to dispose of the site of the former North Westminster Community School.

A draft planning brief for this site was agreed for public consultation by the Cabinet Member for Built Environment on 3 February 2009, and has since been updated in order to take account of consultation responses and emerging policies. The updated brief sets out the relevant policies and the site specific issues that any scheme for development would be expected to address.

### Recommendations

1. That the Sub-Committee notes the issues raised through the public consultation exercise on the draft planning brief and endorses the responses made by officers as set out in the schedules of replies to consultation appended to this report.
2. That the Sub-Committee agrees the amended planning brief, as attached at Appendix A, is recommended to the Cabinet Member for the Built Environment for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document for development management purposes.
3. Subject to 1 above, that the Strategic Director Built Environment be authorised to make any further editorial changes or factual updates before publication, or any amendments that the sub-committee wishes to be made.



City of Westminster

## Planning Sub-Committee (Planning Briefs and Local Development Framework) Report

Item No:	4
Date:	26 January 2010
Classification:	For General Release
Title of Report:	North Westminster Community School, W2 Planning Brief for adoption
Report of:	Strategic Director Built Environment
Wards involved:	Hyde Park
Policy context:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ City of Westminster Adopted Unitary Development Plan (January 2007)</li> <li>○ London Plan (Consolidated with alterations since 2004) (February 2008)</li> <li>○ City of Westminster Core Strategy (Publication Draft November 2009)</li> </ul>
Financial summary:	The planning brief will have implications for the capital receipt for the land and for the planning benefits sought with the development.
Report Author:	Tim Butcher City Planning
Contact details	020 7641 5972 <a href="mailto:tbutcher01@westminster.gov.uk">tbutcher01@westminster.gov.uk</a>

## 1. Background Information

- 1.1 A draft North Westminster Community School (NWCS) Planning Brief was agreed for public consultation purposes by the Cabinet Member for Built Environment on 3 February 2009.
- 1.2 Public consultation concluded on 20 April 2009, and the responses are summarised in tables at Appendix B and C, incorporating the officer responses, and the impact of each comment on the brief, if any.
- 1.3 Given the intended sale of the NWCS site by the council, the brief has now been updated to reflect recent developments in local, regional and national planning policies and aims. The brief is attached as Appendix A, and seeks to provide clear advice and guidance for the following purposes:
  - o To inform and advise all interested parties, including public agencies and residents;
  - o To reduce planning uncertainty over alternative uses, which will assist the council with its forthcoming marketing campaign by providing clarity for interested purchasers of the site;
  - o To assist in identifying a consensus on the way forward by allowing comments from interested parties to be addressed through consultation.

## 2. Detail

- 2.1 Given that the NWCS site is likely to be sold by the council after 2010, it is appropriate to ensure the town planning approach to the site is clearly defined. The draft planning brief enabled the relevant planning policies and the council's aspirations for the site to be documented and consulted upon. The brief attached at Appendix A has been amended to bring it up to date with reference to the Core Strategy and other documents within the Development Plan, in addition to amendments made as a result of consultation responses.
- 2.2 A number of consultation responses have been received, as summarised in the tables at Appendix B and Appendix C. Appendix C shows comments made by Imperial College NHS Trust, which have resulted in some significant changes being made to the draft planning brief. The draft was written in the absence of any knowledge of a serious proposal for the site from any social and community user, and therefore promoted a primarily residential scheme, incorporating a proportion of floorspace for social and community uses. In light of the response from the Trust outlining its desire to acquire the site in order to provide a national Particle Beam Therapy Unit, Patient Treatment Centre, and local GP clinic, the Land Use Options section in particular has been revised.
- 2.3 It is clear that in accordance with adopted and emerging Development Plan policies, an application for health uses such as a Particle Beam Therapy Unit, Patient Treatment Centre and local GP clinic would be acceptable land uses in principle on this site, which has an existing lawful community use.
- 2.4 However, other associated uses, such as the proposal for up to 1000 beds of post-graduate accommodation would not be considered social and community uses, nor meet the council's priorities for housing for permanent residents. The brief

makes it clear that under the Core Strategy, beyond accommodating social and community uses for which there is viable demand, the priority will be for market and affordable housing. This accords with both Appendix 1 of the Council's draft Core Strategy, which identifies this as Proposals Site 3, with "Priority to social and community. Residential also likely", and the Housing Land supply assessment, published in the December 2009 Annual Monitoring Review.

- 2.5 The site currently lies outside the Paddington Special Policy Area (PSPA), as defined in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP), although the intention is to include it in a new Paddington Opportunity Area (POA), which was a 'preferred option' in the council's draft Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy. The POA is likely to have similar aims and, therefore, similar policies to the PSPA. The planning brief therefore anticipates this change in designation of the site, but includes a caveat that, should a development proposal based on PSPA policies come forward in advance of the boundary being formally extended, it would have to be regarded as a departure from the UDP. That said, should it meet other policies in the Development Plan, it may not be considered unacceptable in principle.
- 2.6 On 7 July 2008, Cabinet (which considered a report on the future of the site) agreed that the development should be primarily residential in order to meet national and local housing targets. It was also agreed that the ratio of housing should be 70% for private sale to 30% affordable housing, on the basis that a proportion of any additional value achieved could be used to fund more affordable housing in the surrounding area. The revised brief is in accordance with Cabinet's decision and aims for approximately 80% of land permitted to change from community use to be residential. The brief anticipates the site's inclusion in the POA where the lower 30% affordable housing threshold would be acceptable, although, as stated above, should an application for permission pre-date this change, it would be determined with reference to the adopted UDP.
- 2.7 Beyond the priorities for the use of the buildings in any redevelopment of the site, the brief acknowledges that the loss of the existing school would involve the loss of open space used for recreational purposes, and in order to remedy deficiencies identified in this area in the Open Space Strategy, any development will be required to provide a substantial contribution on site to open space.
- 2.8 The Mayor's 2004 Energy Strategy calls for every borough to have at least one 'zero carbon' development by 2010. In February 2008 the Government introduced targets requiring all new homes to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes 3 star rating (Code 3) by 2010, Code 4 from 2013, and Code 6 from 2016. The initial draft brief suggested that a development on this site had the potential to be zero carbon, and that the Code for Sustainable Homes 6 star rating (the highest sustainability rating for residential development) should be the aim.
- 2.9 The brief has had to be substantially revised in terms of its environmental sustainability aspirations. It has become apparent through consultation that the draft brief's aim for a "zero carbon", or Code level 6, development is not achievable on this site, or in Westminster at all in fact. The biggest challenge is providing new development with renewable energy. A biomass Combined Heat and Power (CHP) unit would be the only way of serving a site of this size with

renewable electricity and hot water but the adverse impacts upon local air quality, traffic generation, and the problems associated with sourcing material would make such a facility unacceptable. The brief's aspirations have therefore been downgraded to seeking a development that maximises its scores in each of the nine categories in the Code for Sustainable Homes, with a minimum overall score of Code level 4.

- 2.9 It would be possible to achieve this Code level by powering and heating the development with a gas-fired Combined Heat and Power network (CHP). In accordance with the London Plan and the council's Core Strategy policies, if the site is unable to link into an existing CHP system, the brief now calls for the development to provide a site-wide CHP system that is extendable to provide additional capacity for future users beyond the site. This would satisfy one of the main aims of Core Strategy policy CS3, to provide a district CHP network in Paddington.
- 2.10 The site does not lie within a conservation area and does not contain any listed buildings or other buildings of interest. Whilst it is very unlikely that any of the existing buildings on site will be retained, several healthy, mature trees are worthy of retention. The brief recognises the value of the trees, but the redraft has also recognised that the practicalities of the redevelopment may prevent the retention of all trees of merit. In such circumstances it will be necessary to ensure that the tree replacement scheme will result in no net loss in number.
- 2.11 The site has several constraints when considering a social and community or residential development. The primary one is perhaps the proximity of the Westway and Harrow Road, both busy main traffic arteries. The brief sets out the aims to improve routes across those barriers for pedestrians and cyclists, and to address the problems of noise and pollution associated with the heavy traffic flows.

### **3. Financial Implications**

- 3.1 The brief will have an impact on the site value and, therefore, the capital receipt from the sale of the land.

### **4. Legal Implications**

- 4.1 The amended brief will have material weight in determining applications for planning permission.

### **5. Staffing Implications**

- 5.1 None

### **6. Business Plan Implications**

- 6.1 The planning brief will assist the City Planning Delivery Unit in meeting its business plan objective to work with other agencies on major development initiatives. The planning brief will also contribute to the objective of providing an efficient, responsive, high quality Development Planning service by assisting the

council in meeting its targets for speed of determining applications and ensuring high quality development.

## **7. Outstanding Issues**

7.1 None

## **8. Crime and Disorder Act 1998**

8.1 Under Section 17 of the Act, a Local Authority has a duty “to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area”.

8.2 The planning brief consultation and adoption process affords the council a useful opportunity to work with those with an interest in the land and designers to ensure that opportunities for crime given by the built environment are minimised.

## **9. Health and Safety Issues**

9.1 None

## **10. Human Rights Act 1998**

10.1 None

## **11. Conclusions and Reason(s) for the proposed Decision(s)**

11.1 The Sub-Committee is asked to consider consultation responses and agree that the draft planning brief (as amended by officers in the light of those responses) be recommended for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The brief will become a material planning consideration in the determination of any planning application.

