

Letters of Objection and Support  
for PP/09/02786  
Wornington Green

**George, Edward: PC-Plan**

---

**From:** emma Dent Coad [edentcoad@yahoo.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 28 December 2009 15:02  
**To:** Tollitt, Penelope: PC-Plan  
**Cc:** Cllr-Moylan; Lerner, Peter: PC-Plan; Flight, Alison: PC-Plan; George, Edward: PC-Plan; Craig, Richard: PC-Plan  
**Subject:** Wornington Green - my initial comments on initial submission  
**Attachments:** Response to KHT Planning Application, Cllr E Dent Coad.doc

Dear Mrs Tollitt

While I am sending in my comments before the deadline, I would like to object very strongly to the timing and means of consultation we are being subjected to. This has been hanging over me throughout Christmas, and frankly I and my family are most unhappy about it.

It is hard enough for even experienced users of the Council website to find the planning application, and once found it is a Herculean task to trawl through the listed documents to find those of interest, none of which have been summarised, and then to read these huge and weighty texts, some of several hundred pages. As you know I have hard copies of many of these documents, but even so many of the most revealing are online.

Nonetheless I have done what I can in the time available, and hope that you and Mr George will bear with those of us who will continue to send comments over the next few weeks as we come to grips with the various issues described.

kind regards and Happy New Year

Emma Dent Coad  
Councillor, Golborne Ward  
RB Kensington and Chelsea

ExD	HDC	HSS	HPD	HoE	Policy	Design	Trees
DC		Received RBKC Planning				Reg	PIO
Ent		- 4 JAN 2010				LLC	Appeals
Str Oth		N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other

## **KHT Planning Application for Wornington Green** **Response by Cllr E Dent Coad**

During four years as Councillor representing Golborne Ward and leading on Wornington Green, I have spoken to nearly all households on the estate, some of them many times, formally and informally. There is a fantastic sense of community here, and while most residents want improvement of some kind - genuine 'regeneration' - very few would wish this at any cost. Crime is low, people know each other, there is safety in familiarity, some families have four generations living there, and there is healthy tolerance and co-dependence. For many, the total demolition and rebuilding of the estate - full redevelopment - is a frightening prospect that they do not believe will improve their everyday lives and the life prospects of themselves or their families.

Many residents, possibly two-thirds (confirmed by just 32% who responded positively in the ERS survey) would like to keep many of their well-loved but rather scruffy buildings, and some of the buildings are certainly worth saving, ie, Pepler House, Edward Kennedy House and the park buildings. However, IF the conditions of the Council's SPD were strictly adhered to, some level of development would still keep the community together and improve their health and life prospects. Added to that, IF there were a convincing case that this proposal was of excellent quality and would offer the improvements residents deserve, I would enthusiastically support redevelopment and try to convey my reasons for doing so to residents. As a former student and current guest lecturer at the Bartlett School of Architecture and Planning, and writer on design and architecture for many years, I am well qualified to form judgments.

I state this specifically as there are comments in the Community Strategy document that refer to my role at Wornington Green as supporting a vociferous minority in opposition to the plans. I would like to refute this. The two petitions that have been set up by community members comprise 410 signatures to 'Save Athlone Gardens' and more recently 1,450 signatures to 'Save the Venture Centre'. Added to that is the day to day experience of residents who tell me they are getting a very poor service from KHT, and do not believe that the redevelopment as proposed will improve their lives at all nor offer the housing they need. Many of them do their utmost to inform themselves and ask me to be the conduit of their concerns.

So there is huge anxiety about this application that is based on a number of unanswered questions and concerns of the residents and neighbours of Wornington Green, plus some of my own. Many residents from the various ethnic groups, which together form a majority, believe the intention is to 'design out' their communities by creating a neighbourhood that is attractive to the kind of people who would not normally live in North Kensington; the regular mention of Onslow Square in the application reinforces this. This deep-seated distrust will be very hard to address, given the developer's consultation process, which has been narrow and exclusive.

## **RISKS**

One of the major risks is that if the development goes ahead, it will get 'stuck' at some point. Phase 1 proposed mews houses in Munro Mews are very small and cramped, with a huge space dedicated to an integral garage. The ground floor has a small room supposedly a 'study', though I cannot imagine a family dedicating an entire room in a small house to this use. The main family space is on the second floor, implying that all the supplies must be hauled up two floors, and residents must run up and down two flights of stairs to answer the door and dispose of waste, for which there are no facilities outside. There is just one bathroom and the only outside space is a tiny balcony; there are no windows whatever to the rear of the building. As there is no footpath and the front door gives directly onto the road, I cannot imagine these being desirable family homes. Block 1 to the rear of this has a very narrow communal 'court' that will get no or little sunlight, so a waste of space, and only the bedrooms face south, a truly bizarre arrangement. The risk here is that buildings in the first phase of a huge and long-term development will quite simply not sell (SPD 1.4.1).

There are already plenty of precedents nearby for newly built private homes lying unsold. The flats in Bevington Road, Appleford Road and Barlby Road are all 'mixed tenure', but many private flats are unsold, as are some of the shared ownership as these are very expensive to run. The upmarket development at Portobello Dock, despite being a gated development and having the prize location beside the canal, is also largely unoccupied after three years. This last was an award-winning design by a well-known architect; at Wornington Green the design is banal and commercial. Without sales, the development will come to a standstill, with half a park and some buildings half demolished.

In short, the Golborne area may be interesting and 'coming up', but not to the dizzy heights anticipated by estate agents and developers. There is a long history in this area of developers getting it wrong. My own home, in a Victorian terrace house within four minutes' walk of a tube station, was spec housing built in 1898 when the Hammersmith and City line was built, as a large family home with stables behind. It was empty for five years and became a boarding house; like many similar houses in Ladbroke Grove it has NEVER been lived in as a single family home. Similarly the houses that became 'slums' and were demolished to build Wornington Green were also split into boarding houses. Purpose built flats of varying sizes may have been more suitable.

On this subject, the new flats are being touted as 'a modern reinterpretation of the mansion block' (SPD 7.10.1). This claim is entirely fallacious; mansion flats were built as grand and spacious family homes to attract those who might otherwise buy a house. The flats proposed here are of a banal and undistinguished idiom designed to absolute minimal standards as per the Mayor of London's draft Housing Design Guide and not one sq cm more. Added to that, we are told that the market flats will be 'almost' the same so may well be smaller, a further risk here of being unattractive to buyers (SPD 3.6.4). The mega-block down Wornington Road in the final phase has no attractions whatever; I cannot imagine anyone living there by choice (SPD 7.10.2).

The first phase includes a very risky part demolition of a single wing of an H-block, where there are communal services and circulation routes; the threat of a partly demolished building being left for some years, with accompanying issues of redistributing communal services, cannot be tolerated. Similarly the third phase sees the partial demolition of Pepler House. If the development becomes 'stuck' at either of these stages there will be further risks of having an estate in a very poor condition with half demolished buildings and half a park.

It also seems quite bizarre that the most problematic buildings that are currently left in the worst condition – the H-blocks in the centre and towards Ladbroke Grove – are in the last phase so most at risk of being left long-term, whereas the better designed and maintained buildings around the park are being demolished first. The phasing plan has been very badly conceived with little consideration of possible risks.

Another risk relates to the decanting and subsequent rehousing of residents from the estate (SDP 3.1.2). The first phase provision of social rented housing in no way answers the needs of the residents who will have been decanted in this phase. The need throughout the estate is for additional homes, and for additional family homes of 3+ bedrooms, but in fact the number of family homes is being reduced in total (see Part Three), and is a very minor part of the first phase, despite 44 houses in total being demolished with the accompanying need this implies. Further analysis of the somewhat confusing charts is being undertaken to clarify this and will be supplied as soon as available.

Issues relating to the various community groups will be dealt with by the relevant leaders. Other comments are in the ensuing numbered sections.

## **Part One: The 20 CABE Building for Life criteria (SPD3.1.5) applied to the planning application for Wornington Green Dec 09**

---

### **Environment and community**

01. Does the development provide (or is it close to) community facilities, such as a school, parks, play areas, shops, pubs or cafes?

A: Community facilities are being reprovided like for like, despite doubled density, same size of community centre, park and playspace, no extra health facilities, schools or nurseries (SPD 5.1.1, 5.1.3, 5.1.6).

02. Is there an accommodation mix that reflects the needs and aspirations of the local community?

A: No, need is for more family homes, provision is for fewer family homes of 3+ bedrooms, and 119 fewer bedrooms than currently in an estate supposed to be 50% overcrowded (SPD 3.1.2). There is an overprovision of private rented in the

borough (Strategic Housing Market Assessment [SHMA] 6.20).

**03. Is there a tenure mix that reflects the needs of the local community?**

A: No, need is for more social rented as per recent SHMA (SHMA 5.10), new provision projected for additional private only, where there is a surplus and unsold new private homes locally (SPD 3.5.1, SHMA 6.20).

**04. Does the development have easy access to public transport?**

A: Yes, but doubling density will overstretch local transport, and there are no plans to improve access, only to increase car use (SPD 9.2).

**05. Does the development have any features that reduce its environmental impact?**

A: No, only minimal Code 4 by 2012, and CHP. Otherwise just increased car use where air pollution is already very bad.

## **Character**

**06. Is the design specific to the scheme?**

A: Possibly, but hard to tell as it is very banal and commercial (SPD 7.8.1, 7.9.3iv).

**07. Does the scheme exploit existing buildings, landscape or topography?**

A: No, it will obliterate all buildings, the well-loved park and mature trees, and change the name of the area.

**08. Does the scheme feel like a place with distinctive character?**

A: No, it is very banal, could be anywhere. The widely admired and 'almost listable' Pepler House by Clifford Wearden, pupil of Basil Spence, is an excellent typology for social housing and knits well into the area, but is to be demolished. The Twentieth Century Society stated: 'It makes no sense to destroy such buildings'.

**09. Do the buildings and layout make it easy to find your way around?**

A: Maybe, hard to tell, mega-blocks look confusing, but if so it's a small gain.

**10. Are streets defined by a well-structured building layout?**

A: Not really, a bit of a mess, with a mega-block down Wornington Road and an awkward tall building on an unattractive roundabout, that will probably remain empty forever (SPD 7.11.1, 7.3.7).

## **Streets, parking and pedestrianisation**

**11. Does the building layout take priority over the streets and car parking, so that the highways do not dominate?**

A: No, it's all about cars here (SPD 7.2.2).

**12. Is the car parking well integrated and situated so it supports the street scene?**

A: No, there is an increase of street car parking that will set the tone, in full view of the new park.

**13. Are the streets pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly?**

A: No they are not; to think we are trying to create a walking neighbourhood! 1,000 underground cycle parking spaces and no public realm improvements to encourage use (SPD 7.1.1).

**14. Does the scheme integrate with existing streets, paths and surrounding development?**

A: Not really, the old street pattern was replaced by the estate, and the plan puts some streets back but still looks like an estate.

**15. Are public spaces and pedestrian routes overlooked and do they feel safe?**

A: Yes, overlooked, though many are now, and the estate has very little crime at present: everyone knows each other.

## **Design and construction**

**16. Is public space well designed and does it have suitable management arrangements in place?**

Q: No, not at all, unless they get a new management team.

**17. Do the buildings exhibit architectural quality?**

A: No, it is very banal and overscaled, and could be anywhere, though it has stated pretensions of being 'Onslow Square'. In North Kensington!

**18. Do internal spaces and layout allow for adaptation, conversion or extension?**

A: None whatever, though this was specifically asked for in the light of 'Lifetime Homes' and cultural imperatives for segregation of gender at family gatherings. (SPD 3.6.7).

**19. Has the scheme made use of advances in construction or technology that enhance its performance, quality and attractiveness?**

A: Not apparently, it meets minimum standards and is not attractive.

**20. Do buildings or spaces outperform statutory minima, such as building regulations?**

A: Not at all, minimal regs throughout. Only 10% wheelchair accessible provided despite having 20% disabled on the estate.

Dec 09

## **Part Two: Comments on Wornington Green planning application vis á vis GLA comments and requirements**

---

The letter from the Mayor of London's office dated July 2009 stated a number of detailed matters to be addressed. These included:

- **issues of financial viability relating to 'maximum reasonable amount' of affordable housing (minimum possible offered, fewer bedrooms)**
- **opportunity to deliver additional affordable housing (ignored)**
- **integration of affordable and market housing (different cores, different amenities, full basement bedrooms)**
- **reference to London Housing Design Guide Draft (see below)**
- **pedestrian and cyclist priority in reinstated streets (none)**
- **defensible space (total lack of privacy)**
- **'largely car free approach' (underground or integrated garages for each MARKET home)**
- **enhance access for buses/improve transport infrastructure (no)**

**We are not convinced that any of these issues have been addressed.**

**In relation to the London Housing Design Guide (LHD) Draft, we have the following comments:**

- **the scheme does not enhance but obliterates the character (and even the name) of the area, its park with fine mature trees and Pepler House. Instead it is trying to create 'Onslow Square' in North Kensington (SPD 4.3, LHD 1.1.1)**
- **the new road network and streetscape is unsympathetic in a neighbourhood of older people and young families (LHD 1.1.2)**
- **amenity open space has been eaten up, there will be few pleasant views and trees will be destroyed. The only green space will be a new park, which has aspirations to be a 'grand garden square' (LHD 1.2.1)**
- **communal courtyards will have one hour of sunlight/day (SPD 7.12.1, LHD 1.2.3)**
- **density is doubled but privacy ignored. We asked for improved privacy for families, but are offered plate glass windows and glass-fronted balconies, which will not mitigate against street noise either (LHD 2.1.1)**
- **transport infrastructure: just more cars (LHD 2.1.2)**

- accommodation mix does not meet local need and is not tenure blind (LHD 2.2.1)
- 'accessible' properties are on two floors with no connecting lift (LHD 3.2.5, 4.3.2)
- number of dwellings sharing a core is increased to 24: in 38 street properties and around half of the blocks it is currently fewer (LHD 3.2.4)
- open spaces will be dominated by parked cars, all around the park, and there is an underground car park or integrated garage space for each private home (LHD 3.3.1, 3.3.3)
- cycle parking is within the underground car park, inconvenient and with poor access to the street (LHD 3.4.2)
- there is no internal flexibility to layout, or ability to close off open plan kitchens LHD 4.2.2, 4.3.3)
- 'private' open space is a small inset balcony with clear glass front, same size for small or family flat; most face north and will not get any direct sunlight, too small for family to sit out, no privacy (LHD 4.10)
- although this was specifically requested, for cultural and other reasons, privacy and overlooking has been little considered (LHD 5.1.1)
- mews houses are single aspect, the largest ground floor space seems to be an integrated garage, small pokey rooms, one bathroom (LHD 5.2.1)
- there are few affordable homes in the first phase (particularly Block 1) that will receive direct sunlight into habitable rooms; it is the bedrooms that face south (LHD 5.5.2)
- amenity space has been given over to roads, increasing run-off and increasing flood risk (SPD 8.9.2, LHD 6.3.3)

Dec 09

**Part three:  
How many bedrooms will address  
overcrowding on Wornington Green?**

---

In 2005 KHT's Housing Needs Study stated they were 201 bedrooms short. There have been many references to the estate being 50% overcrowded, and that total redevelopment is the only way to resolve this. However ...

