

Monica Lucas
Belgravia Neighbourhood Forum
25 South Eaton Place
London
SW1W 9EL



24th July 2023

Dear Monica,

Re: Belgravia Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 16 Consultation Response

Thank you for your formal submission of the draft Belgravia Neighbourhood Plan and associated documents. Clearly an immense amount of time, effort and hard work has gone into the preparation of a neighbourhood plan that supports the community's ambitions for the Belgravia Neighbourhood Area, and as such the Council supports the submission of the Belgravia Neighbourhood Plan and commends the work of the Neighbourhood Forum.

The plan must meet the 'Basic Conditions' as set out in section 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This principle is also set out in Paragraph 37 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The key elements of the basic conditions are:

- That it is appropriate to adopt the plan in light of national policies and guidance;
- That the plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
- That the plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Council's Development Plan (being the City Plan 2019-2040 and London Plan 2021); and
- The making of the plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations (this largely relates to a process of environmental screening which has been completed).

Whilst most of the plan's policies would meet the basic conditions in terms of principle, we believe further amendments are needed to some areas to ensure they are robust, effective and enforceable, thereby complying with national planning policy. This requirement is set out in Paragraph 16(D) of the NPPF, which states that plans should "contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals". There are also limited areas of the plan that we consider to require further refinement in order to meet the basic conditions, particularly in terms of being in conformity with higher level planning policy and contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. Detailed comments and suggested amendments in relation to the above are set out in the table contained as Appendix A attached to this letter.

We hope you consider our suggestions to be constructive and we now look forward to supporting the Belgravia Neighbourhood Forum through the next stages of the examination process and towards getting the plan to a position whereby it is ready to become 'made'.

Yours sincerely,

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

Brandon Avery
Policy Officer (Planning)
Westminster City Council

Reference	Comment
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We suggest amending any reference to the 'City Plan' to 'City Plan 2019-2040' We suggest amending any reference to 'New London Plan' to 'London Plan (2021)'.
5.2 - Design Principles	
Policy BEL1 (B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wording of this clause should be amended to reference the 'principles' of the Belgravia Design Codes in lieu of 'requirements'. This is due to the Design Codes being guiding principles that are contained as an appendix to the plan rather than them being strict requirements that are contained within actual policy provisions. Revised wording to be as follows: <i>"Proposals for new development and redevelopment of existing buildings in Belgravia must demonstrate how they have responded to the <u>requirements principles</u> of the Belgravia Design Codes (as summarised in Appendix A)."</i>
Clause 5.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We suggest changing wording from 'restore' to 'refurbish' in the third line of the second paragraph in this section to better reflect the actual process of retrofitting. Revised wording to be as follows: <i>"Whilst supporting WCC's ambition for energy-minimising new building designs... it is almost always more sustainable in terms of carbon footprint to restore <u>refurbish</u> and upgrade an existing building than to demolish and rebuild, i.e. to consider retrofit first."</i>
5.3 - Mitigating the Effects of Climate Change	
Policy BEL2 (B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This clause as currently worded reads more as guidance on the implementation of Clause A and it should therefore be moved to the supporting text of Clause 5.3.1. Reference to the materiality (i.e. timber and wood) of different types of glazing treatments should also be removed to allow for sufficient flexibility in the interpretation of this clause and to cater for evolving technologies that may not utilise these materials.
Clause 5.3.2 (Belgravia Sustainability Charter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 3 – This point should be reworded to account for the need to still provide amenity to occupants through providing openings and access to natural light and ventilation, as well as other design related matters that apply to the external appearance of buildings, such as fenestration patterns. Revised wording to be as follows: <i>"do keep glass window to wall ratios as low as possible to minimise solar heating and the need to cool artificially, <u>whilst also taking into account the need to provide natural light and other design related matters</u>".</i> Point 4 – This point should be reworded as it does not currently account for the fact that almost all forms of plant/equipment generate heat and/or emissions. Revised wording to be as follows: <i>"do design buildings to minimise the need for air conditioning, including through reducing the need for equipment that generates high levels of heat and/or emissions."</i> Point 5 – This point should be reworded to account for our statutory duties to not unduly impact upon listed buildings and/or conservation areas. Revised wording to be as follows: <i>"do fit external sun shading devices to keep buildings cooler in summer (e.g. blinds and awnings), <u>taking into account any implications on listed buildings and/or Conservation Areas.</u>"</i> Point 10 – The term 'SUDs' should be corrected to 'SuDS' for accuracy. General – We recommend the inclusion of the following additional points within the Belgravia Sustainability Charter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> do integrate the use of solar energy where appropriate and feasible;