**If you have any queries about this report or wish to inspect one of the background papers please contact Tim Butcher on 020 7641 5972, fax 020 7641 3050, email [tbutcher01@westminster.gov.uk](mailto:tbutcher01@westminster.gov.uk).**

### **APPENDICES**

- A. North Westminster Community School revised draft planning brief and appendices.
- B. Table of consultation responses received, with associated officer comments and recommended changes to the brief
- C. Table of consultation responses received from Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, with associated officer comments and recommended changes to the brief

# Appendix B

Received From	Comment	Officer Response	Change to Draft Brief
<p>1. Lisa Walduck Adviser, Planning and Green Infrastructure Natural England 12 March 2009</p>	<p>a) The document appears to address Natural England's areas of interest and we are therefore generally supportive of the Planning Brief b) We welcome inclusion of paragraphs 111-114 which address biodiversity, in particular the need to ensure that the development makes a positive contribution to biodiversity through enhancements c) We are also encouraged to note that on-site trees will be retained and that the development will incorporate open space which is planted to encourage biodiversity in addition to providing amenity.</p>	<p>a) Welcomed  b) Noted  c) The brief identifies those trees in good condition and seeks their retention, and seeks a contribution to alleviate deficiencies identified in the Open Space Strategy</p>	
<p>2. Patrick Blake Network Operation South East Highways Agency 20 March 2009</p>	<p>The Highways Agency do not wish to comment on the Planning Brief</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>3. Sarah Burgess Senior Planning Advisor CABE 1 April 2009</p>	<p>a) Unfortunately, due to limited resources, we are unable to comment on this document. However we would like to make some general comments which you should consider b) Design is now well established in planning policy at national and regional levels, and LDF's offer an opportunity to secure high-quality development, of the right type, in the right place, at the right time c) Robust design policies should be included within all LDF documents and the Community Strategy, embedding design as a priority from strategic frameworks to site-specific scales d) To take aspiration to implementation, local planning authorities' officers and members should champion good</p>	<p>a) Noted  b) Agreed, WCC's Core Strategy aims "to make Westminster the foremost world class city, with exemplary sustainable design" c) Agreed. This strategic document (planning brief SPD) includes a section on design and townscape d) Agreed. It is hoped the brief will assist in ensuring "good design"</p>	

	<p>design.</p> <p>e) Treat design as a cross cutting issue – consider how other policy areas relate to urban design, open space management, architectural quality, roads and highways, social infrastructure and the public realm.</p> <p>f) Design should reflect understanding of local context, character and aspirations. You should include adequate wording or ‘hooks’ within your policies that enable you to develop and use other design tools and mechanisms, such as design guides, site briefs and design codes.</p> <p>g) CABE guidance is available on our website.</p>	<p>e) The brief endeavours to balance all these issues</p> <p>f) The brief is not ‘policy’ but an interpretation and application of it. Other guidance is referred to throughout where relevant</p> <p>g) Noted</p>	
<p>4. John Richards Associate Knight Frank, on behalf of WCC’s Property Division 8 April 2009</p>	<p>a) The aim of the Property Division is to obtain best value for the City Council by securing optimal planning permission in relation to value, sustainability, community uses, open space and other objectives to facilitate the sites sale on the open market</p> <p>b) The content of the exec summary should be reconsidered in relation to requiring at least 80% of floorspace to be residential; the practicality of requiring the retention of all existing mature trees on site; and the challenges of providing an amenity strip along the northern boundary.</p> <p>c) Para 8: The planning brief should provide greater detail with regard to the policies within the Development Plan (UDP and London Plan (LP)). It should not introduce new policy approaches which do not form part of the adopted Development Plan.</p> <p>d) Paras 10 and 13: Should acknowledge that the site was included in the Paddington Opportunity Area as part of the alterations to the LP adopted in Feb 2008. As the 2008 LP is the most recently adopted document within the Development Plan, any policies in conflict with the 2007</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Should the principle community use be lost, housing (with supporting uses) is the priority for the council; retention of all mature trees not required; greenery to Harrow Road required</p> <p>c) Agreed, although Core Strategy policies are included to ensure all are aware of the forthcoming changes</p> <p>d) Agreed to reference POA, but the LP doesn’t prohibit any particular uses in the POA, rather it encourages housing and job creation. The LP’s POA aims are</p>	<p>b) Executive Summary altered</p> <p>c) Amended to refer to 09 draft London Plan, and Core Strategy</p> <p>d) Para 13 (now in Planning Policy context section) altered to reference the LP</p>

UDP must be given precedence. Therefore, if the proposal were in accordance with policies 2A.5 or 5B.2 of the LP it would not have to be considered a departure from the UDP because, the policies in the 2008 LP would have precedence over, and effectively supersede, those in the UDP. It is proposed the text at para 13 be amended to read:

*“it should be noted however, that in the event that proposals which include uses only expected in PSPA, and uses not allowed in the Paddington Opportunity Area as defined in the 2008 London Plan, come forward in advance of the PSPA boundary being formally extended, they will have to be considered as a departure from the UDP”.*

e) Para 15: The quoted 2400sqm of play space needs to be reconsidered. Only 1238sqm is dedicated to recreation, the other areas are used as car parks.

f) Para 19: Whilst the target should be residentially led redevelopment in the order of 80% gross floorspace, it is important to retain an element of flexibility around this target in order not to impair viability. Suggested amendment: **“predominantly residentially led mixed-use scheme which incorporates alternative uses such as commercial offices, community, hotel and student housing where viable and appropriate”.**

The Property Division and Knight Frank agree with the UDP that “Paddington provides considerable opportunities for office development including major, large-scale buildings which will add to London’s World City role and that otherwise could not be provided in Westminster”, and requests that the overly prescriptive requirement is reconsidered to enable sufficient flexibility and the option

however subject to more general infrastructure improvements at 5B.1. By determination of any application, the Core Strategy will carry material weight. Proposed wording therefore not agreed

e) That parts of the site are sometimes utilised for car parking does not prevent their use for recreation

f) The current council priority is for housing. Paddington today has less need for offices, hotels, student housing etc, and such uses would reduce the ability of the site to contribute to those priorities

e) deleted, and ‘approximately 0.2 hectares put under Open Space

	<p>of delivering the type of commercial building that has made Paddington such an attractive location for large-scale office occupiers.</p> <p>g) Para 20: Amend phrase to acknowledge site specific constraints to <i>“highest standards of <b>achievable sustainable architecture</b>”</i> revise final sentence to read <b>“...the college is using the NWCS site and buildings until 2011 with an option to terminate the lease early subject to giving 6 months notice”</b></p> <p>h) Para 22: the brief should recognise that any affordable business space and/or small business incubator space should be considered a community benefit delivered as planning gain. Potential users of the space should be identified in advance to avoid vacancy. Should also have regard to other initiatives (eg. Alfred Rd; Merchant Sq BOC) to avoid flooding the market</p> <p>i) Para 25: amend to recognise #15 bus to <i>“..located on Harrow Rd, Edgware Rd <b>and North Wharf Road</b>”</i></p> <p>j) Para 28: It is not considered the height range of 22 to 45 metres is applicable in the context of the site (which is surrounded by buildings of between 31 and 120 metres). Suggest if context necessary, change to <b>“there are buildings of varying heights which surround the site within the height range of 31 to 120 metres which establish a challenging townscape context for new developments in the vicinity”</b></p> <p>k) Para 29: As the site has not been tested for its ability to accommodate a tall building having regard to DES3, it is not possible to prejudge whether or not a tall building could be introduced onto the site. The final sentence should either be removed, or amended to <b>“further buildings of</b></p>	<p>g) Agree needs clarification</p> <p>h) Para 18 does that. Any S106 agreement is likely to secure for the council either an option to lease the space at a discount, or take a cash benefit (if no demand)</p> <p>i) Agreed</p> <p>j) The general PSPA context is 40-50m. There are specific exceptions where higher buildings have been justified on the basis of their inherent design quality and specific location</p> <p>k) See above. DES1 (A,4) is also relevant. The brief applies council policy in order to guide development of a planning application. If the brief is</p>	<p>g) “very highest” and “that can be achieved on this site” added. 2011 sentence amended, but now to refer to QK’s 2013 demand in para 19</p> <p>i) deleted and put under public transport section</p> <p>j) changed to 40-50m</p> <p>k) Final sentence amended</p>
--	--	--	--

***such scale should be assessed having regard to the testing criteria set out in UDP Policy DES3***", as work necessary to enable the brief to make the assertion that *"further buildings of such a scale are unlikely to be acceptable"* has simply not been undertaken having regard to the adopted Development Plan and the need, in the context of PPS12 for policy documents to be founded upon a robust and credible evidence base.

l) Para 30: The brief should reconsider its use of the term 'amenity strip', given the quality of space that could be provided along the northern boundary. The requirement for this space should also be reconsidered, as it would mean setting the buildings back further into the site. Clarification is also sought concerning its environmental value, and if evidence cannot be provided *"environmental asset"* should be removed from the planning brief. The brief should also be more explicit regarding the value of retaining the trees on the northern boundary having regard to both their condition and their potential environmental and ecological value. Should be amended to read: ***"any redevelopment scheme may provide an opportunity to introduce a green backdrop to the Harrow Road/Westway corridor through the visual greening of any new buildings"***

m) Para 37 requires a much closer assessment of the actual wording set out in policies 2A.5 and 5B.2, including the need for developments to demonstrate their ability to *"maximize residential and non-residential"* densities.

n) Para 38 Reference to the various studies undertaken by should be removed, as an SPD is not an appropriate document to introduce a new policy approach, such as enhancing a particular transport corridor, without

followed, permission is likely to be forthcoming, but advice in a planning brief is always open to challenge by an application that does not accord with it.