**November 2008**

**Q: How many existing social rented habitable rooms are there, and how many are proposed?**

**A: Existing: 538 units, 1654 rooms**

**Proposed: 540 units, 1660 rooms**

- two extra flats, six extra habitable rooms

**And this year, three further versions ...**

Affordable Rented	Existing	Proposed July 2009	Proposed Nov 2009	Proposed Masterplan
1 bedroom	210	256	267	267
2 bedrooms	154	142	151	150
3 bedrooms	128	86	87	86
4 bedroom flats	8	28	21	12
5 bedroom flats	-	-	-	8
6 bedroom flats	-	-	-	1
3/4 bedroom houses	38	26	12	12

**TOTAL BEDROOMS NOW: 1,086**

**TOTAL BEDROOMS PROPOSED: 967**

**= 119 FEWER BEDROOMS THAN NOW**

**So, HOW will they fit the '50% overcrowded families' into 119 fewer bedrooms??**

- overcrowded families are encouraged to apply to RBKC
- hidden households are told they are 'eligible' to apply to RBKC
- adult children are also 'eligible' to apply to RBKC
- older people are encouraged to apply for sheltered housing with RBKC

**There is an RBKC waiting list of 6,000 households already, but still residents are told:**

**'apply to RBKC'**

**(SPD 2.2.1, 2.2.2)**

**Dec 09**

**PART FOUR:**  
**RESPONSE TO**  
**WORNINGTON GREEN PLANNING APPLICATION**  
**OTHER THINGS ASKED FOR via SPD**

<b><u>WE ASKED FOR</u></b>	<b><u>WE ARE GETTING</u></b>
Good standards of privacy, maybe shutters (7.5.2, 7.14)	Plate glass windows and balconies, no shutters
Balconies large enough for occupants to eat on (7.12.2)	Juliet balconies, plus others not big enough for family to sit out on
Shared communal gardens (7.15, 7.12.1)	Narrow courtyards that will get no sun, will end up as service areas
No massive blocks (7.10.2)	Wornington Road mega-block
Zero extra parking except for disabled	Each new private home will have access to underground or integrated garage
Off-street parking for those who have it now (7.6.2)	No off-street parking for those who have it now
Healthcare, education, youth facilities, fitness, etc (5.1)	None of that
'regeneration benefits' (3.1.1)	Just development
Highest building should be eight storeys (7.10.2)	Highest building will be 15 storeys
Tenants must not be moved off estate if they want to stay (3.1.2)	Tenants being moved off, told they are not eligible tenants
Entrances should serve 6-12 dwellings (3.2.1)	Entrances serve up to 24 flats
'More larger units', currently 174 three and four bed (3.5.2, 3.5.3)	Fewer larger units, 129 three bed+
Reprovide park with a range of activities for all ages (3.1.3)	Aspiration for 'grand garden square' like Onslow Square
Keeping the community together	'Rebranding the area, giving it a new name'
Cohesive neighbourhood	'richness' 'grand homes' 'grand approach', grand gestures'
Regeneration ie, opportunities for children, young people and adults to achieve their potential	'Health and happiness', but no means to achieve it apart from chance to mix concrete

<b>Decent day to day management and maintenance</b>	<b>'High quality management to match high quality buildings' (ie, not yet)</b>
<b>Dedicated youth facilities</b>	<b>'An opportunity for Venture Centre to work with youth' (ie, not KHT)</b>
<b>Rationale for reopening road to Ladbroke Grove, when community fought for closure (7.2.2)</b>	<b>'Re-energising Wornington Road'</b>
<b>Gardens to replace gardens (3.2.2)</b>	<b>Money to replace gardens</b>
<b>Affordable retail space</b>	<b>Market rate retail space</b>
<b>Permanent accommodation for Residents' Association, Tenants' Forum, and Youth Services</b>	<b>All this forgotten</b>
<b>Recycling facilities within buildings (8.5.3)</b>	<b>Separate building for waste</b>

Dec 09

## **George, Edward: PC-Plan**

---

**From:** emma Dent Coad [edentcoad@yahoo.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 02 January 2010 16:17  
**To:** Tollitt, Penelope: PC-Plan; George, Edward: PC-Plan; Lerner, Peter: PC-Plan  
**Subject:** Wornington Green: Comments on Environmental Statement, Air Quality  
**Attachments:** Cllr EDC Comments on Env Statement, Air Quality.doc

Please find attached my comments on Air Quality re the Wornington Green planning application. I have only sent to the three of you at the Town Hall, so please forward on to whoever else may be interested in W8.

kind regards  
Emma Dent Coad  
Councillor, Golborne Ward  
RB Kensington and Chelsea

**Wornington Green Planning Application  
Response to Environmental Statement, AIR QUALITY  
Cllr E Dent Coad**

---

Having done my utmost to read this 387-page document in the short time available, I will inevitably have missed or even misunderstood some issues, and this may not be a balanced critique. I have therefore focussed on areas that were already of particular concern.

We are all well aware that RBKC is an Air Quality Management Area and that air quality is monitored at a number of sites across the Borough. In North Kensington this is of particular concern due to the proximity of a number of busy main thoroughfares: the A40; Ladbrooke Grove; and the railway line. For example, measurements taken from the monitoring sites in North Kensington during 2009 have indicated that the maximum readings for particulates (PM10) reached 65 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> in January 2009 and 73 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> in April 2009, well in excess of what could be considered acceptable.

The Council's 2009 Air Quality Updating and Screening Assessment (USA) for RBKC indicates that air quality is already particularly poor in and around the Wornington Green estate. The map on page 16 of the Assessment indicates that predicted NO<sub>2</sub> levels for 2010 are expected to be above 41 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> across the entirety of the estate, above 43 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> over most of the estate, and well above 45 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> (possibly as high as 51-60 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup>) in that part of the estate in proximity to the railway line, all well above the recommended upper limit of 40 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup>. The report offers similar predictions for particulate matter (PM10) concentrations, the map on page 20 of the USA indicates particulate levels are predicted to be above 24 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> across the entirety of the estate, above 25 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> over most of the estate, and above 26 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> in that part of the estate in proximity to the railway line.

Given the content of RBKC's 2009 Air Quality USA it comes as a bit of surprise to find that the Environmental Statement (ES) that has been submitted by Kensington Housing Trust (KHT) does not contain figures that tally with those in RBKC's USA. Table 9.6 on page 187 of the ES lists the highest level of NO<sub>2</sub> forecast for 2011 as 44.2 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> at one specific location and significantly below 40 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> over most of the estate. These forecasts are clearly well below RBKC's own estimates. Similarly the highest level of PM10 particulates forecast for 2011 is of 19.5 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup>; also clearly well below RBKC's own estimate.

The reason for this discrepancy becomes clear upon closer examination of the ES: it has used a monitoring station a significant distance away from both the Wornington Green estate and any significant sources of NO<sub>2</sub> and PM10 in the area as its sole point of reference (and all forecasts

have subsequently been extrapolated from that monitoring station's data). This monitoring station is located on a quiet road near Sion Manning School, immediately adjacent to the convent's walled gardens (the largest open space in the area). The monitoring station is two blocks away from Ladbroke Grove and three blocks away from the railway line. As a result it comes as no surprise that the forecasts proposed within the ES do not tally with those in RBKC's 2009 USA for the Wornington Green estate: quite simply, they are not based on data from the site of the estate. They do however tally with those of the monitoring station – RBKC's 2009 USA predicts NO<sub>2</sub> levels of between 38 and 41 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> and PM<sub>10</sub> levels below 24 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> for that location in 2010. The obvious question therefore is whether or not the figures and forecasts contained in KHT's ES are actually of any relevance to the site of the Wornington Green estate, given that they are based on data obtained from a source at a location known to have significantly lower levels of both NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and no effort appears to have been made to account or compensate for this discrepancy when preparing the forecasts for 2011, 2014 and 2022. It should also be noted that pages 22 and 25 of the USA show a NO<sub>2</sub> 'corridor' along the railway for 2010 of an incredible 61-141 micrograms/m<sup>3</sup> and a similarly high reading for PM<sub>10</sub>. Moreover, none of these predictions have mentioned the potential impact of Crossrail, that we presume runs on diesel and will also have an adverse effect.

It is possible that the differences highlighted in the ES's forecasts are reasonable. That is to say that pollutant concentrations will rise by the percentages indicated under the "do something" scenario. They would however rise against a much higher baseline than that used in the ES; one where current levels of NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> are in line with RBKC's 2009 USA and therefore much higher. Forecast increases in NO<sub>2</sub> levels of up to 9.2 % in 2011 and up to 9.7% in 2014 would therefore seem like huge increases if taken as increases of the figures in RBKC's 2009 USA. In that case the impact of the redevelopment would clearly make a poor situation noticeably worse.

Unfortunately questions also arise as to whether the forecasts contained in the ES have actually taken proper account of the impact of the construction work or of the additional traffic that the "new" Wornington Green estate will facilitate. For some unknown reason no account has been taken of the impact on air quality of the construction vehicles accessing the site prior to 2014 (as per statement 9.37 on page 191 of the ES) despite the fact that demolition and construction work will have been going on for some time prior to 2014. And the proposed development will clearly make the entire site much more "vehicle friendly" than it is today as well as increase the number of car parking spaces on the site by over 320% (from 176 to 576), all of which will result in a significant increase in car use and through traffic within the area, perhaps doubling current levels. It is hard to see how either of these could be reasonably expected

to have a negligible or nil impact on air quality, as appears to be suggested.

The ES also makes a number of "promises" with regards to the control of dust and emissions at the construction site, particularly with regards to the use of abatement devices to minimise particulates and the use of ultra low sulphur fuel. Will the Council be requiring KHT to abide by these "promises" or are they merely "aspirations" on the part of KHT?

Finally, the Executive Summary of the Council's 2009 Air Quality USA states that "a detailed assessment of N02 in the vicinity of the Paddington to Swansea rail line is required". I am not aware that this work has been planned or undertaken, and would recommend that the work be carried out prior to the granting of any permission with regards to the proposed redevelopment of the Wornington Green estate given the close proximity of the railway line to much of the estate, and the potential added impact of Crossrail.

#### **SUMMARY**

- Air quality is already very poor in the immediate area
- KHT's ES uses different baseline figures to that of RBKC's USA
- KHT's estimates are well below those of RBKC
- Should these figures be challenged?
- If forecast rises are correct against RBKC's baseline, air quality will be unacceptable
- Impact of demolition and construction work pre-2014 has been ignored
- Effect of 320% increase in car parking and through traffic ignored
- Mitigation measures of dust and emissions: promise or 'aspiration'?
- Detailed assessment of N02 beside railway must be undertaken

Jan 2010

## George, Edward: PC-Plan

---

**From:** emma Dent Coad [edentcoad@yahoo.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 02 January 2010 18:31  
**To:** Tollitt, Penelope: PC-Plan; George, Edward: PC-Plan; Lerner, Peter: PC-Plan  
**Subject:** Worrington Green: Visual Impact etc comments  
**Attachments:** Cllr EDC Comments on Env Statement, Townscape etc.doc

Another thousand pages reviewed.  
Emma Dent Coad  
Councillor, Golborne Ward  
RB Kensington and Chelsea

**Wornington Green Planning Application  
Response to Environmental Statement  
TOWNSCAPE, LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT  
Cllr E Dent Coad**

---

The Townscape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment contains interesting research but I would take issue with many of the conclusions here. The proposed development in no way follows regular street and block patterns (SPD 7.1). The residential areas surveyed in the ES are in quiet back-streets without through traffic. These are not comparable with KHT's aspirations for Portobello and Wornington Roads, which are in or next to busy local shopping destinations. Buildings surveyed for the ES, for example those in St Quintin Estate, are of relatively small scale, mostly two-storey houses, and none have integral garages, which are absolutely NOT a local typology even in nearby mews homes such as Golborne Mews. There are no local mews homes in a through road, which means they are more amenable to having no footpath. The proposed Munro Mews, however, has no footpath, integral garages, and is a through road; this must present road safety issues.