Reference	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>do utilise sustainable, recycled, or low-carbon impact materials in construction and renovation projects wherever possible;</i> ○ <i>do provide facilities for cycling and electric vehicle charging stations to encourage the use of greener modes of transport.</i> ○ <i>do design outdoor spaces that include greenery, such as gardens, green roofs, or living walls, to improve air quality and provide habitats for local wildlife</i> ○ <i>do install water-efficient appliances and fixtures, and consider systems for rainwater harvesting or greywater recycling.</i>
Non-Policy Action 1: Climate Change Mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clause (b) should be deleted as it is considered to be ineffectual given that it duplicates Policy BEL1 (C) where it is already given statutory weight as part of an actual policy provision.
5.4 - Character Areas – Mews, Kinnerton Street and Barnabas Triangle	
Policy BEL3 (A) & (B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clause A and B should be combined into a single policy to improve the legibility of the policy. As it currently reads, Clause A is a statement, rather than containing any specific actionable policy criteria. ● Revised wording to be as follows: <i><u>"The following are residential character areas in Belgravia There are three residential character areas in Belgravia, namely:</u></i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. The Mews (Figure 5.2 – applies to all buildings fronting on to the identified mews streets)</i> <i>b. Kinnerton Street (Figure 5.3)</i> <i>c. Barnabas Triangle (Figure 5.4)</i> <p><i>These character areas are predominantly residential and development proposals for non-residential uses must not have a significant detrimental effect on residential amenity, e.g. noise, odours, servicing. In the parts of the Kinnerton Street and Barnabas Triangle Character Areas that are designated as Local Centres, a range of commercial and community uses are considered acceptable, as directed by Westminster City Plan Policy 14 (Town centres, high streets and the CAZ)."</i></p>
Policy BEL3 (D)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This clause should be amended to remove the final sentence relating to development outside of character areas. This aspect of the policy has the potential to inhibit development of significant scale in areas that would otherwise be appropriate, thereby running contrary to City Plan Policy 1(A)(1) which seeks to support intensification and optimise densities in order to make the most efficient use of land. It also has the potential to impose onerous validation requirements in terms of significant modelling of the impact of proposed schemes on the character areas, something that would normally only be required for major applications, tall building proposals or development effecting protected views. It is also considered that sufficient protections exist within the City Plan Policies 38, 40 and 41 to ensure that development is of an appropriate scale for its setting, meaning the necessity of an additional policy layer is questioned. ● Revised wording is as follows: <i>"Development must be of a scale and massing that responds to and preserves the setting of the character areas. This also applies to development outside the character areas which could affect their setting."</i>
5.6 – Refurbishment and Enlargement of Buildings	