l) Agree to change 'amenity strip' phrase. Trees and greenery are 'environmental assets' as they make visual and biodiversity contributions to the townscape. The suggestion of visual greening will be incorporated

m) Draft LP (and the CS) require densities to be 'optimised' rather than maximised. This brief advocates a high density development when balanced against townscape and other issues

n) Reference to other studies

l) Changed to 'tree buffer zone', and reference made to green backdrop and visual greening

n) reference to

	<p>examination.</p> <p>o) Para 40 See full report by Camco at Appendix 1. In summary, only a biomass system could potentially provide the carbon reduction potential for true 'zero carbon'. Biomass CHP or Biomass heating + solar PV is required to meet Code 5. Given biomass unacceptable for air quality (eg. nearest monitoring station measured 58.6ug/m3 in 2007, and UK strategy objectives are 40ug/m3) and other reasons, suggest on-site requirements are capped somewhere between CSH levels 4 and 5, with a minimum requirement for energy efficiency.</p> <p>p) Para 45 This wording is supported as it promotes a residentially led scheme whilst providing sufficient flexibility to demonstrate the most beneficial commercial/residential split may be.</p> <p>q) Chapter 6 General representations concerning transportation and movement prepared by ARUP, and attached at Appendix 2.</p> <p>r) Para 56 Amend to remove reference to Praed Street and read: "<i>the first is at ground level for pedestrians and cyclists between St Mary's Terrace and <b>Hermitage</b> street</i>".</p> <p>s) Para 58 Basement servicing is not the only way to achieve the objectives of this paragraph. Propose: "<b>servicing should be provided in such a way as to minimise traffic delays on the road networks and to ensure least disturbance from deliveries. These could be at basement levels or within the site perimeter at ground levels</b>"</p> <p>Also see full response by Arup at Appendix 2. [<i>In summary, a separate access/egress directly onto Harrow Road would be of considerable benefit to the site to reduce impact on nearby residents</i>] "In principle" TfL would not</p>	<p>does not imply a new policy approach, but can assist application development</p> <p>o) Agree a Code 6 development isn't currently achievable given biomass unacceptability, although Code 6 will be mandatory by 2016</p> <p>p) Noted. In planning terms the 'most beneficial' would be predominantly housing, should the loss of community use be acceptable, which is stated at para 20</p> <p>q) Noted</p> <p>r) Not agreed, the route is proposed to be through the basin, to Praed St.</p> <p>s) Agree all but the final sentence, as minimisation of ground floor space taken up by building services is preferable, and wording doesn't preclude ground floor servicing.</p> <p>Still await TfL's statement in writing. It may be that all access including parking might be acceptable to TfL, further</p>	<p>Farrell's studies removed</p> <p>o) Requirement changed to require each CSH category to be maximised</p> <p>s) First sentence incorporated</p> <p>Sentence amended to allow TfL flexibility</p>
--	--	---	--

object to such an arrangement. Suggest “**Subject to TfL’s agreement, an access/egress point on Harrow Road may be acceptable for a small number of vehicular movements such as those associated primarily with the servicing of the development**”.]

t) Para 60 The suggestion of a ‘greenway’ should be removed. There is much greater value in building up to the northern boundary of the site, enabling a tranquil, high quality and usable open space within the centre of the site. Suggest “**it may be appropriate to consider a visual ‘greenway’ along the northern boundary of the site**”

u) Para 62 See full response by Arup at Appendix 2. [*In summary*, agree with the requirement to provide a footway and cycleway.]

v) Para 63 The now reconstructed Hermitage St extension is not adopted highway and therefore should there be a need to undertake improvements to this section, it would be on third party land. WCC should look into this matter.

w) Para 66 remove para as the obligation would not be “reasonable” as set out in Circular 05/05. The Property Division take the view that redevelopment on the NWCS site would be unlikely to be refused permission as a result of noise generated by vehicles on the Westway. The Planning Department would need acoustic evidence of unacceptable existing noise levels to impose this obligation.

x) Para 68 Needs amending to say the north-west to south-east desire line being promoted relates to the creation of a cycle route, specific to cyclists only predicated by the introduction of a surface crossing linking Hermitage St with St Mary’s Terrace. The principal pedestrian desire line is likely to run from south-west to

minimising impact on residents

t) Agreed. The addition of ‘visual’ clarifies the meaning of the sentence

u) Noted

v) The highway was adopted in 2005

w) Internal noise levels will need to be demonstrated to be low enough by the developer. Tackling the noise at source isn’t required by the brief, but may contribute towards a solution should internal levels be too high.

x) Not agreed. The se/nw link (and the proposed crossing) is also a pedestrian desire line through Merchant Square. Both routes need to be addressed from a pedestrians perspective, as

t) ‘visual’ added

w) Para 149 reworded, under *Noise*

	<p>north-east.</p> <p>y) Para 69 The phrase “<i>the number of car parking spaces on site should be minimised</i>” is particularly welcome as it accords with the development being a model of sustainability by discouraging the use of private cars by future residents.</p> <p>z) Para 72 amend to read “<i>highest <b>achievable</b> standards of sustainable and inclusive urban design and architectural quality</i>”</p> <p>A) Para 72 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet welcomed as it recognises that the massing of any redevelopment should “<i>respect and integrate with built and permitted developments</i>”. Regard should be had to representations made previously in the context of para 28 and the view that it is neither possible nor desirable due to the diverse building heights surrounding the site, to introduce overly simplistic contextual requirements (such as height baselines). See attached height illustration at Appendix 3.</p> <p>B) Para 72 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet should be amended to remove the requirement for the retention of mature trees to the northern boundary to read: “<i>...including the retention of <b>mature trees to the southern boundary</b></i>”. Regard should be had to the amenity, ecological and environmental value of those trees, and the implications on the quantum and quality of open space able to be located within the centre of the site if the buildings need to be set back.</p> <p>C) Para 72 The 4<sup>th</sup> bullet (80% residential) should be removed</p> <p>D) Para 72 10<sup>th</sup> bullet should be amended to recognise the opportunity of making use of the existing vehicle access located on the northern boundary by adding “<i>if <b>acceptable in road safety terms, Harrow Road</b></i>”</p>	<p>explained at para 67</p> <p>y) Noted</p> <p>z) Agree needs clarification</p> <p>A) Noted</p> <p>B) Agreed</p> <p>C) Disagree. If community use is lost, priority would be housing according with CS33</p> <p>D) Agreed</p>	<p>z) “very highest” and “that can be achieved on this site” added.</p> <p>B) Suggestion incorporated with “and north boundary where feasible” added</p> <p>C) Amended to recognise community demand</p> <p>D) Amended as suggested</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>E) Para 73 Remove 80% residential as before</p> <p>F) Para 75 Recognition that as replacement facilities have been provided, other uses than community can be considered is welcomed, as it accords with SOC1 (E) regarding community facilities that are surplus to the needs of the existing provider.</p> <p>G) Para 76/77 Welcome the recognition that an alternative community facility should be 'needed' by the local community surrounding the site. The property division request the brief promotes sustainable and viable community facilities where there exists a demonstrable need, ensuring a situation does not develop similar to that at Hermitage Walk where the children's nursery had to close due to lack of demand</p> <p>H) Para 79 The content and relevance of this para need to be carefully considered following reps made to the brief by Imperial College NHS Healthcare Trust</p> <p>I) Para 80 Where 30% of on-site affordable housing is being provided, 5% should be for key workers. It is not appropriate for the Council to require a higher proportion of Key Worker housing because SPD's should only be prepared to provide greater detail on policies in the Development Plan.</p> <p>J) Para 83 See comments on para 15. There is no formal 'playspace', and the only area of dedicated outdoor space used for recreational purposes measures c. 1,238sqm. Playspace should be replaced with "<b>outdoor open space used for recreational purposes</b>" to acknowledge there is no playspace, as defined by the UDP and OSS, rather a number of informal open spaces with planting and seating areas. It is not accessible by the public or the community, therefore the introduction OF ANY publicly accessible</p>	<p>E) Disagree, as C) above</p> <p>F) Noted, although demand for an alternative community use has now been ascertained</p> <p>G) Noted, although at Paddington Walk, despite unmet community demand, the associated rents and service charges were too high to enable the provision to sustainably deliver services. Community spaces need to be future proofed and affordable</p> <p>H) Agreed</p> <p>I) Noted</p> <p>J) Although the OSS wouldn't class playgrounds as formal 'playspace', it does also seek informal playspace, and the space at NWCS has had public accessibility at various times, and so has visual and practical amenity value. The site has the ability to contribute to all OSS</p>	<p>F) Land Use section amended</p> <p>H) Section 8 amended</p> <p>I) Affordable Housing paragraph (102) amended</p> <p>J) "Open space used for recreational purposes" used in paragraph 106</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>open space will be addressing localised deficiencies in the context of the OSS. It is not realistic to expect one site to contribute to ALL of the open space related deficiencies in a particular area, and the brief should be revised (by taking out the words 'or all') to accord with the open space and play standards in the Development Plan (SOC 6 and GLA's SPG 'Providing for Children and Young People's Play and informal recreation')</p> <p>K) Para 85 Support this wording</p> <p>L) Para 86 The planning brief may want to promote balconies and roof level gardens over private ground floor open space, having regard to other local developments that don't have that, and the desire to maximise public ground floor open space.</p> <p>M) Para 88 Support the promotion of affordable business space, but request final sentence amended to recognise such a use would be considered part of the proportion of community space required on site.</p> <p>N) Para 90 The brief should be amended to recognise that the final quantum of ancillary retail or leisure floorspace that may be introduced will be informed by a viability assessment taking into account future employee and resident projections.</p> <p>O) Para 92 Reconsider final bullet, as Heathrow expansion and Crossrail are likely to ensure demand for bed spaces is very high. The principle of a new hotel on NWCS site is supported by the London Plan policy 3D.7, and UDP policy TACE2.</p> <p>P) Para 94 The phrase "<i>there is potential here to provide the first zero carbon or Code for Sustainable Homes 6-star development in Westminster</i>" should be removed, as, given biomass is unacceptable, they cannot be achieved in</p>	<p>deficiencies, although the brief does not require it.</p> <p>K) Noted</p> <p>L) Agreed that ground floor shouldn't be prioritised, given public open space requirements</p> <p>M) Affordable business space would not be considered community space</p> <p>N) Not agreed. The brief mentions how these uses may be appropriate, but does not require them</p> <p>O) TACE 2 doesn't support new hotels outside PSPA; PSPA has a number of hotels; the opportunity cost of providing hotel space is less housing/community/business space</p> <p>P) Agreed</p>	<p>L) Amended to remove unintended hierarchy of private open space</p> <p>P) Amended</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>energy terms.</p> <p>Q) Para 109 Should be amended to read “<i>the feasibility of linking the development to the Merchant Square CHP plant should be investigated having regard to the practicalities of doing so involving third party interests</i>”</p> <p>R) Para 109 Although the site may be considered for a Tri-generation powered district CHP system, it is not a requirement under adopted Development Plan Policy so the brief should acknowledge this paragraph as an aspiration rather than a requirement.</p> <p>S) Paras 118/119 The brief may wish to promote screening noise from Westway by new buildings along the northern frontage. These would reduce noise levels to below WHO guidelines within the site, and slightly to adjacent developments such as Paddington Walk and Merchant Square, and may allow natural ventilation of other new buildings on NWCS. The buildings overlooking Westway would require high performance facades.</p> <p>T) Paras 120/121 The height range included is incorrect. The reference to built or permitted developments being “<i>around 22-45m high</i>” should be removed, as there are a number which exceed 45m. A more valuable approach would be to recognise this diversity of building heights which create a challenging townscape context for new development to respond to.</p> <p>U) The height limit of 50m should be removed as it is not supported by a reasoned evidence base and conflicts with London Plan policy 5B.2 which requires developments to “<i>maximise residential and non-residential densities</i>”, it conflicts with and satisfies none of the DES3 tests and is unsound in the context of PPS12. Request deletion of “no</p>	<p>Q) Agreed, although the practicalities need to be overcome if the Core Strategy policy is to be satisfied</p> <p>R) Policy ENV1 encourages, and forthcoming Policy CS38 requires it</p> <p>S) Agreed</p> <p>T) Agreed that the reference could be clearer, but there is a prevailing height</p> <p>U) The brief is an interpretation of policy, and it is likely that buildings taller than 50m would be opposed. Buildings of such height would constitute a particularly high density</p>	<p>Q) Amended</p> <p>R) CS38 referred to</p> <p>S) Amended as suggested</p> <p>T) Amended to read 22-50m</p>
--	---	--	--