A far better example of a modern interpretation of a typical street grid pattern would be that of Swinbrooke Estate, built by the Council in the 1970s, which has fared well and attracts those who wish to buy leases, so it is a genuine mixed tenure neighbourhood. It has a fine grained streetscape with small plots of public space that are well used; a proper family neighbourhood. Kerrington Court at the end of Wornington Road is a modern terrace with shops below and flats above, but entirely in keeping with the area. Pepler House is also an intelligent design popular with residents that has been widely admired and works well, being of decent human scale. Contrasted with this, the mega-blocks proposed for Wornington Road in its place, and the 15-storey office block at the end, have no architectural merit and will totally change the character of the area, at least doubling the building height and removing all private outdoor space and storage sheds. The proximity with Kerrington Court will be a total mismatch and entirely out of scale.

To encourage a 'sense of place' (SPD 7.9) the SPD has suggested that high quality architecture is achieved through a mansion block-type design, keeping to local scale of 6-8 storeys (SPD 7.10.2). Traditional mansion blocks of any scale in the area, such as Thorbury Court in Chepstow Villas, are set well back from the road and have large communal gardens to the rear and interesting facades that blend with neighbouring terraced houses. Typically mansion blocks have a different hierarchy from family houses, with flats of equal dimensions and equal window sizes on each floor, leading to a more egalitarian distribution of space than terraced houses that were designed for 'Upstairs, Downstairs' 19<sup>th</sup> century living. It must be said that the typology of the flats proposed for Wornington Green with more or less

direct frontage onto the street creating canyons and total lack of privacy, is more 'scaled down blocks of flats' than that the 'modern reinterpretation of the mansion block' that the SPD (7.10.2) requires. The proposed design, such as described though there is little detailing, has little visual interest and insufficient character, balance or delicacy in scale to justify the heights proposed along narrow streets.

We have already commented on the height of the buildings proposed, which will lead to overshadowing, loss of scale and considerable overdevelopment, or appearance of same (SPD 7.11). The SPD also stipulates the need for private outdoor space. A conservative estimate of at least one-third of the estate has a front or back garden or both, and these are highly treasured and regarded, with some residents winning prizes for their flower gardens and others creating wildlife sanctuaries and growing vegetables, while some use them as outdoor dining areas in good weather; obviously they are also used for everyday play areas for small children. All these gardens are to be lost in the proposed design, and are to be replaced with small balconies not large enough for a family to sit out on (SPD 7.12.2). Given that in the first phase most of these balconies, at least for social tenants, face north, these can hardly be described as private outside space (SPD 7.15.1, 7.14.1). Also there will be a loss of sitting out space for those who get out rarely, and will suffer further health problems from a deficiency of fresh air, Vitamin D from sunlight, and general well-being from opportunities to be outside.

The loss of nearly half the trees on the estate, plus a loss of views from almost all adjacent buildings, will certainly not meet the borough's objective for this area of 'A Great Place to Live and a Great Place to be'. There are several parcels of amenity space around the estate, none have been recorded and none will be replaced. Some are lovelier than others, but the sense of space and quiet they produce, with mature trees and wildlife, is an important mitigation for people living in the inner city, and is under threat of being entirely lost along with the songbirds that residents treasure.

One of the biggest surprises for me in the proposed plans is the 320% increase of car parking, where a reduction in car use had in fact been recommended in the SPD (SPD 7.6). Given that the Environmental Statement suggests that the public transport network is adequate to take the proposed increase of use, there can be no excuse for this whatever; frankly it is quite shocking. Given also the development of underground car parking for the market homes – a hugely expensive investment, and unwise given the problems regarding security created by underground car parks – the proposals in this regard are simply unfathomable. If it is the case, as some have suggested, that the development will be dependent for its financial viability on selling car park spaces, we must suggest in return that this is not a recommendation and is quite unjustifiable on any terms.

**If this is to be a 'once in a lifetime opportunity' to create a more pleasant and fitting, and more attractive environment for residents in Wornington Green, in a development to last at least 100 years, we must insist on a far greater consideration of the visual impact and loss to the environment we may face if the redevelopment goes ahead as proposed.**

### **SUMMARY**

- **Comparisons with St Quintin Estate or St Lawrence Terrace are quite unjustified; Swinbrooke Estate, Kerrington Court and KHT's St Marks Road houses would be more appropriate**
- **Integral garages are not a local characteristic**
- **Mews streets should be cul de sacs, not through roads**
- **Kerrington Court and Pepler House have human scale, new blocks are overscaled and uncharacteristic, especially 15 storey**
- **This is not a 'modern reinterpretation of a mansion block' too high, too big, and out of scale**
- **Increase of 350% car parking, with concomitant increase of traffic and pollution, and decrease in road safety are unacceptable**
- **Loss of private outdoor space and gardens for a majority of homes**
- **Loss of intermediate space, wide decks, social play areas**
- **Loss of sunlight**
- **Loss of trees and wildlife**
- **NOT 'a great place to live and a great place to be'**

**Jan 2010**



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA  
 THE TOWN HALL KENSINGTON W8 7NX  
 Tel: 020 7937 5464 Fax: 020 7938 1445

**Councillor Pat Mason,**  
**GOLBORNE WARD**  
 Email: [Cllr.Mason@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.Mason@rbkc.gov.uk)

15<sup>th</sup> January 2010

Penelope Tollitt,  
 Planning and Borough Development,  
 Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea,  
 The Town Hall,  
 Hornton Street,  
 London W8 7NX

ExO	HDC	HSS	HPD	HoE	Policy	Design	Other
DC	Received RBKC Planning				Reg	PIO	
Enf	18 JAN 2010				LLC	Appeals	
Str Dev	N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other	

Dear Ms Tollitt,

**Wornington Green Planning Application from KHT**

I have served as a Councillor in Golborne Ward for almost 20 years now and have spent about half of that time representing residents concerns and views on a series of plans and designs to regenerate Wornington Green put forward by KHT before and since they became part of the Catalyst Housing Group. For example, in 2004 I set up and chaired the WG Residents Estate Development Group that brought residents, KHT, the Council and others to the discussion table.

I know very many residents and their families, and have watched their children grow up, become adults with families of their own. I work closely with the Golborne Road and Al-Manaar Mosques and know many of the Muslim residents on Wornington Green, including Imam Driss who lives in Pepler House. I am also in regular contact with local Christian churches where WG residents go to worship.

In the early 1990s, I worked with the Wornington Green Residents Association to set up the WG Detached Youth Work Project that developed into a charity I chaired for 9 years, and that was supported by the Royal Borough Council and other funders. I also served on the Venture Centre Community Association management committee for many years, and spent 18 years on the management committee of the North Kensington Law Centre, (also serving as chair), on nearby Golborne Road.

WG is not just a collection of buildings and streets, it is where generations of families live, the place their children will recognise as home, where mum and dad live, where my uncle and aunt lives. And when I go to the Mosque or the church, the people I see around me live on my streets at WG. This is my place, my community, I belong here, people know me.

This is probably the reality on most estates, 'villages' and local areas in the borough. It is the feeling that I live in, feel safe in and know my community. This is what I believe we have at WG, and the residents there will not easily give this up.

Even at this late hour, I hope that KHT and the Council will think long and hard before authorising a 10-year levelling of WG that will turn the whole area into a permanent noisy building site, and will cause the dispersal beyond the estate / Golborne area, and probably beyond the borough, of our many residents, despite the promises we hear from KHT today, and have heard from Council Cabinet Members when I have questioned them at Council Meetings.

### **Traffic & air pollution**

I am concerned about the increase in local and through traffic and air pollution that is likely to result from the doubling of housing density, the provision of parking facilities on the development, and the linking of the new road lay out to the main local transport arteries.

Vehicle ownership is about 37% in Golborne Ward at present, and doubling the housing density adding half or more private homes to the present affordable figure is likely to increase car ownership levels on the development and therefore worsen the already unhealthy air pollution levels.

I have seen no credible baseline analysis of the present or projected air pollution levels from KHT for WG, not least because KHT appears to have used the readings from the air pollution monitoring station at Sion Manning School that is monitoring an area that emits less pollutants than is the case at WG. KHT's pollutant estimates anyway appear to be below the Council's own estimates for WG? Look, for example, at the 2010 NO2 map produced for the Council by the GLA that includes readings for Golborne Ward, and the discrepancy is clear.

This seems strange when you consider that WG is ringed by Ladbroke Grove, Great Western Road, Kensal Road, Golborne Road that moves significant traffic levels, and also the Paddington Railway Line that spews pollution from trains especially towards Pepler House, Thompson House and Edward Kennedy House.

I refer you to the excellent WG Air Quality comments provided to the committee by my Ward colleague, Cllr Emma Dent Coad who has asked for more and better air quality studies to be carried out at WG to ensure that we do not create a future air pollution hot spot worse than is presently the case at WG.

### **KHT's 'open up the roads' layout arguments**

Since the first redevelopment plans in 2000, KHT has consistently argued that the present estate road layout is unsafe for residents and somehow leaves them prone to higher crime levels. If this analysis held any water, then various 'villages' and closed residential schemes in Chelsea and in other London boroughs would also suffer high crime levels, but they do not. WG and Golborne Ward have had deprivation status for at least 20 years, and it is well accepted that it is poverty, deprivation, unemployment and the like that are the engines of crime, and crime levels have been no higher on WG over the years than elsewhere in Golborne Ward and North Kensington.

In recent years, Metropolitan Police figures show consistently low crime figures for Golborne Ward, and this is reflected at WG. And the Borough's Park's Police incident figures show consistently low incident levels in Athlone Gardens where we have also been told by KHT that there is a lot of crime. On both counts – the road layout and the park – KHT have used bogus arguments to try to prove their point.

I believe there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the idea of the present road layout that keeps the large amounts of through lorries and other traffic off the estate that will flow past residents houses on the proposed development. This is bound to lead to more accidents to local children, more traffic congestion and air pollution, exactly what the Council say they want to prevent.

I believe that linking up the streets directly to the main arterial network will anyway reduce local residents control over these streets and their area, and that abolishing the identity of 'Wornington Green' is an attempt to abolish the idea of a community at WG, and to transform the area into a set of streets no one living there will feel they need to worry about.

We can see examples of these lifeless streets all over London where the idea of community has all but ceases to exist, and I believe that recreating such an environment at WG is a backward step the Council should not support. Even the government is moving away from levelling entire estates and disrupting and dispersing the communities living there.

### **Athlone Gardens as a Community Hub & Loss of Trees**

For a number of reasons I am opposed to the building over and 'reprovision' of Athlone Gardens that belongs to the wider area and not just to WG.

Given that Golborne residents have the least amount of green / open space per head of population in the borough, I do not believe it is right to effectively remove Athlone Gardens –a Council-owned asset supported by Council Tax payers - from public use for the several years it will take to complete phase 1 and reprovide this green space, although it is impossible to reprovide a mature park. This park is well used by schools, the Moroccan and Muslim community, by young people and families and by elderly and disabled residents. I believe the Council should consider any other development configuration that would not result in building over Athlone Gardens.

I am opposed to the loss of the London Plane Trees in Athlone Gardens that are protected by Tree Preservation Orders and that are recommended to be kept by the adopted SDP. We need more trees not less, because, as we all know, trees help to mop up air pollutants.

The residents consultations and meetings I was involved in over the years led me to believe that there was support for the idea of clustering the Venture Centre & Notting Hill Adventure Playground, youth project, a café, health facilities, and perhaps also the North Kensington Law Centre and a community centre for all residents including the Muslim community.

Indeed myself and Imam Driss met with the then KHT Director to discuss this concept that KHT said they liked. Such a concept would create a community hub of the kind that operates successfully elsewhere. I can only assume that the present Garden proposals

are motivated solely by financial considerations as opposed to working to create a destination cluster of economic, service & entertainment etc activity that would most benefit this less affluent area. The Council is working to bring a Cross Rail station to North Kensington, and we have the chance to provide an attraction hub at WG that will feed visitors to Golborne and Portobello Roads, and I believe that the present development proposals are a missed opportunity.

### **Wornington Green youth project**

The WG Detached Youth Work Project has a presence on the estate at the youth hut between the end of Wornington Road and Ladbroke Grove, W10. The Hut, originally erected as a local police base, is leased to the youth project on a peppercorn rent by KHT.

The youth project has served the estate since 1992, and has been an important vehicle in reducing drug dealing, street violence, burglary and the like, and this has been recognised by the police who have worked with the project on many occasions. In 1998, the government's Social Exclusion Unit used this project as an example of what was later rolled out nationally.

I have asked KHT and the Council on several occasions why the youth project is not mentioned in the development plans, why no one has talked to the current officers at the project, although I know that they have tried to talk to KHT and the Council without success.

I want to know why the youth project has not been included in the development proposals, and ask that the planning committee should decide that such provision should be made.

### **Golborne Road market storage lock-ups**

Golborne Road and the street market are economically important to the whole area.

I am concerned that Council planning officers are objecting to the 20 reprovided storage lock-ups in KHT's proposals on architectural and other grounds, and either want the number reduced or want them relocated off-site, but then say that no alternative site can be found.

I am opposed to the number of storage lock-ups either being reduced or provided off-site. We need these lock-ups to service the street market, and we will increasingly need more as Golborne Road is improved and market trading expands.

Waiting to find a location off-site will obviously take years and this is unacceptable. We need storage facilities located close to Golborne Road, as they are at present in Munro Mews, and until this matter is resolved these facilities should remain in use and accessible to the market.

### **15 storey building**

I support the objections to the proposed 15-storey tower at the Ladbroke Grove end of WG. I think it is out of character to the surrounding area. This tower and the 7 and 9 storey blocks will change the character of the area and embolden other developers to start building up to and then beyond this level in future years. Quite soon we will be living in a sea of high canyon buildings and skyscrapers.

### **Residents external storage units**

There appears to be no provision made for external storage units for residents, and as we can see from multi occupied properties in the borough where this is the case, for example, many more rubbish bags and various items of furniture are dumped in the street or in communal areas. This problem needs to be designed out because no amount of enforcement will rectify it later.

### **Cycle and motor cycle parking**

The last and present London mayors have promoted the expansion of cycling and the use of scooters and motor bikes, and this is supported by the Council.