Reference	Comment
Policy BEL4 (b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This clause should be amended so that it acknowledges that in most cases, there will be some impact from construction activity on residential amenity and whilst efforts should be made to mitigate these impacts, it may not be possible to have these ‘properly and fully’ impacts addressed. Revised wording is as follows: <i>“properly and fully <u>adequately</u> address amenity issues that may arise during the construction activity on neighbouring properties;”</i>
5.9 – Shopfronts	
Policy BEL7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This clause should be reformatted to improve legibility. Revised wording is as follows: <i>“Proposals for the refurbishment of shopfronts or the design of new shopfronts <u>which require planning permission</u>, including awnings and projecting signs, which require planning permission must demonstrate how they reflect the relevant Belgravia Design Codes. In particular this relates to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. materials;</i> <i>b. architectural details; and</i> <i>c. the sensitive incorporation of security measures.”</i>
6.3 - Mitigating the Impact of Late-night Activity	
Policy BEL9 (A)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This clause should be reformatted to improve legibility and improve the effectiveness of the policy. Revised wording is as follows: <i>“Outside of the Local Centres, the two Secondary Centres and the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) (shown on Figure 6.1), The Belgravia Neighbourhood Area is predominantly residential. Outside of the Local Centres, the two Secondary Centres and the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) (shown on Figure 6.1), <u>Late night uses, including such as restaurants, cafes, public houses, bars, hot food takeaways and entertainment uses,</u> outside these locations will generally be resisted.”</i>
Policy BEL9 (B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The phrase ‘will only be supported’ should be removed from this clause as the current broad wording removes any flexibility from the application of the policy and would not allow for a case-by-case assessment of applications on their individual merits. Revised wording is as follows: <i>“Outside the CAZ, new development or change of use proposals for food and drink or entertainment activities needing planning permission will be directed to the Local Centres and Secondary Centres and will only be supported if applicants can <u>should</u> demonstrate that impacts on residential amenity can be satisfactorily mitigated. Such impacts include, but are not limited to noise, litter, odours and tables and chairs and equipment on the street to support alfresco service.”</i>
6.5 - Workspaces	
Policy BEL10 (A)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meaning of ‘flexible terms’ should be clarified in the policy wording to clearly outline what this relates to. It is presumably a reference to leasing terms, but should be clarified as there is the potential for this to be misconstrued with planning permission requirements or conditions of approval.

Reference	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised wording is as follows (N.B. that leasing was used as it was the presumed meaning of the phrase): <i>“Proposals to provide commercial space suitable for incubator/start-up businesses in the CAZ, Local Centres or Secondary Centres (shown on Figure 6.1), particularly on flexible <u>leasing</u> terms, will be supported.”</i>
7.3 – Trees and Greening	
Clause 7.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first paragraph of this clause underplays the importance of trees to the character and appearance of Belgravia and is at odds with the appraisal of the importance of trees in the Council’s draft Conservation Area Audit (CAA) for Belgravia, which says: <i>‘6.2 Part of the distinct character of Belgravia derives from the formal character of its planting, which separates the hard built environment from the natural environment. The planting of trees in the majority of the Belgravia Conservation Area is restricted to the formal squares, which act as oases, or green lungs for the area. The impact of the garden squares extends beyond their immediate surroundings; the dense greenery of the tree canopy and smaller perimeter species are often visible in long views down approaching streets’.</i> The garden squares with their mature trees play a principal role in defining the character of the northern part of Belgravia in particular. These set pieces of design of the area are valued within the conservation area, as set out in the CAA which says, <i>‘4.2 The distinctive character of the conservation area derives from the combination of opulent cream stucco terraces, spacious streets and the verdant garden squares on which these are set’.</i> As such it is suggested that the context should be revised to refer to the importance of the planned layout, including the value of gardens with mature trees in determining the character and appearance of Belgravia. Revised wording is as follows: <i>“Trees are an important aspect of the attractiveness of Belgravia, though it should always be recognised that Belgravia is notable as a district primarily because of its historic buildings rather than on account of its planted environment. Nevertheless, trees help to contribute to the biodiversity and air pollution control of the area as well as reducing carbon emissions. The Belgravia Conservation Area Audit recognises the positive contribution by trees to the character of the area.”</i>
Clause 7.3.1(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wording of this section remains unduly negative with respect to London Plane Trees in the garden squares. It is therefore not supported and should be amended as detailed below. Whilst it is acknowledged that many of the London Plane Trees are of significant size, these trees have generally reached maturity and are unlikely to grow substantially in forthcoming years. If the trees do obscure architectural features or views, then a balance needs to be struck between the merits of the trees, and the impact of any obstruction of views or buildings. A tree filled vista may be of equal if not greater merit than a view of a building. The draft CAA states the following in this regard: <i>“6.3 The London Plane is the chief species among these formal planting schemes – the large size of the squares means that this large tree species can be accommodated happily, without either disrupting or overshadowing the very formal architecture of the surrounding buildings.”</i> It is also noted that all of the trees contained within Belgravia’s Garden Squares are protected by Tree Preservation Orders. The current wording is particularly broad and does not adequately reflect the protections afforded to these trees. Management of trees for reasons such as allowing more light into private communal gardens or for aesthetic reasons must be considered with regard to the merits of the individual trees and their contribution to character of the area, visual