*building should be higher than 50m and any building(s) of this height would need to be justified as a visual termination or punctuation to the overall mass and form of development”.*

V) Para 122 Should be amended to note that “***although the existing tree planting to the northern boundary of the site provides a visual buffer to the road, its retention may not be desirable having regard to the need to position new buildings directly on the northern boundary of the site to screen the remainder of the development from noise and pollution and in order to create a larger public open space within the centre of the site. Consideration should be given to alternative greening approaches such as green walls and internal winter gardens.***”

W) Para 123 The preservation of views to St Mary’s Church should not be an overriding aim for the redevelopment of the site due to the divisive presence of the Westway.

X) Para 124 The brief should be cautious in its promotion of specific desire lines. Given Crossrail, the Northeast/southwest desire line is likely to be more beneficial than northwest/southeast, which is based upon a ped/cycle crossing yet to be approved.

Y) Para 126 See previous comments on trees on northern boundary and need for pedestrian desire lines to be based on an assessment of projected ped and cycle movements.

Z) Para 131 Should be amended to read “***for any proposal that does not exceed 50m, there will be no need for visual analysis from distant viewpoints. Any future scheme that proposes buildings above 50m in height should include detailed visual analysis***

development

V) The paragraph is not prescriptive as to how to landscape the northern boundary, but it should be landscaped

W) Agreed - the paragraph says this

X) That is an important cycle desire line, part of a plan approved with Merchant Square. The para requests the establishment of other desire lines. Cycles travelling northeast/southwest can use North Wharf Road

Y) Noted

Z) Agreed

Z) Amended as suggested, and local viewpoints added

	<p><b>necessary to satisfy the requirements of UDP policy DES3 and London Plan Policy 4B.10”</b></p> <p>A1) Para 135 Should be more flexible to recognise it is desirable to retain as many Category A trees as possible, but loss may achieve other planning benefits. Suggest amendment to read:  <b>“where possible, those trees categorised ‘A’ should be designed into any scheme, with those on North Wharf Road of particular value. If the practicalities of scheme layout result in the loss of one or more category A trees, suitable replacement native species should be introduced that result in an overall higher number of trees present on site with greater overall amenity, environmental and ecological value”</b></p> <p>A2) Appendix 2 should be updated to include reference to the proposed Crossrail station and proposed changes to the gyratory. Should also be amended to read <b>“Core Strategy Paddington Opportunity Area”</b></p> <p>A3) The original source of the information at Appendix 4 should be quoted, and if necessary updated to reflect the most recent condition of trees present on site.</p>	<p>A1) Agreed</p> <p>A2) Agreed</p> <p>A3) Agreed</p>	<p>A1) Paragraph 169 amended</p> <p>A2) Amended to include Crossrail station</p> <p>A3) Source added</p>
<p>5. Michael Scott  Chief Executive, and  Joe Hegarty  Chair  NHS Westminster  16 April 2009</p>	<p>a) We offer full support to the proposals being made by Imperial College Academic Health Sciences Centre for a mixed use including cancer therapy, community health facilities and key worker housing. NHS Westminster wishes to support this application for a number of reasons.</p> <p>b) The use of particle beam therapy will be a national first, not only offering excellent service to local residents, but more over it will attract considerable kudos to Westminster.</p> <p>c) The community health facilities and leisure facilities would enhance the area. With the number of new</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Noted</p>	

	<p>developments in the area and the relatively isolated nature of the site we feel this would add necessary local healthcare provision.</p> <p>d) We support the creation of key worker housing. The recruitment and retention of key staff to health and other public services is vital for the continuing health of local people and the provision of healthcare.</p> <p>e) We also strongly support the regeneration of the Westminster economy. We believe a vibrant economy and jobs for local people ultimately improve health status and reduces health inequalities. Both are key aims for NHS Westminster. We are therefore particularly interested in the regeneration aspects of this scheme as well as the benefits to health.</p> <p>f) We support additional provision of affordable housing in Westminster to help deal with issues of homelessness and overcrowding which are a public health concern.</p> <p>g) We recognise the planning brief proposes an affordable housing component on the NWCS site, however we believe the advantages of the Imperial college proposal are so substantial as to outweigh this on this particular site. We do however believe it is imperative for the council to identify alternative sites for affordable housing to meet urgent housing need.</p>	<p>d) Noted, affordable housing would be required as part of any residential development</p> <p>f) Health inequality is notable in this area (particularly Church Street and Lancaster Gate Wards), but decent housing is part of the solution</p> <p>f) Noted</p> <p>g) There is potential for the site to address both the NHS and local housing requirements</p>	
<p>6. Mike Derbyshire Director Savills, on behalf of Imperial College London (ICL) and the Imperial College Healthcare Trust (the Trust)</p>	<p>a) ICL and the Trust have been considering opportunities to substantially improve and secure the future of health and education facilities at St Mary's Hospital for a number of years.</p> <p>b) ICL and the Trust have initiated discussions with members and officers at Westminster City Council regarding their vision and proposals for both the future of St Mary's and the NWCS site. Their vision is to provide</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Agreed</p>	<p>b) The Trusts needs and desires have been incorporated into</p>

<p>20 April 2009</p>	<p>Westminster with world-class medical, research and educational facilities that will have far reaching and long term benefits locally, regionally, nationally and internationally. The NWCS site offers a unique development opportunity to expand the exceptional range of health, education and complementary facilities that will link to and support St Mary's Hospital and will provide excellent health care for local people.</p> <p>c) The uses that ICL and the Trust propose are completely policy compliant with regard to the London Plan, and WCC's UDP, which is demonstrated in the attached representations. The scheme would also meet a number of the Council's key objectives and has the support of both the Department of Health and Westminster PCT.</p> <p>d) ICL's and the Trusts proposals will make the best use of the NWCS site when considered against reasonable alternatives and would make a fundamental contribution towards making the long-term regeneration of Paddington sustainable. In light of the detailed representations attached, ICL and the Trust hope that the Council are assured as to their commitment to delivering their vision for both the NWCS site and St Mary's Hospital. ICL and the Trust are also committed to working with the Council to deliver the unique opportunity that ICL and the Trust propose that the planning brief is amended accordingly.</p> <p>e) Detailed representations and their 6 (none commercially sensitive) appendices are attached</p>	<p>c) The site has a community use, and demand for that need to be ascertained. Whilst the particle Beam Therapy Unit, Patient Treatment Centre and Local GP/Community clinic are probably community uses, the Research Centre, Business Incubator Units and student accommodation are probably not.</p> <p>d) Whilst the expressed commitment to delivery of the vision is clear, the brief will need to consider how the vision can meet planning policy</p> <p>e) Noted – attached as at Appendix 3</p>	<p>Land Use Options section</p> <p>c) The Land Use Options section has been updated to consider the proposal and explain that community uses would be acceptable in principle</p>
<p>7. Ian Runeckles Planning Manager British Waterways 13 May 2009</p>	<p>a) We believe that Farrells' proposed 'Greenway' offers an excellent opportunity to re-connect Paddington Basin to the heart of Paddington, namely St Mary's Church and Paddington Green. We appreciate the Greenway will require significant funding and raise logistical issues, but</p>	<p>a-f) Noted, but the greenway is not now a preferred option. There are significant problems with design including the setting of a listed church; construction</p>	

believe there are wider benefits that should be taken into account as part of a cost/benefit analysis.