It is therefore important that KHT makes provision for the parking and storage of these vehicles, and particularly for bicycles that will litter the communal areas inside and out unless this is done. Like other objectors, I do not see any adequate provision made in the present development proposals.

### **Access to the underground car parking**

I am opposed to the building of car parking facilities, underground or overground, that will encourage more car ownership, especially amongst the private house owners, I suspect, and it is still contrary to the Council's parking control policies to grant such permission.

But it seems wrong to use the streets around the reprovided Athlone Gardens as access entrances to the underground park, when the vehicles using the park will spew noise and pollution on the Athlone Gardens users that will inevitable include babies and young children. Such a car park should be sited elsewhere, perhaps off-site. It is worth asking if the spaces in this car park will be leased to the private house owners who may be the only people who could afford to pay?

## **Housing – Overcrowding conditions on Wornington Green**

I support the objectors who say that the proposed affordable housing build on this double density development will do nothing to resolve the overcrowding problem, unless KHT expects that despite the guarantee of return for existing residents, they hope that few of their residents will actually return which is what various surveys looking at such situations seem to suggest.

If this is not the case, and KHT were to take into account the expansion of families over the years, then why are they proposing a standstill to deficit re-provision? They must be aware that the Council's most recent Housing Needs Survey tells us that the most overwhelming need, especially in Golborne Ward and North Kensington, is for social rented / affordable housing build need for the people who already live here.

WG residents suffering severe overcrowding cannot afford to buy the proposed private houses, and bringing in the equivalent of another WG population who can buy private houses built only to finance the development will not help them.

KHT needs to project the present WG population forward and calculate a realistic affordable housing build, or it is possible that too many of the present families who will wait 5 years or longer to return will have grown too large to be accommodated on WG.

## **The Venture Centre & Notting Hill Adventure Playground**

I want to ensure that the Venture Centre and the Notting Hill Adventure Playground are re-provided as fit for purpose facilities to service a doubled population, and not squeezed in as an afterthought by those who have no other interest but to maximise finances, and think of the space the Venture Centre needs as dead space they think could be sold.

I want to re-state the comments The Venture Centre's Director, Chris Peacock sent to Penelope Tollitt at Planning and Borough Development following a recent Venture Centre Board Meeting:

"The proposed development", he says, "will double the density of the WG estate. It is an essential principle both of the current London Plan and Section 106 provisions that community spaces and community amenities should expand in proportion to any increase in population created by a proposed development.

The Venture Centre and Notting Hill Adventure Playgrounds are vital community spaces which need to expand to accommodate the increased population. 60% of our child users and 40% of our adult users come from the WG estate. Therefore, the new community will require a 40% larger community centre and a 60% larger adventure playground.

KHT's proposal involves replacing the Venture Centre and Notting Hill Adventure Playgrounds with spaces which are no larger than the current provision.

Given that the existing provision is inadequate to meet the needs of the community at its current size, and given that it is proposed to replace Athlone Gardens with a park which is no larger than at present, the proposed community spaces will be incapable of meeting the needs of the enlarged community.

Any enhanced amenity value which derives from the provision of a more modern Venture Centre and a better designed park will do nothing to address this fundamental lack of space".

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, I support very many of the objections and comments made by Wornington Green residents and the other interested parties who are unhappy with both the manner in which KHT carried out the consultation process, and who oppose the final development proposals.

I think this is a missed opportunity to produce a beacon project that could become an economic & community hub in Golborne as opposed to replacing the present estate with a collection of streets designed only to make the area look like any other area in the borough. I don't think this is good enough to justify the £millions that will be spent in this deprivation area. KHT and the Council should try harder to get more for our money.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Pat Mason', with a large checkmark at the end of the signature.

Councillor Pat Mason  
GOLBORNE WARD, RBKC

4/1/10

ExD	HDC	ASD	RPD	Obj	Policy	Design	Ties
DC		Received RBKC Planning			Reg	PIO	
Enf		30 DEC 2009			LLC	Appeal	
Str Dev		N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other

Mr. Jules Montero  
7 Ashburnham Tower  
World's End Estate  
London SW10 0EE

Planning and Borough Development  
Ground Floor  
Town Hall  
Hornton Street  
London W8 7NX

28<sup>th</sup> December 2009

Re: PP/09/02786 (Wornington Green Estate)

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing with regards to the above planning application by Kensington Housing Trust (hereafter "KHT") for the proposed "redevelopment" of the Wornington Green Estate in the north of the Borough. I am an ordinary resident of the Borough and have no vested interest in either KHT or the estate, I simply wish to ensure that a proposal of this scale, with the potential to negatively impact the lives of hundreds of the most vulnerable households in the Borough, be properly scrutinised and all interested parties convinced of its merits and viability before it be allowed to proceed.

Having taken the time to read and consider some of the many documents submitted with the planning application detailing KHT's current proposals I do have a number of concerns with what is being proposed. In particular, I do not believe that the application and documents provide sufficient convincing evidence that:

- i. The proposals are financially viable.
- ii. The proposals meet the needs of the estate's residents, in particular with regards to their ability to provide the additional housing required to meet not only the estate's current housing needs but also future housing needs.
- iii. The proposals have the support of the majority of the estate's population, that the residents have been properly consulted, and that their opinions have been taken into consideration by KHT when drafting the proposals.
- iv. The claims made by KHT with regards to tenure mix and housing density are accurate.
- v. The plans drawn up and submitted for the first phase of the works are complete and, in particular, provide sufficient detail of the decanting process to be used so as to provide reassurance that it will not unnecessarily negatively impact on the estate's residents.

The reasons why the documents submitted by KHT fail to convince on these questions are described below. I believe all of these issues are worthy of further investigation and proper resolution before permission to proceed with the demolition and redevelopment of any part of the existing Wornington Green Estate should be granted.

## **1. Financial Viability**

It is clear from the documents supplied with the application that I have been able to examine that the proposal is dependant on KHT securing a significant amount of funding through the sale of private units on the "new" redeveloped Wornington Green estate. The extent of this financial dependency and risk is unclear, as KHT have, for obvious reasons of financial confidentiality, not supplied a breakdown of the costs and corresponding income they need to secure for each phase of the proposals. I assume however that such detail will be provided to the local authority on a confidential basis and that the local authority will be able to scrutinise the figures.

I would note that some indication of the proposal's dependency on income from the sale of private units can be gleaned from the number of private units being developed. It should therefore be noted that the first phase includes a total of 150 private units out a total of 324 (46.3% of the total) suggesting that the scheme is heavily dependant on income from the sale of private units and that it is likely that not only are subsequent phases of the proposal dependant on the sale of those 150 private units, but that so is the first. If this is indeed the case the local authority would be wise to ensure that: (i) KHT's expectations with regards to its ability to sell these units are realistic; and (ii) KHT's expectations with regards to the income it will generate from the sale of these units are also realistic. If KHT's expectations are unrealistic in either case (i.e. they underestimate how difficult it might prove to sell the private units and/or they overestimate the amount potential buyers will be willing to pay for the private units) the local authority needs to consider the possibility that KHT will be unable to source the income it requires from the sale of these private units and may, as a result, not be able to complete the works proposed in whole or in part, thus endangering not only subsequent phases of the proposal but potentially also the first. The local authority would then also need to consider the potential fallout of such a failed scheme, whether it failed during the first phase, the last phase or any of the phases in-between, as it is very possible that the local authority could end up in the position of having to act to secure the physical structure of the estate and ensure the wellbeing of its residents.

For background information, a small amount of research suggests that selling private property of the kind proposed in the north of the Borough, and the Golborne area in particular, is far from easy. There are several private developments in the general vicinity of the Wornington Green estate containing a significant number of unsold properties. I would also note that KHT must bear in mind the simple fact that private property located within, or on close proximity, to large social housing estates tends to "suffer" from depressed pricing in comparison to the local "ordinary" housing market. An obvious example of this is the estate in which I live – the World's End Estate in Chelsea. Property prices within the estate (which is now truly mixed tenure – 22% of properties are leasehold, and a significant proportion of these, perhaps up to a third, are now owned by private-sale, rather than right-to-buy, leaseholders) are usually significantly lower than in the smaller social housing estates of a smaller size located nearby (smaller being beautiful in this particular case) and much lower than in the blocks of private flats in the area. The possibility that a similar situation might arise in this case must be borne in mind when determining whether any figures submitted by KHT with regards to the expected sale prices of the private units are realistic. I would also suggest that there is even the possibility that the introduction of such a large quantity of private housing into the area may result in universally reduced housing prices, due to the oversupply that would result. This must also be considered by all concerned.

## **2. Housing Need (Overcrowding and Hidden Households)**

Many of the documents submitted by KHT refer to the problem of "chronic overcrowding" on the estate (in particular, both the Statement of Community Engagement and the Housing Need Assessment refer to "chronic overcrowding"). Unfortunately it is not at all easy to see how the proposals address this problem. In fact, having carefully considered the information provided by KHT I would suggest that they simply do not, as the proposals do not meaningfully increase the amount of social housing available at the site. The estate currently contains 538 households

containing 1087 bedrooms. The proposal, if implemented in its current form, will provide 527 households containing 967 bedrooms. This is a net loss of 11 households and 120 bedrooms. This will clearly not relieve or resolve the problem of chronic overcrowding; it will actually make it worse.

Of more concern is the fact that the Housing Need Assessment is very clear in identifying the need for larger dwellings (2 or 3 bedrooms or larger) but this does not seem to be borne out by the proposal as the majority of the dwellings proposed are 2 bedrooms or less in size. The current proposal from KHT therefore fails to meet the housing need/requirement identified by KHT. Given the seriousness of this omission one must wonder whether KHT's designers and architects have actually bothered to read their own Housing Need Assessment properly prior to drawing up their plans or whether the Housing Need Assessment has been produced solely to bolster the application's credibility.

The Housing Need Assessment also notes the presence of a large number of "hidden households" on the estate (71 according to the assessment, although I would suggest that this is a conservative estimate at best and that the real figure is likely to be significantly higher, perhaps double). Unfortunately the document provides absolutely no insight whatsoever into the nature of these hidden households. It is impossible, for example, to determine how many of these are the result of adult children looking after elderly parents, or how many are the result of multi-generational households (which are common amongst some BME communities) which will have no desire to be broken up as part of the redevelopment of the estate. In addition, KHT's sole response to the issue of hidden households appears to be, quite shockingly, to simply direct all of these existing residents of the estate to the local authority for re-housing. Whilst this may be all that is legally required of KHT one would have hoped that a social landlord would have taken a much more socially responsible attitude, in particular given the fact that it is extremely unlikely that the local authority will be able to re-house all, or even many, of these residents in the immediate future given the size of the current housing waiting list.

When the manner in which all of these issues are dealt with by the current proposals – by providing less units and bedrooms for social housing than currently available, by failing to meet the housing need they themselves have identified, and by referring hidden households (existing residents) to the local authority for re-housing – it becomes apparent that the only way in which KHT intends to deal with the problem of "chronic overcrowding" on the estate is by making it someone else's problem, namely the local authority's. If the proposals go ahead in their current form it will be the local authority, not KHT, who will find itself in the position of trying to re-house those displaced by the proposed development. A development that, in its current form, will clearly only serve to exacerbate the housing shortage in Kensington and Chelsea, not improve it. The local authority needs to consider whether this is in any way acceptable. I would suggest that it is not.

### **3. Consultation**

Many of the documents submitted by KHT, and in particular the Statement of Community Engagement, make reference to the extent to which KHT claim to have attempted to consult the residents of the estate. Unfortunately the documents do not reveal just how effective these efforts have actually been. The documents concentrate on telling us how many events – "focus groups", "open days" and "coffee mornings" – were held but fail to mention how many residents actually attended or participated in these. The only meaningful data contained in the documents submitted with regards to participation in any form of consultation is the brief description and summary of the door-to-door survey carried out by ERS (on page 12 of the Statement of Community Engagement). Unfortunately, not only are the results of the ERS survey less than convincing but they actually cause concern. In particular:

1. The participation rate in the survey (253 households, 47% of the estate) is rather low by the standards of similar door-to-door surveys on other estates of a similar size. In

addition, the summary notes that some residents actually refused to participate in the survey. KHT would be wise to find out why 53% of the estate's households were unable or unwilling to participate in the ERS survey. I would suggest that possible reasons for such a low participation rate are a general mistrust of KHT's motives by a significant portion of the estate's population and/or a failure to engage with some of the estate's BME communities, who clearly form a large portion of the estate's population and may well have viewed the survey with a significant degree of suspicion.

2. The result of the survey – that 69% of those who answered favoured “full redevelopment” – actually indicates that only 174 households (out of 538) were in favour. This is actually less than a third of the estate and thus hardly the ringing endorsement of the proposals that KHT suggest.
3. The summary does not provide any detail as to the questions that residents were asked. I assume these were drafted by KHT rather than ERS (as ERS do not generally draft survey questions) and that, as such, there is no reason why full details of the survey could not have been included in an appendix to the Statement of Community Engagement or similar. Such detail would help determine whether or not the questions were well drafted and the survey's results generally trustworthy or whether the questions were phrased in such a way as to obtain the “desired result” (as anyone who has been involved in such surveys will attest, it is relatively easy to obtain the “desired result” by asking the “right questions”).

Suffice is to say, that KHT's consultation efforts to date, as detailed in the documents submitted, are less than convincing and they engender little confidence in KHT's claim that the proposals have the support of the majority of the estate's population. For all we know 53% of the estate want nothing to do with KHT (a problem KHT would be wise to address) and two thirds would like the estate to remain as it is.