Reference	Comment
	<p>amenity and the townscape more widely. The natural form and appearance of many of the London Planes is an important characteristic of their aesthetic appeal, and it would be preferable if this section was worded to support resisting tree work which would result in harm to the amenity that they provide, in line with City Plan Policy 34(H) which says that <i>“Trees of amenity, ecological and historic value and those which contribute to the character and appearance of the townscape will be protected.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised wording is as follows: <i>“Many of the trees in Belgravia’s garden squares are London Plane trees which are considered by many to be quintessentially typical of London squares and scenery. In this regard they play an important role in defining the heritage and townscape of the squares. However, several of these have now grown to very substantial heights—potentially much larger than envisaged by the original designers of the garden squares. These large trees can have some unwelcome impacts, specifically:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>–They can grow to such a size that they obscure key architectural features and vistas of Belgravia — many overtop the average roofline.</i> <i>–Each year there is a heavy leaf fall which blocks drains and can cause slippery pavements.</i> <i>–Plane tree leaves are especially tough and, if not assiduously cleared, can take up to 5 years to decompose</i> <i>–In the spring/summer their seeds can cause allergies and breathing difficulties in those susceptible.</i> <p><i>Most of these trees are in the ownership of Grosvenor (NB excluding the small triangular garden at Chesham Place, which is in private ownership). First and foremost, tree management is <u>may be</u> necessary where safety is at risk, often due to the instability caused by a diseased tree. Beyond this our recommendations are that owners of garden squares in Belgravia be permitted to manage London Plane trees where such trees have become a nuisance or are damaging to residential amenity. In such circumstances, appropriate pruning should be the first option. In the event of tree removal where pruning has not been able to reduce the nuisance factor, trees other than plane trees, which can demonstrate a biodiversity benefit, should be planted in replacement. Permission must be sought from WCC and it is important that these matters are considered within the context of the wider issues with mature trees explained above.”</i></p>
Clause 7.3.1(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst biodiversity is an important material consideration in determining applications for development, the primary consideration in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation)(England) Regulations 2012 in relation to tree protection is the amenity that the trees provide, and their contribution to the character and appearance of a conservation area, so it would be inappropriate to rate amenity considerations as somehow of less importance than biodiversity considerations in this paragraph. In addition, it is not only the removal of mature trees that is resisted by virtue of Policy 34(H) of the City Plan Policy 2019-2040, and it would not be appropriate to simply refer to mature trees in respect to development. It is suggested that the wording at City Plan Policy justification 34.13 is used as the basis for resisting tree removal in relation to development of private garden spaces. The final section of this paragraph is not supported and should therefore be deleted.