b) The Greenway would help reconnect the Basin (and the emerging new quarter) with existing communities to the north in a way that cannot be achieved with a refurbished subway. The greenway would create a safe, pleasant and sustainable route to the basin to allow all to explore on foot or by bike. This would help generate additional footfall and passing trade for businesses around the basin, and add more life, vibrancy and animation.

d) We understand the Greenway proposal would lead to a podium on NWCS site. Such a podium could have wider benefits to the delivery of other development objectives in the POA and PSPA. E.g. a temporary taxi waiting area to replace taxi queuing as a result of Crossrail.

e) The podium could be used to house the Travis Perkins Builders Merchants currently at 149-157 Harrow Rd, which would resolve current access/amenity issues, and enable the 149-157 site to be used for uses that generate greater development value, which could in turn contribute towards funding the Greenway.

f) There would then be a strategic opportunity to spatially plan a number of key development sites as part of a wider masterplan, including: NWCS; Dudley Hse; Harrow Rd Gyratory; 149-157 Harrow Rd; 55-65 North Wharf Rd; the canal; and the Triangle sites. Collective masterplanning would give rise to significant outputs and deliverables and help generate higher development values which could be reinvested in the area as part of mitigation measures/enhancement projects; which would be more beneficial than planning each of the above sites individually.

including the impact on traffic; cost and the ability of any development to afford the bridge; and the townscape impact of a podium deck

<p>8. Rose Freeman Planning Assistant The Theatres Trust 20 April 2009</p>	<p>a) The Theatres Trust is a national advisory public body for Theatres. The GPDO 1995 requires the Trust to be consulted on planning applications which include '<i>development involving any land on which there is a theatre</i>'. It was established by The Theatres Trust Act 1976 to '<i>promote the better protection of theatres</i>'. This applies to all buildings that were either built as theatres or are used for theatre presentations, in current use, in other uses, or disused.</p> <p>b) With regard to the Studio Theatre at the school, mentioned on page 9, item 23, please ensure we are consulted on the redevelopment plans at the appropriate time.</p> <p>c) We have no comment to make on the draft planning brief but look forward to being consulted on further planning policy documents in due course.</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Agreed, although the studio has been reprovided as part of Paddington Academy</p> <p>c) Noted</p>	<p>b) Loss of theatre mentioned under paragraph 117</p>
<p>9. James Owens Gerald Eve LLP Chartered Surveyors &amp; Property consultants On behalf of Derwent London 20 April 2009</p>	<p>a) We support the continued regeneration of the PSPA that redevelopment of the site will bring.</p> <p>b) Subject to satisfactory amenity considerations (hot food takeaways need particular care), a whole range of uses should be appropriate and the brief should allow for this. Commercial flexibility would help ensure retail units do not remain unlet and avoid associated dead frontage. Support the view on nightclubs.</p> <p>c) The council must be satisfied that the level of off street parking will not give rise to on-street parking stress, or give rise to North Wharf Rd becoming a 'rat run'.</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Agreed, paras 91 and 92 gives credence to retail uses other than A5</p> <p>c) Noted, the brief encourages vehicular access and egress at either end of the site, avoiding the need to use North Wharf Road</p>	
<p>10. Richard Lambert Director-General CBI 16 April 2009</p>	<p>a) The CBI recognises the value, to London and the wider economy, of the business incubator facility proposed by Imperial College, to encourage synergies between the university and research companies.</p>	<p>a) Noted. These are not considered a community use, and therefore not a land use priority to be required in the planning brief</p>	

	<p>b) Science based incubator businesses facilitate mutually beneficial opportunities between business and science for the development and marketing of innovative processes and products, crucial to the long term health of the UK economy in terms of job creation and in making the UK a competitive and attractive place to invest.</p> <p>c) The CBI has highlighted the need for planning procedures to duly recognise the long-term economic benefits that arise from the sensible integration of high-tech research facilities and academic institutions.</p> <p>d) Your proposal would provide new high-value job opportunities for specialised research activities that are important for buttressing the long term skills base of the UK economy.</p>	<p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Noted</p> <p>d) Agreed</p>	
<p>11. Charlotte Saini Development Manager WCC Childrens Services April 2009</p>	<p><b>Education</b> a) Should the site be given over for residential, there will be increased impact on education and contributions should follow the standard SPG formula.</p> <p><b>Childcare</b> b) The Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) shows Paddington Station and some of its surroundings in the poorest 10% in England (affecting children between 0-16 years). 25.7% of children in Hyde Park ward are dependent on workless benefits. This indicates a broad range of childcare needs for local parents and encourages a focus of childcare resources.</p> <p>c) Hyde Park ward has 3.6 children to every childcare place (2008). Further consultation is needed to establish demand and what provision would best facilitate those low income and unemployed families to access training and employment opportunities. A particular area for research is the need for before and after school and holiday</p>	<p>a) Agreed</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Noted. The results of Children's Services' consultation will inform the forthcoming SPD on planning obligations</p>	<p>b) Incorporated under Land Use Options</p>

schemes for 0-13 year olds.

d) There is limited childcare provision in the area – one affordable nursery (Micky Star) providing full day care with 36 available places for under 5's, and is the lead setting for the designated Children's Centre in the area. Parental feedback over the past year shows that parents and partners want more services to be delivered. There are also 3 private/independent nurseries in the ward with unaffordable rates providing full day care for a total of 184 under 5's. There is one out of school play project providing holiday and after school provision for 24 children under 8.

Service areas that are in demand are:

- Family support (drop in and play sessions; structured Drop-in sessions)
- Health (health and early intervention services; space for a child health clinic or health visitor one day a week)
- Employment (employability including careers advice/interviews; ESOL classes for upskilling those who do not have English as a first language)

**Young People**

e) Request to consider allocating funding for existing youth clubs to increase access for positive activities for young people

**Play Space**

f) Support the development of additional play areas for children, particularly if housing, but request consultation on playspace be undertaken with Children's Services prior to development.

**Comments on specific paragraphs**

g) Para 20 Should the development be given over to 80% residential use, Children's Services emphasise the

d) Noted. Designers will be encouraged to work with Children's Services to ensure that community space is able to meet contemporary demands

e) Youth clubs can bid for funding from the Social & Community fund

f) Agreed

g) Noted

f) Para 86 updated

	<p>importance of the supporting active uses such as community space and open space.</p> <p>h) Paras 74-77 Children’s services supports redevelopment providing an alternative community facility such as a youth centre, children’s centre, nursery and play space in line with needs set out above.</p> <p>i) Para 89 saying education or health facilities would be appropriate would be supported</p> <p>j) Para 130 Children’s services requests developers work with relevant services to ensure that location of play spaces are designed to overcome noise and nuisance issues.</p>	<p>h) Noted</p> <p>i) Noted</p> <p>j) Agreed</p>	<p>j) Para 99 updated</p>
<p>12. Claire Craig Regional Planning Adviser English Heritage 20 April 2009</p>	<p>a) We welcome the sustainability appraisals recognition of pressure on historic buildings.</p> <p>b) We note the assessment is positive for heritage, but the appears to be heavily dependant on the implementation and this could usefully be reflected in the rating perhaps “=/+”. Heritage features exist in the vicinity of the site meaning the site exists as part of a cultural landscape no matter how fragmented and it needs to be understood in this context. English Heritage would have more confidence in the current rating if it was clearly stated what all the heritage assets in the area are and the contextual relationship of the site to them particularly in respect of their settings and views to and from them.</p> <p>c) Para 29 Welcome the clear identification that the Blade is not to serve as a precedent in this vicinity. Recommend WCC’s High Buildings Study 2000, and EH/CABE publication “<i>Guidance on Tall Buildings</i>” in Chapter 5.</p> <p>d) Welcome the consideration given to providing quality surfacing and strong sustainable transport ie. Walking and cycling routes. These initiatives support the heritage</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) The legislation no longer requires the planning brief to have a sustainability appraisal</p> <p>c) Noted</p> <p>d) Agreed</p>	