#### **4. Tenure Mix and Housing Density**

KHT describe the proposed development as “mixed tenure”. Based on the plans submitted for the first phase of the proposal this description is arguably disingenuous. The first phase proposes the construction of a number of adjacent but effectively standalone blocks. Each block is a building in its own right as it does not share any key communal facilities with adjacent blocks. Each block will be composed entirely of social housing or private housing. This is not “mixed tenure”. These are adjacent buildings/blocks of social and private housing, no more, no less. Mixed tenure is where there is a mix of social, affordable and private housing within the same building, and where all of the residents – social, affordable and private – share key communal facilities (such as the front door!). As far as I can see this is simply not being proposed and it is therefore difficult to see in what way what is being proposed by KHT is in any way “special” as adjacent blocks of social and private housing already occur naturally across many parts of the Borough without the need for grandiose “master plans”.


I am also less than convinced by the figures for housing density provided for the first phase of the proposed development by KHT. The first phase, as proposed, will provide 324 dwellings, 174 (53.7%) of which will be social housing and 150 (46.3%) of which will be private housing. These will then provide 509 habitable rooms of social housing (51.6% of the total) and 419 rooms of private housing (48.4% of the total). There is an obvious discrepancy here – the private housing is on average larger than the social housing (46.3% of the dwellings containing 48.4% of the habitable rooms). This is likely the opposite of what is actually required, where families living in social housing are likely to be larger in number for a variety of reasons and thus require larger dwellings with more habitable rooms. This reinforces the previous point made with regards to whether or not what is proposed meets the actual housing need of the existing population of the estate. Again, I would suggest that it does not.

## 5. Decanting

The documents supplied by KHT do not provide a comprehensive description of the decanting process that KHT intends to use. In particular, the project plan (Gantt chart) for the first phase appears to have completely omitted decanting the residents living in the blocks to be demolished in that phase. I would also note that it is clear that there is insufficient spare capacity on the estate to decant all of the residents in the blocks to be demolished in the first phase onto other blocks on the estate. As such, whatever aspirations KHT may have in this regard, and however much it would "hope" not to damage the community during the proposed demolition and construction works, damage to the community is inevitable. I suspect that KHT are perfectly aware of this, given the vigour with which they are apparently trying to convince residents to relocate elsewhere, outside both the estate and the Borough.

I would be most grateful if you would take the above issues into consideration and in particular, consider whether they are of such a fundamental nature to the proposal as it currently stands that KHT be asked to address them before any permission is granted. Should there be any questions with regards to any of the points I have raised at this time I would be more than happy to answer them.

Yours faithfully:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jules Montero', with a large, stylized flourish at the end.

Mr. Jules Montero

*(jules.montero@worlds-end.org.uk)*



**Planning: PC-PlanSvc**

ES6

(Tom)

**From:** webmaster@rbkc.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 10 December 2009 13:22  
**To:** Planning: PC-PlanSvc  
**Subject:** Comments about planning application PP/09/02786

ExD	HDC	HSS	HPD	HoE	Policy	Design	Tree
DC	PP/09/02786	Received RBKC Planning				Reg	PIO
Enf		10 DEC 2009				LLC	Access
Str Dev		N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other

mm  
10/12/09

\*\* START OF FORM DATA \*\*

Case\_Reference\_Number - PP/09/02786

Case\_Address - Wornington Green Estate - Land bounded by the main railway, Wornington Road, Munro Mews, Portobello R

Case\_Proposal - Demolition of existing buildings and temporary partial loss of existing open space (Athlone Gardens), to facilitate redevelopment to provide new residential accommodation of up to 1,000 units, incorporating affordable housing provision of not less than either 538 units or 1,622 habitable rooms, up to maximum of 3,104 sq.m. (GEA) of non-residential floorspace (A1, A2, A3, A5 and/or B1 Use Classes), reprovision of community facilities & associated outdoor adventure playspace (not less than 1,883 sq.m.) (Use Classes D1 & D2), relocation & reprovision of area of open space (Athlone Gardens) (not less than 9,186 sq.m.), reprovision of 20 lock-ups (Use Class B8), provision of a temporary energy centre in Phase 1 to be replaced by a permanent energy centre, provision of landscaping, provision of new internal road network based on traditional internal street pattern, access junctions & associated roads including reconnection of junction with external road network at Ladbrooke Grove and Portobello Road and Wornington Road at Barlby Road, up to 733 car parking spaces (on-street & off-street) & 1,062 cycling parking spaces, with details submitted for Phase One & all other matters reserved (Outline Application for a Major Development)

Comments

Case\_Officer - Edward John George

User\_Comments - Hi

We are urbanbliss based at 333/335 portobello road, I would like to know the impact of these works on our business and could not find a construction management statement in your plans. i am concerned re the effects of 10 years of construction works in the area, will you be closing off roads, suspending parking etc? and if so at what stages and for how long etc?. We have been here for 12 years and suffer greatly from the fact that we are the quieter end of portobello and we are in the process of trying to address this by creating a greater awareness of our end of portobello road and Golborne road and whilst i see the potential benefits of the outcomes of your proposals (although i am aware of the potential effects on the housing side) feel generally that this is a good move, I am very concerned that years of building works, road closures, noisy excavation vehicles etc could potentially be detrimental to ours and other business that already struggle to survive this end of the Portobello road and would like some kind of reasurance on this matter. The other issue here is that there are a number of empty commercial properties and a lot of business that try to set up in the area are only lasting 1/2 years before they are forced to close again

because of the quietness of the area. Part of reason for our initiative re publicising this area is to make it more attractive to new businesses to open and take the empty properities and to survive and thrive here. Again I see the potential in your proposals in aiding this matter but am really concerned of the impact on these works in the next 5/10 years and to be honest we need to be attracting these businesses now and cannot wait untill these works are finished as you will find that many of the existing businesses will simply not survive the upheaval.

I would be grateful for a response on this matter

yours sincerely

Helen Thorp

User\_Name - Helen Thorp

User\_Postal\_Address - 333 Portobello Road London W10 5SA

User\_Telephone - 020 8969 3331

User\_Email - helen\_thorp\_bliss@yahoo.co.uk

\*\* END OF FORM DATA \*\*

\*\* START OF TROUBLESHOOTING DATA \*\*

to\_name - Planning Applications

to\_email - planning@rbkc.gov.uk

Subject - Comments about planning application PP/09/02786

Webpage\_Sent\_From -

[http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning/scripts/acolaidetails.asp?  
casetype=pp&caseyear=09&caseno=02786](http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning/scripts/acolaidetails.asp?casetype=pp&caseyear=09&caseno=02786)

Date sent - 10/12/2009 @ 13:21:53

\*\* END OF TROUBLESHOOTING DATA \*\*

**Planning: PC-PlanSvc**

ESG  
(SUPP)

**From:** webmaster@rbkc.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 11 December 2009 00:23  
**To:** Planning: PC-PlanSvc  
**Subject:** Comments about planning application PP/09/02786

ExD	HDC	HSS	MPO	HoE	Policy	Design	Task
DC		Received RBKC Planning				Reg	PIO
Enf		11 DEC 2009				LLC	Appeals
Str Dev	N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other	

14/12

\*\* START OF FORM DATA \*\*

Case\_Reference\_Number - PP/09/02786

Case\_Address - Wornington Green Estate - Land bounded by the main railway, Wornington Road, Munro Mews, Portobello R

Case\_Proposal - Demolition of existing buildings and temporary partial loss of existing open space (Athlone Gardens), to facilitate redevelopment to provide new residential accommodation of up to 1,000 units, incorporating affordable housing provision of not less than either 538 units or 1,622 habitable rooms, up to maximum of 3,104 sq.m. (GEA) of non-residential floorspace (A1, A2, A3, A5 and/or B1 Use Classes), reprovision of community facilities & associated outdoor adventure playspace (not less than 1,883 sq.m.) (Use Classes D1 & D2), relocation & reprovision of area of open space (Athlone Gardens) (not less than 9,186 sq.m.), reprovision of 20 lock-ups (Use Class B8), provision of a temporary energy centre in Phase 1 to be replaced by a permanent energy centre, provision of landscaping, provision of new internal road network based on traditional internal street pattern, access junctions & associated roads including reconnection of junction with external road network at Ladbroke Grove and Portobello Road and Wornington Road at Barlby Road, up to 733 car parking spaces (on-street & off-street) & 1,062 cycling parking spaces, with details submitted for Phase One & all other matters reserved (Outline Application for a Major Development)

Case\_Officer - Edward John George

User\_Comments - I've studied the plans on-line, and I think that restoring the original street plan opens up the whole area and should result in a far safer environment for all residents. I would trust that residents who will have to be de-canted and re-housed will end up with superior homes. In principle, the plans look to be a positive development.

User\_Name - Ivor Flint

User\_Postal\_Address - 16, Kensal House,  
Ladbroke Grove,  
W10 5BQ

User\_Telephone - 020 8968 9605

User\_Email - ivor.flint@virgin.net

\*\* END OF FORM DATA \*\*

\*\* START OF TROUBLESHOOTING DATA \*\*

ExD	HDC	HSS	HPD	HoE	Policy	Design	Trees
DC	Received RBKC Planning					Reg	PIO
Enf	- 5 JAN 2010					LLC	Appeals
Sr Dev	N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other	

**WORNINGTON GREEN PLANNING APPLICATION DECEMBER 2009**

**Proposed Development from the RBKC Planning Department Website**

**30 December 2009**

**Objections recorded by Roger Roberts, 357 Portobello Road, London W10 5SA**

At the outset I wish to record that the plans were very hard to negotiate, – it is a concern that the public may not be able to decipher the plans adequately to be able to give a considered and complete response to the proposal.

It is very difficult to discern the proposals for external finishes and elevations in relation to street patterns.

- In particular, the proposed building for the corner of Wheatstone Road and Portobello Road has a design which is unsympathetic to the surrounding architecture, and at 4+1 will increase the height of the building roof lines, impacting on light and views.
- There will need to be destruction and removal of some lovely green space currently at this corner which makes an important contribution to existing visual amenities for the whole community and its loss is unsupportable with this design.
- The proposal for the flats above the ground floor to have balconies to the front overlooking Portobello Road is unacceptable. These will be the only balconies on the entire length of Portobello Road, not-with-standing the set back blocks at Portobello Court in W11. This section of Portobello Road has residential units along its entire frontage, above the business units of the Victorian terrace of business units. It is clear that the balconies as designed will impinge on the privacy of residents of the units opposite and on the privacy of the residents of the new flats!
- The description for the external cladding/finish to this building is unclear and therefore it is difficult to be able to see how it adds to /detracts from the existing streetscape. But it does not seem to have any particular architectural design merit to justify moving so much away from the existing architectural character of this part of Portobello Road.

Overall, the increased density remains a major concern when looking at the proposal. The proposed 15 story “landmark” building at the corner of Portobello Road and Wornington Road is unimaginable with the detail provided; ground floor, street level treatment of public realm, visual amenity, role of and type of tenants; commercial, business offices, market and/or affordable residential. There is clearly a need for an impact assessment on the wider community for this proposal, especially on the impact of the building on light for the area.

What is more concerning generally for the whole development is the clear implications of the reduction of sunlight to much of the proposed redevelopment.

- The ongoing discussions and consultations hosted by KHT implied that 8 stories were to be the maximum height of any new buildings and that this would be the exception rather than the norm.
- The proposal instead indicates that high building with 8+1 floors is typical, culminating in the proposed 15 story tower block. The design shows that the buildings come directly up to the pavements; enclosing any green or communal space within their courts. The impact on direct sunlight reaching the lower windows and the courts themselves will be limited and further assessments must be made.

These designs also leave the wider community worse off than now, through the loss of visual amenities for the tenants and wider community. Other than the reprovisioned Athlone Gardens, there is no provision for front gardens, recessed doors, lawns to the front of buildings, additional view of green space which currently exist with some spacious green spaces open to any who walk by.

- The redevelopment will remove the majority of mature trees which now exist in the park and around the development. It is clear that there are no plans for these trees to be replaced; there is no space where they would flourish nor will the pavements be wide enough to support newly planted trees developing and maturing to full heights.
- The council has in the past stated that its parks and trees are the lungs and heart of the Borough. So it is perverse that in North Kensington, an area blighted by poor air quality and the unmanageable impact of the raised M40 flyover, that public green spaces and trees are being reduced.

It must be pointed out that the original justification for moving ahead with the proposal to completely redesign and rebuild Womington Green was to counteract excessive overcrowding. Yet the proposed rebuild does not create any additional "affordable" housing and when looking at the tables, reduces the number of larger properties and 2 bedroom flats with a large increase in 1 bedroom flats for this sector. It reduces the number of 3 -5 bedroom houses for the affordable housing market – where will larger families be rehoused?

The new estate appears to have been designed to reduce the number of families living in affordable housing!

There is also limited attention to such environmental needs as rubbish collection and storage areas for the flats and especially the mews houses.

The space given to the roads for the mews is limited, with doors opening directly on to the mews, with garages and other parking in the area likely to become a hazard for foot traffic.

Parking generally is difficult to understand from these plans. There is clearly going to be additional street parking to ensure that the existing tenants who have parking entitlements continue to do so. However the proposed street patterns do not seem to have taken this into consideration; instead reinstating the narrow Victorian patterns of the surrounding areas which create narrow passing points with parking on both sides of the road. Equally, the existing non-estate residents must continue to have the same entitlements to residents' parking spaces, but the designs are not clear on how this will be met.

The provision of external storage units for residents seem completely absent, the likely result of this will lead to on street or internal court dumping – nor is there clear provision for parking for bicycles and motor bikes other than in the underground parking areas. This implies a lack of understanding of people, their needs and their habits. It will lead to on street clutter and unattractive streetscapes.

The plan to use the streets encircling the new Athlone Gardens as a major access to underground parking, results in this area becoming a major traffic attraction; resulting in increased street dangers for children who eventually will be major users of the park.

The proposed Athlone Gardens is welcomed in the overall scheme but it is not clear if the reprovided space is including the existing sunken football pitch on Wornington Road. If it is not, then it should. In fact, the consultation process has implied that not only would the new development re-provide a better and improved public park, but that it would possibly be larger. This does not appear to be the case, which is perverse when the redevelopment is almost doubling the population density of the area and consequently should be vastly increasing the public amenities from those now available. This is an issue which needs to be looked at.

I repeat that generally the documents and attachments were very difficult to manoeuvre and understand. The resulting impression leaves me more disquieted about the plans for Wornington Green now than I was before! It is very difficult to actually visualize and understand what KHT is planning for the development and its impact on the wider community.

Please record these as objections to the proposals as they now are.

Roger Roberts  
357 Portobello Road  
London W10 5SA

**WORNINGTON GREEN PLANNING APPLICATION (Revised) January 2010  
submission by R Roberts**

Case No.	W09/0001	Applicant	Roberts	Case Name	
App Type	Full Planning	Received	RBKC Planning	Reg	PIO
App Date		1 FEB 2010		LLC	Appeal
App Ref				Rev	Other

**Proposed Development from the RBKC Planning Department Website**

**31 January 2010**

**Objections recorded by Roger Roberts, 357 Portobello Road, London W10 5SA**

In response to a letter for Mr Peter Lerner dated 27 January 2010, I have followed the advice and gone to the Council's Website to check the revised plans and information for the above proposal. This website did not provide any visual supporting documentation, only a listing of references with a summary of the proposed provision of parking and of the composition of proposed housing units compared to existing configuration. I need to record that the notification of a meeting to view the revised proposal in detail to take place at the Venture Centre on Wednesday 3 March is very short notice. A standard practice would be to consider the demands on anyone's diary and to allow a minimum of 10 working days to provide the opportunity for individuals to arrange their time accordingly. This has not happened on this occasion with only 3 working days allocated with the letter arriving on Saturday 30 January.

I am unable to attend that meeting so made arrangements to view the proposals at the Venture Centre on Saturday afternoon. I did so until it was clear that I had to leave for the centre to be closed up.

I note that receipt of any comments is required as of 14 days for the date of the letter – 27 January 2010; the means 1 week after the meeting which is planned for the Venture Centre. Please note that this is a particularly short turnaround if the Authority truly wants considered input into the planning process.

It is still very difficult to discern the proposals for external finishes and elevations in relation to street patterns when referring to the plans available for viewing. It is impossible to do so when viewing the website. It is clear that the revised plans have reduced the number of proposed floors in some, but not all, of the development. It was not possible to judge the impact on architectural design and impact from the papers provided.

The building proposed to replace Telford House at the corner of Wheatstone Road and Portobello Road has had no change to the originally proposed design. This is a design which is unsympathetic to the surrounding architecture, and at 5 stories (4+1) will increase the height of the building roof lines, impacting on light and views. This will have an adverse impact on the light and privacy in my own home.

It is also clear when looking at the proposed scheme to remove trees for the redevelopment, the removal and the stated intention not to replace trees along Portobello Road at this juncture will exacerbate this loss of privacy, contribute to overlooking and reduce opportunities to screen views into private homes on either side of the road. It is not clear from the plans what will happen to the line of this building onto Portobello Road. Currently, all the residents are set back from the pavement with only the ground

**WORNINGTON GREEN PLANNING APPLICATION (Revised) January 2010**  
**submission by R Roberts**

and first floor offices of KHT being on to the pavement. If the new building is to be in line with the offices, the flats will be brought forward, resulting in a smaller distance between properties and the sight lines for the flats on the upper floors on either side of the Portobello Road. This needs to be mitigated in any redesign and new building, with improved privacy measures, not decreased ones. The impact on space, light and privacy must be considered. The upper floors of the new building should be recessed from the street as they are now.

There will need to be destruction and removal of some attractive green space at this corner and which makes an important contribution to existing visual amenities for the whole community. Its loss is unsupportable and not compensated for with this design.

- The proposal for the flats above the ground floor to have balconies to the front overlooking Portobello Road is unacceptable. These will be the only balconies on the entire length of Portobello Road, notwithstanding the set back blocks at Portobello Court in W11. This section of Portobello Road has residential units along its entire frontage, above the business units of the Victorian terrace of business units. It is clear that the balconies as designed will impinge on the privacy of residents of the units opposite and on the privacy of the residents of the new flats!
- The description for the external cladding/finish to this building is unclear and therefore it is difficult to be able to see how it adds to /detracts from the existing streetscape. But it does not seem to have any particular architectural design merit to justify moving so much away from the existing architectural character of this part of Portobello Road.
- Please note concerns about the plum line of the new building onto Portobello Road, compared to the set back residential element of the existing building.

Please record my formal objection to this proposed building.

Overall, the increased density remains a major concern when looking at the proposal. The new plans indicate an increase in the number of dwelling units planned from the earlier submission with 1000 new units; an increase of 68 from the 932 originally submitted.

This means an even greater density of population but there has been no change to the proposed reinstatement of community amenities. The relocated Athlone Gardens, once mooted to potentially be increased in size, is not in this new plan. In fact the "Design & Access Statement" document dated 25.01.2010 is confusing as on page 32 the size of the Gardens is given at 8721 m<sup>2</sup> whilst on page 42 is given at 8692 m<sup>2</sup>. One page refers to the size of the Ball Court but it is not mentioned again. I would want the Council to be certain of the sizes of all RBKC properties under discussion.

**WORNINGTON GREEN PLANNING APPLICATION (Revised) January 2010**  
**submission by R Roberts**

The Venture Centre continues to be ignored as a community resource which needs to be increased in size if it is to continue to meet the needs of a more densely populated Wornington Green and Golborne area. No such increase is planned for in this design.

The revised plans continue to leave the wider community worse off than now, through the loss of visual amenities for the tenants and wider community. Other than the re-provisioned Athlone Gardens, there is no provision for front gardens, recessed doors, lawns to the front of buildings, additional view of green space which currently exist with some spacious green spaces open to any who walk by. In particular the loss of the front gardens which exist at Telford House, fronting Portobello Road, together with the stated intention to remove all trees from Portobello Road will result in a very sterile urban environment, much worse an environment than that which currently exists. The two together mean that the plans for the loss of trees on this stretch of Portobello Road must be resisted if the loss of the Telford House front gardens goes ahead. It is also noted that:

- The redevelopment will remove the majority of mature trees which now exist in the park and around the development. It is clear that there are no plans for these trees to be replaced outside the re-provisioned park; there is no space where they would flourish nor will the pavements be wide enough to support newly planted trees developing and maturing to full heights.
- The council must take heed of its own research which states that its parks and trees are the lungs and heart of the Borough. So it is perverse that in North Kensington, an area blighted by poor air quality and the unmanageable impact of the raised M40 flyover, green spaces and trees are being reduced.

It must be pointed out that the original justification for moving ahead with the proposal to completely redesign and rebuild Wornington Green was to counteract excessive overcrowding. Yet the proposed rebuild does not create any additional "affordable" housing and when looking at the tables, reduces the number of larger properties:

- Socially rented houses which are currently 3 bedroom or 4 bedroom+ will reduce from 38 to 12 – a loss of 26 houses for this market
- 4 bedroom + flats reduce by 18 to 11
- 3 bedroom flats reduce by 10 to 9
- 2 bedroom flats increase by only 2
- 1 bedroom flats increase by 52 with 261 being proposed and resulting in this size of property making up 49% of the overall re-provided social housing provision. This would indicate that the plans for Wornington Green are not for the provision of growing families now or in the future.

The issue around environmental needs such as rubbish collection and storage areas for the flats and especially the mews houses still seem not to have been addressed. The space given to the roads for the mews is limited, with doors opening directly on to the mews, with garages and other parking in the area likely to become a hazard for foot traffic. What is likely to happen to the traders' vans when this mews is supposed to be a family homes access street, but with limited road access?

**WORNINGTON GREEN PLANNING APPLICATION (Revised) January 2010**  
**submission by R Roberts**

Parking generally is difficult to understand from these plans and the tables provided in the revised plan on the website. The proposed street patterns do not seem to have taken this into consideration; instead reinstating the narrow Victorian patterns of the surrounding areas which create narrow passing points with parking on both sides of the road. Equally, the existing non-estate residents must continue to have the same entitlements to residents' parking spaces, but the designs are not clear on how this will be met.

The plan to use the streets encircling the new Athlone Gardens as a major access to underground parking on the North Side of Athlone Gardens is a particular concern as this results in this area becoming a major traffic route; resulting in increased street dangers for children who eventually will be major users of the park.

The provision of external storage units for residents continues to be difficult to identify with the likely result of this will lead to on street or internal court dumping – nor is there clear provision for parking for bicycles and motor bikes other than in the underground parking areas. A reader of these plans could infer a lack of understanding of people, their needs and their habits. It will lead to on street clutter and unattractive streetscapes.

The proposal to reduce the number of storeys to what appears to be 9 (the plans are not clear) for the building at the corner of Portobello Road and Wornington Road is welcome but the overall impact for this intersection continues to be unclear with the current detail provided; ground floor, street level treatment of public realm, visual amenity, role of and type of tenants; commercial, business offices, market and/or affordable residential. The overall character of Golborne would not support buildings any higher than 9 storeys, which is already higher than the “up to” 8 storeys in the initial consultation.

This and the proposal for increased retail and shop fronts along Portobello Road do not seem to be supported by retail needs analysis. There are a number of empty properties along the existing stretch of Portobello Road and adding more risks creating an urban eyesore of empty and boarded up spaces. This will not contribute to urban renewal and will reduce the quality of life for all who live in this part of Golborne - residents of Wornington Green and the surrounding area alike. There seems to be no justification for increasing retail space in this area. I would also want to record my objection to any plans to provide additional evening opening to outlets on this stretch of Portobello Road as to do so will have an immediate and unacceptable negative impact on my right to the quiet enjoyment of my home.

The proposed Athlone Gardens is welcomed in the overall scheme but it is not clear if the reprovided space is including the existing sunken football pitch on Wornington Road. I need to record that the existing Athlone Gardens is much loved and well used by me and others so to have to lose it for the purpose of improving the existing estate means that the estate must indeed be improved and we the wider community must benefit and be compensated for up to 12 years of reduced or lost amenity. The park really should be increased in size if the population is becoming larger and the area more densely

**WORNINGTON GREEN PLANNING APPLICATION (Revised) January 2010**  
**submission by R Roberts**

inhabited. See the comments above about the confusing measurements included in the recent Design and Access Statement.

In this document, too, there is an artist's impression of the newly re-provided Athlone Gardens with a multi-storey building taking up much of the street frontage along Portobello Road set within the park. This concept, whilst understood to be outside the remit of the redevelopment, would be resisted by the residents as it would contribute to the already substantial loss of visual amenity for the wider community contained in the Wornington Green redevelopment plans.

I repeat my concern that earlier arguments that the Council consider allowing the existing park to be built over with half or more of it being unavailable to residents for the duration of the redevelopment could be compensated for by an improved and potentially enlarged park. It is now clear that there will be no contribution to an enlarged park by the developers, therefore the council cannot justify taking any of the footprint for a building offering retail space. – can we really justify giving over the park to these developers with very little gain to the existing residents or the wider community? The non-estate residents do not seem to be being offered any compensation in kind (or otherwise) for the 12 years of dirt, pollution and inconvenience which this redevelopment will generate.

This development is almost doubling the population density of the area but not providing any increase in public amenities from those now available. This seems to be a major failing of the proposed redevelopment.

Please record these as objections to the revised proposals of January 2010.

Roger Roberts  
357 Portobello Road  
London W10 5SA

Planning: PC-PlanSvc

From: webmaster@rbkc.gov.uk  
Sent: 26 December 2009 15:03  
To: Planning: PC-PlanSvc  
Subject: Comments about planning application PP/09/02786

ExD	HDC	N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other
DC	Received RBKC Planning					Reg	AD
Enf	26 DEC 2009					LIC	Spec

\*\* START OF FORM DATA \*\*

Case\_Reference\_Number - PP/09/02786

Case\_Address - Wornington Green Estate - Land bounded by the main railway, Wornington Road, Munro Mews, Portobello R

Case\_Proposal - Demolition of existing buildings and temporary partial loss of existing open space (Athlone Gardens), to facilitate redevelopment to provide new residential accommodation of up to 1,000 units, incorporating affordable housing provision of not less than either 538 units or 1,622 habitable rooms, up to maximum of 3,104 sq.m. (GEA) of non-residential floorspace (A1, A2, A3, A5 and/or B1 Use Classes), reprovision of community facilities & associated outdoor adventure playspace (not less than 1,883 sq.m.) (Use Classes D1 & D2), relocation & reprovision of area of open space (Athlone Gardens) (not less than 9,186 sq.m.), reprovision of 20 lock-ups (Use Class B8), provision of a temporary energy centre in Phase 1 to be replaced by a permanent energy centre, provision of landscaping, provision of new internal road network based on traditional internal street pattern, access junctions & associated roads including reconnection of junction with external road network at Ladbroke Grove and Portobello Road and Wornington Road at Barlby Road, up to 733 car parking spaces (on-street & off-street) & 1,062 cycling parking spaces, with details submitted for Phase One & all other matters reserved (Outline Application for a Major Development)

Case\_Officer - Edward John George

User\_Comments - Comments from the Golborne Forum

In relation to the residential accommodation, the Forum wishes to see a larger proportion of social housing rather than housing for sale and is concerned to note that, despite previous assurances that buildings would not be higher than eight stories, Kensington Housing Trust (KHT) is now proposing 15 stories. The Forum requests that the Council requires an impact assessment of this proposal on the Golborne environment and streetscape before granting permission for any tower blocks. The Forum notes that more one and two bed units are proposed for both the social and market housing and requests that consideration be given to the needs of larger households.