	<p>assets around the site and increase the possibility of creating durable new development that meets the aspiration of creating heritage for the future.</p> <p>e) Para 138 Support the retention of the tablet commemorating 18<sup>th</sup> Century almshouses.</p> <p>f) Appendix 2 Welcome the inclusion of heritage assets map, but it would be helpful to have archaeological resources and statues and monuments referenced as well.</p>	<p>e) Noted</p> <p>f) Agreed</p>	<p>f) Included at Appendix 2</p>
<p>13. Giles Dolphin Head of Planning Decisions GLA 20 April 2009</p>	<p>a) The site is within the Paddington Opportunity Area in the London Plan, as such WCC's intention to extend its PSPA to include the sites is supported.</p> <p>b) Policy 5.B of the London Plan seeks to maximise density. In general the guidance is supported, however given the height restrictions and the lack of guidance regarding density, GLA officers are concerned proposals with fail to provide the maximum intensity of use possible compatible with the local context, in line with policy 3A.3, the design principles in policy 4B.5 and with public transport capacity. The brief should be amended to include guidance for developers with regard to intensity of development expected.</p> <p>c) TfL support the requirement for any development to contribute towards area wide measures as part of PATS, and measures to improve access across the gyratory.</p> <p>d) TfL have no objection in principle to a 'green bridge', though it would require a substantial amount of further work and liaison.</p> <p>e) Bus standing spaces on North Wharf Road must be retained, and TfL also require driver facilities in the area.</p> <p>f) TfL would expect to see a largely car free development. TfL support the minimisation of parking spaces, which</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) The local context is considered to be 40-50m. High towers are not a precedent. Adherence to the brief would allow a dense development in context</p> <p>c) Noted</p> <p>d) Noted</p> <p>e) Noted</p> <p>f) Whilst the UDP's maximum standards have been quoted, the</p>	<p>e) Mentioned under the 'Movement' section</p> <p>f) Cycle docking</p>

	<p>should apply to all uses. Any parking would need to be clearly justified and designed to cater for disabled users or car club spaces. Cycle parking should be provided in line with TfL guidelines and consideration given to the provision of land for a cycle docking station.</p> <p>g) Applicants should approach London Underground Infrastructure Protection for advice on constraints and conditions that may apply to the site. Crossrail safeguarding also needs to be taken into account. Applicants should submit a comprehensive TA, travel plan, delivery and servicing plan and construction logistics plan.</p> <p>h) If development included a net increase in office floorspace over 500sqm, a financial contribution towards Crossrail would be required.</p>	<p>brief seeks a highly sustainable development where the number of car parking spaces are minimised. The council must ensure that on-street parking pressures are not created. Car club provision is encouraged. Cycle docking station potential added.</p> <p>g) Agreed, though not within Crossrail safeguarding zone</p> <p>h) Agreed</p>	<p>potential added under Parking section</p> <p>g) Added under 'Movement'</p> <p>h) Added under 'Undertakings and Obligations'</p>
<p>14. Katie Arthur Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency 1 May 2009</p>	<p>a) Overall we are very pleased with many aspects of the report, especially section 9 "Environmental &amp; Energy issues".</p> <p>b) Para 35 As the site is above 1.52 ha, the proposed development will require a Surface Water Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) in accordance with PPS25. PPS25 (and PPS23 in case contaminated land is found) should therefore be listed.</p> <p>c) As part of the FRA it is essential that SUDS are included on site. SUDS should therefore be mentioned under Section 7. It would also be beneficial to include Water Efficiency Measures within this list in line with Policy 4A.16 in the London Plan.</p> <p>d) We are pleased to see you have noticed the potential of the development to be zero carbon or Code 6 – we fully support and encourage this type of development.</p> <p>e) Para 96 We believe it is necessary to include 'Water Resources' in the bullet point list to ensure flood risk</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) A surface water Flood Risk Assessment should be included in the scope of the EIA</p> <p>c) SUDS and water efficiency measures are mentioned under section 9. 'Model of sustainability' in Section 7 relates to all sustainable measures that can't all be individually listed</p> <p>d) Unfortunately it is clear that under current circumstances, the development could not be zero</p>	<p>b) PPS25 listed</p> <p>c) 4A.16 mentioned under Section 7</p>

	<p>issues have been acknowledged.</p> <p>f) Para 114 The subsection on biodiversity is very encouraging, particularly the paragraph on living roofs.</p>	<p>carbon</p> <p>e) Agreed</p> <p>f) Noted</p>	<p>e) Water resources added</p>
<p>15. Lisa and Mark Farley Residents Marshall Building, Hermitage Street 5 August 2009</p>	<p>a) When we purchased our flat we were told the development on the school site would be in a tiered design with the highest elements at the narrow end, farthest from Hermitage Street. Our view looks out across the A40 to Paddington Green and the Church. Obviously we'd like to retain this view and not have a high rise block in front of us on such a narrow street.</p> <p>b) Why is Hermitage Street one-way? If it was 2-way it would not be used as a rat run as North Wharf Rd does not lead anywhere. A 2-way street would enable residents approaching Marshall &amp; Munkenbeck from Bishop's Bridge to access the car park without driving past M&amp;S and back onto the very busy Harrow Road at a junction that has poor visibility and is very dangerous. A wider, 2-way road would also afford a more open area between the 2 sites.</p>	<p>a) There is no planning reason to design the building as suggested</p> <p>b) When it was designated highway, it was considered appropriate to be one-way.</p>	<p>b) Paragraph 79 now raises the potential of changing its designation to make two-way, or close the southern end</p>
<p>16. WCC Housing Services 29 September 2009</p>	<p>a) The 50m height limit will restrict the number of homes being built, ultimately the number of affordable units across the borough. We suggest the brief be revised to include a height restriction of around 80m, allowing for a 40 storey building depending on design. A more dense development at NWCS will assist in tackling issues around capacity and decanting that may result from potential redevelopment of Church St/Edgware Rd. Additional units will allow us to decant residents from Church St and re-house them locally, meeting both political and policy objectives. We suggest a denser development in line with that achieved at Merchant Square, including buildings of 120m and 90m. A tall building provides us with an</p>	<p>a) The height limit is a townscape threshold, and density is incidental. Townscape policies are not arbitrary and are not compromised in order that a site may fulfil a particular need. Merchant Square has been identified as the place for a single iconic high building, and planning permission has been granted, in accordance with policy. The brief does not afford an opportunity to re-write policy.</p>	

opportunity to have an iconic building with exceptional architectural quality on a prominent site along the Edgware Road. We suggest the brief allows for a series of buildings that result in a tapering of heights similar to Merchant Sq.

b) The brief needs to be reviewed in context of permissions granted for adjoining sites including West End Green and future plans for Paddington Green Police Station. The site's relationship to Dudley House and plans under the Community Build programme need to be emphasised. Developments on all these sites should be seen as integrated and contributing to all aspects of planning policy including housing, affordable housing, commercial and community uses. Additional housing on this site will contribute to borough wide requirements, and more specifically to the housing requirements following any redevelopment on Church St/Edgware Rd. Work undertaken by Sir Terry Farrell, as well as recent tenderers submissions received to carry out the masterplanning exercise at Church Street all suggest that this site and others should form part of the public realm proposals to enhance integration across the Euston-Marylebone Road. On West End Green we understand the current planning permission is due to run out at the end of 2010 and we are aware that it's likely that works will progress or the site sold. In this context it is likely that additional housing units will be forthcoming on this site and will contribute to housing needs generally in the PSPA area.

c) We support the site being developed for residentially-led, mixed use scheme to meet identified housing need and supply in Westminster. A residential scheme with ground floor commercial uses would benefit and encourage area wide regeneration. Encouraging

b) Agreed. There is potential for this site to contribute to borough-wide housing requirements, should the loss of community space be acceptable. Further housing on West End Green would be welcome. The NWCS site will, as the brief requires, accommodate a good deal of open space, enhancing integration as suggested.

c) Consultation has revealed demand from community uses, and assessment is required to ascertain how much of the site can be released for housing,

commercial start ups would be welcome and be compatible with the economic aspirations for the regeneration of Church St. Any loss of social and community facilities could be compensated as part of the masterplanning process on Church St. Edgware Rd regeneration.

d) The issue of open space should be considered in the context of other close developments, as Church street is deficient in open/play space. It should be noted that the planning brief for Dudley House has requirements for community and amenity space, and its important the requirements for NWCS don't over duplicate this provision. Therefore Housing recommends that the two sites should be considered together when determining the levels of open space, amenity and other community facilities.

before incorporation of lost community uses into Church Street is considered.

d) There is distinct need for open space in this area south of Westway. Dudley House is unlikely to offer open space capable of accommodating public play such that overprovision is made. Due to its size, NWCS offers a unique opportunity in Paddington to contribute to some or all of its open and play space deficiencies

# Appendix C

## 12.0 Detailed responses to the planning brief

---

It is noted that the NWSC site has been identified in preferred option 12 and appendix 1 of the Council's Core Strategy (Preferred Options) as a proposal site, however, no preferred uses for the site have been identified. ICL have made representations to the Core Strategy, suggesting that a medical led-development should be included as a preferred use for this site along with complimentary and/or enabling uses such as academic space, key worker housing and post graduate student accommodation. It is also noted that, in their letter dated 11 March 2009, the Government Office for London (GOL) commented that only strategic sites as defined in PPS12 should be included within the Core Strategy. We would strongly contend that the NWSC site is a strategic site given that, for the reasons set out in this response, it has the potential to play a fundamental role in achieving the aims and objectives of the Core Strategy if used for health and educational purposes<sup>1</sup>. We now understand that the pre-submission draft of the Core Strategy will be issued in the summer for consultation before being submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in the autumn. In addition, we note that the draft planning brief for Dudley House, recently published for consultation purposes, also contains proposals which impact on the NWCS site. Therefore, these representations, along with those made to the Core Strategy in September 2008, should be taken into consideration in the preparation of the draft Core Strategy and revisions to the planning brief for Dudley House.