The proposed reprovision of community facilities and associated outdoor adventure playspace presumably relates to the Venture Community Centre. The Forum reiterates its view that with greatly increased housing density, a larger Venture Centre is required and again urges the Council to enter into joint discussions (which the Forum is willing to facilitate) with both KHT and the Venture Community Association with a

view to securing a community centre which will meet the needs of Golborne people in the 21st century.

With reference to Athlone Gardens, the Forum was pleased to note that the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance was changed in response to one of its previous comments to prevent the proposed corner pavilions from reducing visual access to the park from Portobello Road. The current proposals however, still appear to lose some visual access and in particular the entrance to the basement car park on Athlone Gardens is of concern. The Forum reiterates its view that the new Athlone Gardens should be both bigger and better, both to accommodate greater population density and also to compensate the wider Golborne community for the disruption which will be caused over many years by the redevelopment of Wornington Green.

The Forum is pleased to note that KHT's application now includes a commitment to reprovision of lock-up storage as this is essential to the continued flourishing of the Golborne Road Market.

Regarding the reconnection of the junction with the external road network at Ladbroke Grove and Portobello Road and Wornington Road at Barlby Road, the Forum requests that a study is carried out of the effects on traffic flow and the environmental impact before planning permission is granted.

User\_Name - Susie Parsons, Chair, Golborne Forum

User\_Postal\_Address - 171 Oxford Gardens, London W10 6NE

User\_Telephone - 07968801948

User\_Email - [susie@spms.org.uk](mailto:susie@spms.org.uk)

\*\* END OF FORM DATA \*\*

\*\* START OF TROUBLESHOOTING DATA \*\*

to\_name - Planning Applications

to\_email - [planning@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:planning@rbkc.gov.uk)

Subject - Comments about planning application PP/09/02786

Webpage\_Sent\_From -

<http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning/scripts/acolaiddetails.asp?casetype=pp&cayear=09&caseno=02786>

Date sent - 26/12/2009 @ 15:02:44

\*\* END OF TROUBLESHOOTING DATA \*\*

MARIE WEEKES

1 EDWARD KENNEDY HOUSE

196 WORMINGTON RD.

TEL 020 84688904.

W105F2

ExD	HDC	HSS	MPD	HoE	Policy	Design	Ten
DC		Received RBKC Planning			Reg	PIC	
Ent		- 4 JAN 2010			LLC	Appeals	
Str Dev		N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other

DEAR SIR/MADAM.

Re: KENSINGTON HOUSING TRUST

REDEVELOPMENT OF WORMINGTON GREEN ESTATE.

28052009/LPWGE

AS A TENANT FOR OVER 20YRS WITH AN UNEXPIRED LEASE TERM, I OBJECT STRONGLY TO THIS PLANNING APPLICATION ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS:-

1. NOISE + DISTURBANCE
2. LOSS OF PRIVACY
3. TRAFFIC CHAOS AND LOSS OF PARKING

BUT MOST IMPORTANTLY:- THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WILL HAVE A DOMINANT AND OVERTHEARING IMPACT ON THE AREA AND WILL SERIOUSLY DETRACT FROM ITS PRESENT DISTINCTIVENESS AND IDENTITY.

THE BULK, MASSING AND CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE DESIGN OF THE SCHEME WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE IN ITS SURROUNDINGS. ABOVE ALL IT WOULD COMPLETELY FAIL TO PRESERVE OR ENHANCE THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE AREA. THE ARCHITECTURE IS FUNDAMENTALLY UNACCEPTABLE.

THE ABOVE ARE THE REAL REASONS FOR REFUSAL AS IN NO WAY DOES THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT RECOGNISE THE COUNCIL'S OWN U D P.

THANK YOU

ON A PERSONAL NOTE I AM ACTUALLY BEING EVICTED FROM A PROPERTY I HAVE OCCUPIED FOR OVER 20 YEARS WITHOUT REGARD TO MY RIGHTS UNDER MY LEASE

MARIE WEEKES

UV

**Planning: PC-PlanSvc**

ESG  
(09)

**From:** webmaster@rbkc.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 28 December 2009 23:22  
**To:** Planning: PC-PlanSvc  
**Subject:** Comments about planning application PP/09/02786

ByD	DDO	MSD	EMD	PLD	PLD	PLD	PLD	PLD	PLD
DC			Residential PC Planning						PLD
Emt			28 DEC 2009					LLD	Issues
Str Dev		NGN	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other		

\*\* START OF FORM DATA \*\*

Case\_Reference\_Number - PP/09/02786

Case\_Address - Wornington Green Estate - Land bounded by the main railway, Wornington Road, Munro Mews, Portobello R

Case\_Proposal - Demolition of existing buildings and temporary partial loss of existing open space (Athlone Gardens), to facilitate redevelopment to provide new residential accommodation of up to 1,000 units, incorporating affordable housing provision of not less than either 538 units or 1,622 habitable rooms, up to maximum of 3,104 sq.m. (GEA) of non-residential floorspace (A1, A2, A3, A5 and/or B1 Use Classes), reprovision of community facilities & associated outdoor adventure playspace (not less than 1,883 sq.m.) (Use Classes D1 & D2), relocation & reprovision of area of open space (Athlone Gardens) (not less than 9,186 sq.m.), reprovision of 20 lock-ups (Use Class E8), provision of a temporary energy centre in Phase 1 to be replaced by a permanent energy centre, provision of landscaping, provision of new internal road network based on traditional internal street pattern, access junctions & associated roads including reconnection of junction with external road network at Ladbrooke Grove and Portobello Road and Wornington Road at Barlby Road, up to 733 car parking spaces (on-street & off-street) & 1,062 cycling parking spaces, with details submitted for Phase One & all other matters reserved (Outline Application for a Major Development)

Case\_Officer - Edward John George

User\_Comments - I live in a flat opposite the current housing complex, and opposite the site for the proposed 15-floor tower near the Barlby Road/Ladbrooke Grove roundabout. Although I feel that the redevelopment as an entire project would improve the area and make better use of the space under consideration, I feel strongly that the 15-floor building would overshadow the houses in what is already an extensively developed area (including the Raymede and Treverton Towers). If this development goes ahead it will tower over the surrounding buildings, creating a loss of privacy and a sense of enclosure for both my residence and nearby properties. I understand that this particular building is not currently under express and detailed consideration at this stage, but that the council may tacitly allow it by approving a certain number of dwellings, thus committing themselves to this figure by whatever distribution of units is necessary. I would strongly urge you not to commit the area and its residents to this part of the development before further thought has been given to less drastic and overbearing alternatives.

User\_Name - Caroline Dyott

User\_Postal\_Address - 2 Treverton St  
London  
W10 6DW

User\_Telephone - 07796952406

User\_Email - caroline.dyott@gmail.com

\*\* END OF FORM DATA \*\*

\*\* START OF TROUBLESHOOTING DATA \*\*  
to\_name - Planning Applications

to\_email - planning@rbkc.gov.uk

Subject - Comments about planning application PP/09/02786

Webpage\_Sent\_From -  
[http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning/scripts/acolaidetails.asp?casetype=pp&c  
aseyear=09&caseno=02786](http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning/scripts/acolaidetails.asp?casetype=pp&c<br/>aseyear=09&caseno=02786)

Date sent - 28/12/2009 @ 23:22:02

\*\* END OF TROUBLESHOOTING DATA \*\*

# Simon Burt

EJG  
001

357 Portobello Road,  
London W10 5SA  
Telephone: 020 89685648  
simonburt01@btinternet.com

Sat 12 December 2009

The Executive Director Planning and Borough Development  
Kensington Town Hall  
Hornton Street  
London W8 7NX

Dear Sir

With regard to the proposed development at The Wormington Green Estate:

It will be a vast development, covering a large area and taking some twelve years to complete. Its results are so large as to be very nearly imponderable. My main concerns are twofold. First, the effect it will have on the quiet enjoyment of my home during and after the development period, and second, the drastic alteration in the neighbourhood that will happen on completion. Traffic flow will change and increase, parking which is already difficult will become impossible, there will be a huge influx of residents and footfall in an already densely crowded area, and commercial premises will be opened where none have been before, with all the problems of accessing, unloading and footfall that this will incur. All this on an enormous scale. I am also rather concerned that there will be overlooking and loss of light and privacy problems resulting from a considerably larger building in front of my house than the one that is there at present.

The inconvenience to local residents of such an enormous undertaking will be correspondingly large. It seems to me odd that there has been no talk as yet of compensating them for the titanic upheaval it will cause. The cost of double glazing against the noise, at least, would seem to be an area where you could consider compensation.

Yours faithfully,



EXD	HDC	HSS	MPD	HOE	Policy	Design	Trees
Received PPSD Plan...						Recd	PSD

15/12/09

**Mr and Mrs El-Machachi**  
**11, Katherine House**  
**125, Wornington Road**  
**London W10 5YA**

ExD	HDC	REC	PLN	Reg	PLN	Reg	PLN
DC		received RBKC Planning			Reg	PLN	
Dir		22 DEC 2009			LLC	Appeal	
St Dev	N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other	

Dear Mr Lerner,

**Ref: DPS/DC STR/PP/09/02786/EJD**

**21/12/09**

I am writing in regard of the letter you sent on December the 7<sup>th</sup>. I total disagree on the demolition of our property. I have been living here for the **past 32** years and don't think they should be knocked down they are still strong and I am sure all of my neighbours would agree. I have spoken to my neighbours and they all feel the same way in which I feel. The community will be scattered and I feel safe and happy in my home and if I move elsewhere I might not adapt as well to the other house. I'm not looking forward to the change and hope it doesn't even take place.

Yours sincerely,



Mr .M El-Machachi

(Enclosed a copy of letter sent to me)

**Planning: PC-PlanSvc**

EJG  
09

**From:** Claudia Ferrai [claudia.ferrai@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** 17 December 2009 21:53  
**To:** Planning: PC-PlanSvc  
**Subject:** development wornington green estate

For the attention of Planning and Borough Development

Your ref. DPS/DC STR/PP/0902786/EJG

To whom it may concern,

in relation to the abaoe development, may concerns are maily in regards to the reduction of green/open space. The area is hughly populated, all teh area around as well and green space is very important for the life of the inhabitats and teh visitors.

Green space helps with social gathering and integration, reduces tension and creates in overall a better life style.

I have noticed teh additon of planters but I am unsatisfied with teh reduction of green space.

Also, I am glad for teh increse in cycling parking spaces, but the area has and soffers of an high number of bicicle roddery. Are these cycling facilities closed? Are lock going to be provided for at least teh residences?

I euphasise, teh addition of bencehs and open space, even if tehre has to be a reduction in housing.

Also, the existing minimarket facing ladbroke grove, what destiny is it facing? It is the closes and needed even if just to grab milk and top up an oyster card.

King regards,

Claudia Ferrai

ExD	HDC	HSS	HPD	HcE	Policy	Design	Trees
DC		Received RBKC Planning				Reg	PIO
Enf		18 DEC 2009				LLC	Appeal
Str Dev		N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other

✓  
w  
18/12/09

**WORNINGTON GREEN PLANNING APPLICATION**  
**CASE No. PP/09/02786**  
**RESPONSE FROM THE OPEN DOOR FRIENDSHIP CENTRE**

---

**1. The ODFC Within the Redevelopment**

1.1 The Open Door Friendship Centre (ODFC) welcomes the regeneration scheme's attempts to provide a more integrated estate and to deal with social problems such as overcrowding through the provision of additional accommodation. We recognise and appreciate that some efforts have been made to minimise the impact of the scheme on our facility (eg the placement of a street immediately opposite to reduce overlooking).

1.2 However, we believe that the proposed scheme will offer significantly less community space and facilities per capita than the existing estate. The population density will significantly increase, with the number of homes rising from 538 to 986, but the park and Venture Centre are only 'at least as big as the existing facilities'.

1.3 We believe that by excluding the Open Door Friendship Centre from the regeneration plan, an opportunity has been missed to achieve a more comprehensive scheme for the area. Incorporation of the ODFC into the plan would result in:

- Maximising the community facilities available within the *de facto* estate perimeter
- Achieving a more coherent building appearance to the street scene. (The ODFC is 1-2 stories high, amid proposed buildings of 5-9 stories. Building styles will not be integrated)
- Providing increased living accommodation in the area, by construction of housing units on our land.

**2. The ODFC's Current Contribution**

2.1 The ODFC was reconstructed in its present form and opened in January 2003. At present, or in the recent past, we run or have run the following weekly activities, all of which are open to the public:

- English Language Classes. Classes have been offered for 6 years as an outreach centre of Kensington and Chelsea College. We currently operate ESOL classes at Entry 1 and Entry 2, with 34 enrolled.
- We offer conversational English classes for those who cannot access a college-based curriculum. At present we have 20+ participants
- Homework club (primary)
- Spanish class
- Women's keep fit and beauty
- Healthy eating
- Primary Health Care Trust: rental for community health activities
- Prime Time kid's club (5 -11)
- Children's holiday/literacy clubs

- Teenage boys football and games evening
- Christmas and neighbourhood parties (usually 70 -130 attend)
- The facility is available for public hire (parties etc)

2.2 The above are an expression of the Centre's aims to promote:

- Community cohesion (we are one of the very few places on the existing estate where members of different ethnic groups can meet and build friendships. Teaching English is an integral part of this, enabling different groups to communicate in a common language)
- Educational achievement (children and adults)
- The reduction of antisocial behaviour (eg organised football for teenage boys, not football on public walkways)

2.3 We are particularly concerned to reach the vulnerable people we meet on the Estate and in the surrounding area: the isolated, lonely, those who rarely leave their homes or move outside their own ethnic community, those at risk of radicalisation etc.

2.4 The above facilities have been provided on a long term basis, and at no cost (except for minor grants for equipment) to the local authority.

2.5 The major limit on the provision of extra facilities is lack of space.

2.6 An expansion of the ODFC would enable us to provide:

- Extra English classes, reducing crowding and the need to open at times which are inconvenient for participants
- A crèche for the children of those attending other activities
- Separate homework club facilities for different age groups
- Further adult and social education (marriage enrichment, parenting, debt counselling etc)

To do this, we would need one extra classroom and a dedicated crèche room.

### **3. Maximising the Benefit to the Community of the ODFC**

3.1 The Parent Charity of the ODFC has already funded the major reconstruction of the facility in 2002, and is not in a position to fund a further expansion. But it would be prepared to participate in a scheme to secure the advantages to the community detailed above. The construction of some commercially-let units, or of some residential units for sale or let on our land could potentially fund the desired expansion.

3.2 We would hope that the Planning Authority would facilitate such participation either by:

- Incorporating our site into the overall regeneration
- or
- Through a Planning Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act.

We believe that the impact of keeping our site out of the redevelopment scheme is an inevitable adverse impact on the area, through surrounding a low profile property with buildings of 5-9 stories high. In particular, the ODFC's single storey north end will back onto a new building 5 storeys high, and be faced across the street by a building of 9 storeys.

#### **4. Additional Concerns**

Additional concerns regarding the proposed regeneration are:

**4.1 Access:** The ODFC currently fronts a pedestrianised area, giving safe access especially for young children using the facility. The reinstatement of Portobello Road compromises this safe access.

**4.2 Access during construction:** No mention is made in the Planning Application of how access to the ODFC will be maintained from both Ladbrooke Grove and Portobello Road during the reconstruction.

**4.3 Parking:** The ODFC currently has the use of four parking bays, and would wish to see this level of provision maintained or expanded.

**4.4 Community facilities grouping:** The current scheme places the Venture Centre and ODFC on opposite sides of the same street. We are concerned about vulnerable people: the old, disabled, women who scarcely leave their houses and families with many young children. Walking even small distances discourages such people from visiting community centres. (This is partly why we operate successfully as an outreach centre of Kensington and Chelsea College, even though the College is only at the other end of the Wornington Green Estate.) Maximum access to community facilities is obtained by separating the facilities, not by positioning them together.

**4.5 Recreational facilities:** We currently use the tarmac area alongside the NE wall of Paul House for teenage boys' football, as requested by KHT. The removal of this area will leave us nowhere to organise this activity, unless satisfactory provision is made as part of the park.

#### **5. Conclusion**

As stated at the beginning of this response we welcome aspects of the redevelopment of Wornington Green. We want to continue to be a focal point within the community and see improved facilities maximising our provision for the needs of a larger population. In order to do this, we wish to be part of the redevelopment of the area by continuing to interact with the planning and redevelopment processes.

**Planning: PC-PlanSvc**

From: webmaster@rbkc.gov.uk  
 Sent: 14 January 2010 16:43  
 To: Planning: PC-PlanSvc  
 Subject: Comments about planning application PP/09/02786

ExD	HDC	HSS	HPD	HoE	Policy	Design	Taxes
DC						Received RBKC Planning	Reg PIO
Enf						15 JAN 2010	LLC Appeals
Str Dev		N&N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other

*Handwritten:* JG, 15/1/10, Mew

\*\* START OF FORM DATA \*\*

Case\_Reference\_Number - PP/09/02786

Case\_Address - Wornington Green Estate - Land bounded by the main railway, Wornington Road, Munro Mews, Portobello R

Case\_Proposal - Demolition of existing buildings and temporary partial loss of existing open space (Athlone Gardens), to facilitate redevelopment to provide new residential accommodation of up to 1,000 units, incorporating affordable housing provision of not less than either 538 units or 1,622 habitable rooms, up to maximum of 3,104 sq.m. (GEA) of non-residential floorspace (A1, A2, A3, A5 and/or B1 Use Classes), reprovision of community facilities & associated outdoor adventure playspace (not less than 1,883 sq.m.) (Use Classes D1 & D2), relocation & reprovision of area of open space (Athlone Gardens) (not less than 9,186 sq.m.), reprovision of 20 lock-ups (Use Class B8), provision of a temporary energy centre in Phase 1 to be replaced by a permanent energy centre, provision of landscaping, provision of new internal road network based on traditional internal street pattern, access junctions & associated roads including reconnection of junction with external road network at Ladbroke Grove and Portobello Road and Wornington Road at Barlby Road, up to 733 car parking spaces (on-street & off-street) & 1,062 cycling parking spaces, with details submitted for Phase One & all other matters reserved (Outline Application for a Major Development)

Case\_Officer - Edward John George

User\_Comments - The proposed development will double the density of the Wornington Green Estate. It is an essential principle both of the current London Plan and Section 106 provisions that community spaces and community amenities should expand in proportion to any increase in population created by a proposed development. The Venture Centre and Notting Hill Adventure Playgrounds are vital community spaces which need to expand to accommodate the increased population. 60% of our child users and 40% of our adult users come from the Wornington Green Estate. Therefore, the new community will require a 40% larger community centre and a 60% larger adventure playground. KHT's proposal involves replacing the Venture Centre and Notting Hill Adventure Playgrounds with spaces which are no larger than the current provision. Given that the existing provision is inadequate to meet the needs of the community at its current size, and given that it is proposed to replace Athlone Gardens with a park which is no larger than at present, the proposed community spaces will be incapable of meeting the needs of the enlarged community. Any enhanced amenity value which derives from the provision

of a more modern Venture Centre and park will do nothing to address this fundamental lack of space.

User\_Name - C A Peacock

User\_Postal\_Address - Ventre Community Association 103a Wornington Road,  
London, W10 5YB

User\_Telephone - 020 8960 3234

User\_Email - director@venturecentre.org.uk

\*\* END OF FORM DATA \*\*

\*\* START OF TROUBLESHOOTING DATA \*\*

to\_name - Planning Applications

to\_email - planning@rbkc.gov.uk

Subject - Comments about planning application PP/09/02786.

Webpage\_Sent\_From -

[http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning/scripts/acolaidetails.asp?casetype=pp&c  
aseyear=09&caseno=02786](http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planning/scripts/acolaidetails.asp?casetype=pp&c<br/>aseyear=09&caseno=02786)

Date sent - 14/01/2010 @ 16:42:53

\*\* END OF TROUBLESHOOTING DATA \*\*

020 8960 4607 (Home)  
020 7573 5344 (Work)  
07779 140097  
e-mail: ldillonkcc@yahoo.co.uk

42 Pepler House  
Worlington Road  
London W10 5QD

SxD	HDC	HSS	N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other
DC		Received R&C Planning				Reg	PLD	
Enf		14 JAN 2010				LLC	Appas	
Str Dev		N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other	

7th January 2010

Sue Lines  
Design and Access Officer  
Design and Conservation  
The Town Hall  
Hornton Street  
London W8 7NX

### **KHT Planning Application for the Regeneration of Worlington Green Estate Response from Mrs Lesley Dillon**

I understand that KHT has to build on Athlone Gardens first to enable them to initialise the regeneration and build the 1st phase. Why can they not build on the area where their portacabin is at the moment? They could surely put up with a little bit of inconvenience as the residents are going to have to put up with 10-15 years of it. I cannot see people wishing to use the 'remainder of the park that is left without plant and machinery on it' and certainly will not want to bring their children and dogs on to this noisy, dusty, potentially dangerous site for a period of around 10 - 15 years. This also means that any 'new' children, whether it be newly moved in or newly born will have to share this building site with existing residents. This is ludicrous.

I have been strongly involved in all of the proposals over the past 10 years and this one is the most ridiculous for the following reasons:

The regeneration WILL NOT do anything for overcrowding at all, in the beginning we were led to believe that the 'extra' flats/houses would be for overcrowded families and adult children of tenants, we all know now that this is not the case and that any extra flats/houses will be for sale, I do not know of any children of tenants on this estate that can afford a deposit and mortgage. In fact there are LESS bedrooms than before and when I have questioned the staff that are immediately involved I have been told (eventually) that people will move from flats that are under-occupied, this is not the case as KHT have promised these people that they can keep a spare bedroom if they already have one so this is another nonsense. They keep saying that the reason is overcrowding but they are building around 120 bedrooms LESS than there are now, how does that work?

We are going to have to share our doctors, dentists, schools, parking as none of these will be provided for the extra god knows how many more residents there will be. There is not even provision for a nursery as was promised in the beginning along with loads of other things.

KHT keep saying that they have 'consulted' with all the residents, well at least all the tenants, this is not true, I know many people that KHT have not spoken to and of those that have been spoken to have told me horror stories of what they have been promised 'if they move'.

The 'consultation' has consisted of 'focus groups' which I know have not really been well attended and a limit of only 20 people are allowed, why? I have spoken to a few people that have been to them and they have been told entirely different stories. I went to one of the first ones where we were told categorically that we were not going to have 'tower blocks' higher than 5 - 6 floors.

**We were promised**, either a small private garden or a balcony for EACH affordable flat large enough for a table and four chairs.

**We were promised** that our grown up children would be housed on the new estate.

**We were promised** that the community would stay together yet they are forcing different cultures and religions to live in each other's pockets (communal gardens), this will, without doubt cause neighbour nuisance.

**We were promised** permanent housing for Residents' Association, community room etc.

**We were promised** that from the outside the blocks of flats would be identical and no-one would know the difference - this is true except for the fact that we are segregated into different blocks, block for affordable, block for sale! we have no gardens, private does.

Why are we expected to live with kitchens with no windows!!

The pictures we have seen of the proposed interiors have all been of bedsits, not family homes!

What happens when the remaining flats/houses have to be brought up to Decent Homes Standard? what happens if there is another recession and they run out of money? what happens if they cannot sell all of the private properties? we will be left 'in limbo'

The Adventure Playground and meeting rooms is far too small as it is and yet they want it even smaller for double the amount of people!

The idea of having 'communal gardens' is unbelievable, can you imagine what it would be like if say, I wanted to bring my dog into the garden and have a barbecue in the Summer, Muslim people would not like this at all and could cause conflict and we know that KHT are no good at helping with neighbour conflict so the situation would be impossible. The reason this is such a close knit community is that we all respect each other's privacy and different beliefs and religions.

Many of us remember what it was like having roads running through the estate and there was a good reason for them to be shut off. The majority of residents do not want the old roads back and the Borough knows this as a fact.

Any regeneration should be 'to the betterment of the residents' if this goes ahead we are going to LOSE: our homes as we know them, our children if they have to move away, our sunshine (the new estate will have less than one hour per day!) our windows/daylight, our friends, our privacy, our green areas and worst of all our beloved park will be built on and we will have to make do with half a park with building machinery on it, who wants to take our children/grandchildren to play in a park like that, we will be too old to take them by the time its finished and useable if the trust stay true to form on its timekeeping.

We will have nowhere for dogs to go, no dog run, 3 more roads for our children not to be able to play on and a brand new 'mini Venture Centre' that will not be able to accommodate the existing children let alone the potential 300-400 new ones. We were promised so much and are being offered zilch, the homes for sale are the only people to benefit not us, the 'social misfits; that can't afford our own property. I am sure that the Mayor has enough sense to see what is actually going on here.

**PLEASE, PLEASE MAKE KHT FOLLOW THE SPD (the rules) SET OUT BY THE BOROUGH BUT SO FAR HAVE BEEN IGNORED AS FAR AS THE RESIDENTS ARE AWARE.**

We have to stop this travesty happening NOW.

Yours sincerely,



Lesley Dillon  
Resident of Wornington Green for 31 years

Re; Wornington Green New Planning Application

From Mrs.P.O'Donnell 3 Wheatstone House Telford Road W.10.

I object to the design of the homes proposed for the regeneration of Wornington Green Estate.  
No windows in the kitchens.the position of the buildings no sunlight in the rented homes all day . . .

The architects want to put low railings at the end of the gardens at Wheatstone Road and new Athlone Gardens.  
We have lived in 3 Wheatstone House for Thirty Years.There are Walls in brick and strong wire mesh above all the garden walls.... The Kensington Housing Trust put this wire mesh onto the walls above the walls as my neighbour had her T.

T.V. stolen someone jumped over the garden wall. I had an attempted break in windows smashed by a neighbours son the case went to Juvenile Court.We want privacy and to be secure in our homes.Low railing would take this away.A small animal could possibly get in and out of these railings a child would not be safe.We are being deprived of safety.  
The buildings low down could take away natural light too next to the underground car park also all these cars adding to pollution

There was a big problem with people jumping over the walls into the gardens some of them to retrieve their balls until K.H.T.put the wire mesh above the walls.I have spoken briefly to one of the rebuild Architects but have no clarity.They seem to want to build these low railings which will invade our safety .

I cannot see any improvement in the Architects design nor do my neighbours. These railings will not be safe.Design with the wall and wire mesh above it is as it is now the safest way.

*P. O'Donnell*

ExD	HDC	HSS	HPD	HoE	Policy	Design	Trees
DC		Received RBKC Planning			Reg	PIO	
Enf		18 JAN 2010			LLO	Appeals	
Str Env		NSN	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other

1/2/10

1 Telford House,  
Portobello Rd.  
London  
W10-5XY

Dear Sir,

I am speaking for me and my wife and indeed most for most of the People in Warrington Green Estate. I have only met two people who want to leave here. The blatant mendacity of K.H.I is unbelievable. They are not truthful. We have no crime here and it is not overcrowded. If somebody leaves, they move in and renovate the Flat and charge treble the rent. It is all about yuppy rents. We call it eviction and we have seen the plans and are not impressed. They are letting the Estate run.

EXD	MDP	ISS	HPD	AGE	Policy	Design	Tree
DC		Received RBKC Planning			Reg	PIO	
Erf		02 FEB 2010			LLC	Appeals	
Sr Dev	N&N	Obj	Supp	No Obj	Rev	Other	

J. Remcin  
Gratefully Yours  
Tom Heatherston

09/02780