We appreciate that the Council did not have the requisite information in order to assess ICL and the Trust's future plans and requirements for the NWCS site at the time that the draft planning brief was written. However, in light of these detailed responses, ICL and the Trust hope that the Council are able to reconsider their aspirations for the site to promote it for world class health care and education facilities, incorporating the uses set out above. As such, ICL and the Trust suggest that the Council substantially revise the planning brief to reflect this aspiration and anticipate that the Council will work with ICL and the Trust to realise their vision for the NWCS site and St Mary's Hospital. This should be done in the context of the site's appropriate allocation in the Core Strategy. In addition to this general comment, ICL and the Trust's detailed responses to specific sections of the draft planning brief are set out below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraphs 4.6 and 4.7, page 8 of PPS12

Para / Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comment	Suggestion	Evidence	Officer Response	Change to Draft Brief
2	Object	ICL and the Trust object to the promotion of the site for a residentially-led development on the NWCS site.	<p>That the brief be substantially revised to promote the site for world-class health and education facilities.</p> <p>This paragraph should be replaced with the following:</p> <p>Post-2010 the site will be sold for redevelopment. The council wishes to see a development has a number of far reaching and long term benefits for local communities and the borough a whole. It should support existing and permitted uses in the area, and cement Westminster as a world-class centre for health and education. New development on the site should comprise a range of health, education and complementary uses. Housing will also be permitted on the site in so far as it supports the health and education related uses</p>	<p>London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118.</p> <p>Westminster UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.</p>	<p>It will be important for any application for a change of use from Social and Community to demonstrate compliance with Policy SOC1 (and CS33).</p> <p>Housing is a Council priority, but post-graduate housing is not, and would not be considered a social and community use</p>	This paragraph has been substantially revised to recognise social and community uses
5	Object in part	The capacity of the site to incorporate CHP and to link this to existing CHP	<p>Amend paragraph 5 to state:</p> <p>The site offers a unique opportunity, at this scale, for its redevelopment to be a model of</p>	London Plan policy 4A.6 and paragraph 4.23 and	If it is not feasible or viable to connect to an existing CHP network, under CS38, a major development will be	Brief amended to incorporate CS38 in "Environmental & Energy issues", and para 5 amended to

		units is subject to feasibility and viability. This should be recognised in this paragraph.	BREEAM environmental excellence, and building upon the capacity and efficiencies of the Combined Heat and Power units under construction at Merchant Square. However, it is recognised that this will be subject to feasibility and viability.	4.24.	required to provide site wide decentralised energy generation that has the potential to be extended to serve other development sites	refer to BREEAM
5	Object	ICL and the Trust object to the promotion of the site for a residentially-led development on the NWCS site. As such, it is considered that these paragraphs are no longer required.	Delete this paragraph	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118. Westminster UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.	Agreed that, in light of community demand for the site, the adopted brief should not promote a residentially led development.	Exec summary altered to recognise the demand for social and community uses, and for housing
17	Object	This paragraph should be amended to promote the site for world-class	Amend paragraph 17 to state:  <del>This brief, and in particular the process leading to its adoption, seeks to explore the possibilities</del>	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25	A demand for local health facilities has been revealed. Both a health-led and a housing-led scheme	Amended to recognise the demand for the land for community uses ascertained through consultation

		health and education facilities.	<del>when converting the site to non-educational, or tertiary educational use.</del> The consultation process in 2002 suggested that health uses could also be located here, related to proposals for St Mary's Hospital. The need for improved local health facilities remains and it is considered that the NWCS site provides a unique opportunity to provide a range of services and facilities that will support and sustain St Mary's future as a world class health and education provider as well as providing excellent health care to the local community. <del>and through consultation the need, or opportunity for such provision on this site will need to be explored.</del>	and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118.  Westminster UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.	could be acceptable options for the site. However the demand for viable community uses on the site will need to be fully ascertained, in order to prevent the site being blighted, and incorporation fully considered in any application for a change of use from community use.	on the brief
20	Object	ICL and the Trust object to the promotion of the site for a residentially-led development on the NWCS site and propose to redevelop the site for world-class health, education and	That the brief be substantially revised to promote the site for world-class health and education facilities. As, such this paragraph needs to be amended to state:  Following the School's departure, and in line with other policies throughout the UDP, this brief seeks to promote development that meets a	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118.	Agreed that, in light of community demand for the site, the adopted brief should not promote a residentially led development.  It will be important for any application for a change of use from Social and Community to demonstrate	Amended to recognise the stipulated social and community demand ascertained through consultation, and the policy context in relation to a change of use

		complementary uses that will have a number of far reaching and long term benefits for local communities and the borough as a whole.	number of Council objectives and has a number of long term benefits for local communities and the borough as a whole. It seeks development that provides a high quality environment for residents, students, workers and visitors, with the highest standards of sustainable architecture and urban design. In particular the Council would wish to see the site developed for health, education and complementary uses. Housing will also be permitted on site in so far as it supports health and education uses.	Westminster UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.	compliance with Policy SOC1 (and CS33).  Housing is a Council priority, but purpose designed, restricted, post-graduate housing is not, and would not, under the Core Strategy be considered a social and community use	
20	Object in part	ICL and the Trust propose to develop incubator units to support and nurture innovation and enterprise. Whilst it is welcomed that brief recognises that incubation space would be appropriate on the site, it is not considered that	Amend paragraph to state: <del>Offices may be appropriate as part of a mix of uses (subject to the comments about the policy context in para 12 above), and supporting uses such as a sandwich or coffee shop should be considered.</del> It is also recognised that there is a shortage of affordable business space in the area, and provision of small business incubation space, that is, space let at below market rates in order to foster local businesses in their early years, would be welcomed as a	London Plan policy 3B.5 and paragraphs 3.162 and 3.164.	Agreed that given the priorities for social and community and/or housing, the opportunity cost of providing offices should be highlighted, although the opportunity to provide affordable business floorspace as a planning benefit should remain in line with NWEDA, and EDS	Amended “Reasons for producing this Brief” section to remove reference to market office space, and explained more fully in “Land Use Options” section.

		general offices, other than those ancillary to the health and education uses would be appropriate on this site given the high proportion of offices that already exist or are proposed for the area.	planning benefit in line with the council's Economic Development Strategy.			
30	Comment	ICL and the Trust do not object to retaining trees of merit on the site. However, it is important that the Council carefully consider the practicalities of retaining those within the heart of the site with regard to the efficient use of land.	Amend paragraph to state:  Within the body of the site, trees of merit should be retained, unless the practicalities of layout make this impossible or would result in an inefficient use of land.	London Plan policies 2A.1 and 4B.1	Agreed	Final sentence amended to: "should be retained and incorporated into the landscape design unless the practicalities of the good planning of the site make this impossible."
45	Object	The Council do not provide any evidence within the brief to	That the brief be substantially revised to promote the site for world-class health and education facilities. Therefore,	PPS12 paragraph 4.43	Any application for a change of use to housing would need to be accompanied by a	Section revised to refer to the emerging Core Strategy, particularly support for

		demonstrate why the use of the site for residential purposes is more beneficial than alternative and policy compliant uses, such as for health and education facilities.	this paragraph should be deleted.	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118. Westminster UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.	demonstration of thorough understanding and assessment of the need and demand for the site from other social and community users. In the absence of viable demand, housing will be the priority	social and community uses given by CS33
46	Object	ICL and the Trust object to the promotion of the site for a residentially-led development on the NWCS site and propose to redevelop the site for world-class health, education and complementary uses that will	Amend paragraph to state:  Whilst the policy framework for the new Paddington Opportunity Area in the LDF is yet to be formulated, it is highly likely to follow the framework set by the PSPA policies in the UDP. These policies should be applied in conjunction with other policies in the plan. <del>When taking into account the planning framework for any redevelopment of this site (and subject to para 15</del>	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118. Westminster UDP policies	Agree that the brief should not promote housing over social and community uses, given the lawful use of the land and the stated demand for the site for social and community uses.	Section revised to refer to the emerging Core Strategy, particularly support for social and community uses given by CS33

		<p>have a number of far reaching and long term benefits for local communities and the borough as a whole. Therefore, references that promote this site for high density residential use should be deleted.</p>	<p>above) the following UDP principles are most relevant:</p> <p><del>To grant planning permission for Central London Activities as part of the overall aim of promoting mixed-use development in the PSPA (Policies STRA 4 and STRA 8 and PSPA 2 – 4); in this case, the City Council will seek a mixed-use scheme that has a high proportion of residential floorspace</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <del>To encourage area wide regeneration (Policy PSPA 1)</del></li> <li>● <del>To control traffic and parking impacts from development (Policy PSPA 5)</del></li> <li>● <del>To create a high quality sustainable environment (PSPA 6; ENV 1 and other policies in the Environment chapter)</del></li> <li>● <del>To actively seek and secure planning obligations and the provision of related benefits in all types of development (STRA 7)</del></li> </ul>	<p>SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.</p>		
48 and 49	Comment	The planning policy context and	The brief should be amended to recognise the number of benefits that need health and	London Plan policies 3A.20,	Agree that the brief should recognise the benefits that health	This section is about policy context, and now fully refers to the

		sustainability appraisal detailed in this response demonstrates that ICL and the Trust's future plans for the former NWCS site would significantly contribute towards meeting sustainability and wider Council objectives. ICL and the Trust's proposals are also completely policy compliant.	education uses would bring to the local area and Westminster as a whole.	3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118.  Westminster UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.	and education uses would bring. Do not agree that the proposal is completely policy compliant, as the key worker/post-graduate housing would be ring fenced for St Mary's workers, and such accommodation is not as high a priority as general housing	forthcoming Core Strategy. The benefits of healthcare and education uses are discussed in the Land use Options" section
60	Object	It is considered that the specific desire lines that the Council promotes in the planning brief will significantly restrict the development and layout of future development and therefore should be	Remove specific desire lines from the brief and replace with more general guidance on the opportunity to provide better and clearer links/routes through and around the site.	London Plan policy 3C.21.  Westminster UDP policy TRANS 3.	Not agreed. Public access through the site, facilitating pedestrian desire lines, is important and supported by Policies TRANS3 ,TRANS9, and CS40. To an extent, these desire lines will dictate the footprint of development	

		removed and replaced with more general guidance in term of creating safe, secure and convenient routes through the site.				
69	Object	ICL and the Trust propose to redevelop the site for world-class health, education and complementary uses. Therefore, this paragraph should be written to exclude references to offices and retail and include appropriate parking standards for health, education and the complementary uses set out in these	Amend paragraph to remove references to parking standards for retail and offices and include appropriate parking standards for health, education and the complementary uses set out in these representations.	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118.  Westminster UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.	Parking for health and education are determined on the proposals merits, but should be minimised in the interests of the development being as environmentally sustainable as possible, in line with CS40, the number should be minimised. Retail and office use may be acceptable as part of a mixed use scheme, so the standards are still quoted.	

		representations.				
72	Object in part	ICL and the Trust object to the promotion of the site for a residentially-led development on the NWCS site.	That the brief be substantially revised to promote the site for world-class health and education facilities. Therefore, the fourth bullet on page 19 of the brief should be removed.	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118. Westminster UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.	Agree to the bullet being removed, given the stated demand from a community use	
73	Object	The Council do not provide any evidence within the brief to demonstrate why the use of the site for residential purposes is more beneficial than alternative and policy compliant uses,	That the brief be substantially revised to promote the site for world-class health and education facilities. Therefore, this paragraph should be amended to state:  This section considers the possible range of land uses that may be acceptable in future redevelopment proposals for the site. <del>The land uses set out are not exhaustive and all proposals</del>	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118. Westminster	Agree to remove reference to the preferred land use being mixed with at least 80% residential. Both are acceptable alternative options. The first test is to fully understand the demand from alternative community uses, in accordance with policies SOC1	Para amended to refer to the demand and policy support for community uses on this site, and the acceptability of this as an option

		such as for health and education facilities. ICL and the Trust propose to redevelop the site for world-class health, education and complementary uses. It is considered that the brief be substantially revised to promote the site for world-class health and education facilities.	<del>will be assessed on the overall balance of proposed uses and their impact on the townscape, and the amenity of nearby residential communities. In summary the preferred land use mix on this site is for a mixed use scheme comprising predominantly residential (at least 80% of gross floorspace) with an element of social and community uses, open space, and commercial uses. All redevelopment proposals, including any alternatives or variations to the land use mix sought above, should accord with the relevant criteria as set out in the UDP.</del>	UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.	and CS33. The priority for any part of the site not required for community use will be housing	
Paragraphs 73-83	Object	ICL and the Trust propose to redevelop the site for world-class health, education and complementary uses. It is considered that the brief and particularly this section be substantially revised to	Substantially rewrite section 8 to state that the preferred land use for this site is for world-class health, education and complementary facilities, which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incubator business units;</li> <li>• Nursery/early years centre; and</li> <li>• Community sports and leisure centre.</li> </ul> This section of the planning brief should also state that housing is appropriate in so far as it	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118.  Westminster UDP policies	An application for such health and education uses on this site would be likely to be acceptable in principle, however the local housing priority in Paddington is to deliver 3000 new homes of mixed type and tenure by 2026, to deliver sustainable residential communities with a	“Land Use Options” section substantially re-written to note demand, and policy support, for a replacement community use.

		promote the site for world-class health and education facilities.	supports health and education uses, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key worker housing;</li> <li>• Post graduate student accommodation; and</li> <li>• Accommodation for patients and their relatives.</li> </ul>	SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.	range of incomes (CS paras 4.4-4.7)	
73 and 76	Comment	It should be noted that the ICL and the Trust's future plans for the former NWCS site are completely policy compliant and accord with the relevant criteria as set out in the local development plan.	That the brief be substantially revised to promote the site for world-class health and education facilities.	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118.  Westminster UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.	Whilst such an application for redevelopment would be acceptable in principle, and the brief can therefore promote such use as an option, it is important that the brief does not blight the site's ability to contribute to other planning objectives, particularly if community options prove unviable	"Land Use Options" section substantially re-written to note demand, and policy support, for a replacement community use.
78	Support	We strongly support the statement that health, education and	N/A	N/A	Noted	

		social service uses can benefit from being grouped together.				
79	Support	We support the Council's wish to ensure that educational institutions retain their ability to remain in Westminster and attract the best staff and students. In addition, we support the recognition of ICL and the Trust's need for accommodation for their staff and post graduate students.	N/A	N/A	Noted, although the draft brief does not explicitly support the provision of staff and student accommodation on this site, only the acknowledge Imperial College's demand. These uses are not considered community uses that would satisfy SOC1, or CS33. General housing would therefore be a higher priority than restricted staff/student accommodation	"Land Use Options" substantially re-written
79	Object	In light of these detailed representations to the brief, we consider that the following text be removed from paragraph 79:	That the brief be substantially revised to promote the site for world-class health and education facilities.	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109,	Agree to remove that text. Whilst such an option for redevelopment would be likely to be acceptable in principle, and the brief can therefore promote such use as an option,	Section removed. "Land Use Options" section substantially re-written to note demand, and policy support, for a replacement community use.

	<p><i>'At the time of drafting the future plans and requirement for the proposed Academic Health Science Centre (Imperial College NHS Healthcare Trust) are not known and the relevance of their proposals in relation to the SOC1 and other UDP policies cannot be assessed. Responses to this draft brief may well allow this to be reconsidered.'</i></p> <p>We also suggest that the brief be substantially rewritten to accord with the ICL and the Trust's proposals for the NWCS site, which fulfils a number of the</p>		<p>3.117 and 3.118.</p> <p>Westminster UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 , paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.</p>	<p>it is important that the brief does not blight the site's ability to contribute to other planning objectives should community options prove unviable. The brief will not be rewritten to accommodate one particular proposal, but to recognise the stated demand, and the policy support for social and community uses.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--	--

		Council's objectives as well as delivering a more sustainable alternative than the residentially-led scheme currently promoted by the brief.				
80	Object	We object to the term 'Health Campus' and this should be amended to state 'nursing and medical staff working in this location'.	Amend text as follows: <del>at the Health Campus</del> <u>in this location.</u>	N/A	Agreed	Changed as suggested
80	Support	We support the recognition that in this area is suitable for higher levels of key worker housing to serve the particular needs of nursing and medical staff working in this location.	N/A	N/A	Noted	
80	Object	We consider	The brief should be rewritten to	London Plan	Key worker housing is	

		that the brief should be rewritten to state that the site is an appropriate location for key worker and post graduate student housing. The brief should also reflect that such housing makes a significant contribution to meeting housing targets. The brief should also reflect that key worker housing makes a significant contribution towards meeting the need for affordable housing.	state that the site is an appropriate location for key worker and student housing.	<p>policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118.</p> <p>Westminster UDP policies H 4 and SOC3, paragraph 3.66, 6.28 and 6.32.</p>	a local requirement as part of a sustainable community, in a mix of tenures, sizes and income levels	
81	Object	The mix of housing required should be based on up to date housing needs and those needs of specific groups.	Ensure that the brief reflects up to date housing needs and those needs of specific groups.	<p>PPS3 paragraph 22</p> <p>London Plan policy 3A.5</p>	There is clear local demand for private, intermediate and social housing capable of accommodating families, as stated in the council's housing strategy.	Updated in relation to WCC's latest housing standards, and the Mayor's Draft Housing Design Guide, July 2009

		For instance, key workers and postgraduates usually require smaller dwelling units of 1 and 2 beds.				
88	Support	ICL and the Trust support the statement that business incubator space for higher education leavers would be an appropriate use on this site.	N/A	N/A	Noted	
89	Object in part	Although we welcome the recognition that education <b>or</b> health facilities would be appropriate in this location, we consider that both are equally appropriate and should be the preferred uses for the NWCS site.	Amend text to state that education <b>and</b> health facilities would be appropriate uses in this location.	London Plan policies 3A.20, 3A.21, 3A.22 and 3A.25 and paragraphs 3.103, 3.106, 3.107 -3.109, 3.117 and 3.118.  Westminster UDP policies SOC 1, SOC3 and SOC4 ,	Agreed – social and community uses would be required, of which education and health are two.	Amended as suggested

				paragraphs 6.18, 6.19, 6.28, 6.32, 6.41 and 6.42.		
N/A	Omission	Accommodation for patients would be considered as a sui-generis use which is complementary to the healthcare facilities proposed. This should be included as an other appropriate use on the NWCS site	Revise planning brief to state that ' <i>accommodation for patients and their families</i> ' as an other appropriate use on the site.	N/A	Social and Community uses, including ancillary uses, would be an appropriate use for this site.	Appropriateness of ancillary accommodation mentioned at paragraph 96
140-146	Object	It should be made clear that publicly funded higher education institutions, who are both charities and key infrastructure providers in terms of education,	Amend paragraph 144 to include the following text:  Publicly funded institutions that provide key infrastructure will be made exempt from relevant section 106/CIL contributions.	London Plan policy 6A.5 and paragraph 6.23.	Whilst there may be exemptions from certain S106 or CIL contributions, it is likely that S106 or CIL contributions will be required, even from such institutions, to, for example, ensure the public highway is suitable for the proposed use.	

		community (shared facilities) and (in the case of Imperial College and the NHS Trust) health facilities should be made exempt from relevant section 106/CIL contributions.				