Reference	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised wording is as follows: <i>“Trees in private gardens are mostly protected by virtue of being in a Conservation Area or having a Tree Preservation Order. However, if a development proposal involves the removal of a mature tree (being a significant biodiversity asset), such loss of biodiversity should be a fundamental consideration when determining the planning application (although it should also be recognised that trees can contribute towards townscape, amenity, character and appearance of a conservation area). The Environment Act 2021 requires development to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity from development proposals. Policy 34G of the City Plan requires this “wherever feasible and appropriate”. Thus proposals which involve the removal of valuable trees (i.e. trees that provide clear environmental and biodiversity benefits) but are unable to meet the 10% biodiversity net gain on site should only be permitted to remove these trees where the proposals directly address other key objectives in Westminster.”</i>
Clause 7.3.1(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor textual amendments should be made to this section to reflect that the terminology of ‘pavement trees’ and ‘street trees’ are synonymous. It is therefore recommended that the terminology used is reverted to the term ‘street tree’ only for simplicity. It is also important to reiterate that biodiversity net gain is not the only consideration which drives new tree planting. Policy 34(l) of the City Plan 2019-2040 states: <i>“The planting of trees to optimise the city’s canopy cover will be encouraged in new developments”</i> and it is suggested that more appropriate phraseology is used in this section. Revised wording is as follows: <i>“In recent years trees have been planted in pavements in several areas of Belgravia. More recent developments, e.g. No. 1 Ebury Square, have planted trees along Ebury Street to compensate for the removal of mature trees which fell victim to the developer’s space needs. Given the imperative for net biodiversity gain to be achieved from development, as well as the need to optimise the city’s canopy cover, a similar approach is expected from Grosvenor’s redevelopment of the Cundy Street site.”</i>
Clause 7.3.1(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first paragraph of this clause should be amended to reflect that it is not only mature trees, those which are protected by Tree Preservation Orders or trees which offer biodiversity/carbon capture benefits which may be important to retain. As such, it should undergo minor amendments to reflect the terminology in Policy 34(H) City Plan 2019-2040. Revised wording is as follows: <i>“As a general principle the Plan resists the removal of mature <u>valuable</u> trees for the purpose of enabling development, <u>particularly mature trees</u>. Such trees have taken many years to reach their maturity and any new planting that replaces it is unlikely to reach the same levels of benefit in terms of biodiversity and carbon capture for decades at least. As is noted in the WCC Environmental SPD 2022 (p.51), ‘It is important that as a first option trees should be retained. The retention of existing trees is more beneficial than tree removal and mitigating the loss with the planting of new trees.’”</i> The second paragraph should also be amended to reflect the wording used in the British Standard Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations (BS5837:2012). Revised wording as follows: <i>“Developers will be required to demonstrate why the development necessitates the removal of such trees and how this is of benefit to local residential amenity, the character and architectural design of Belgravia and the</i>

Reference	Comment
	<p><i>environment generally. A Tree Management <u>Protection Plan</u> should be developed that seeks to preserve and incorporate more <u>valuable trees</u> rather than remove them."</i></p>
Policy BEL12 (A)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This clause should be amended to include the terminology of 'where necessary' as this more appropriately reflects that retention of the existing tree population is the preferred first option and that regeneration is opted for when necessitated as reflected in Policy 34(H) of our City Plan 2019-2040 and the Green Infrastructure section of our Environmental Supplementary Planning Document. • Revised wording is as follows: <i>"The tree population should be maintained in accordance with good arboricultural practice. <u>Where necessary, it should be regenerated with healthy and diverse species with the aim of creating a balanced age structure that respects character and heritage to maximise its landscape the townscape and amenity benefits to the Belgravia Neighbourhood Area over the long term.</u>"</i>
Policy BEL12 (B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This clause should be amended to include reference to the protections afforded trees and not simply a reference to biodiversity net gain. • The final sentence of this clause should also be deleted given the potential for this to result in the removal of trees where it could be demonstrated this was necessary to meet other strategic objectives, such as providing affordable housing for example. • Revised wording is as follows: <i>"<u>In addition to protecting trees of amenity, ecological and historic value, and those which contribute to the character and appearance of the townscape, in demonstrating a minimum 10% net biodiversity gain, proposals for built development development proposals must take full account of the loss of biodiversity caused by the removal of any trees. In addressing the requirements of City Plan Policy 34G (Green infrastructure), it is considered that failing to meet the requirement for net biodiversity gain on sites where valuable trees are removed shall not be deemed 'appropriate' unless the proposals clearly meet other strategic objectives.</u>"</i>
Policy BEL12 (C)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This clause should be amended to reflect adherence to the 'right tree in the right place' principles to lessen the narrow focus of the current wording as there are many factors to be considered when determining replacement trees. • Revised wording is as follows: <i>"<u>In the event of tree removal and replacement, species that are most conducive to increasing biodiversity and most resistant to the impacts of the changing climate, e.g. drought, should be chosen provided these do not have a detrimental impact on the heritage or townscape of the area. The planting of replacement trees is preferred to the provision of other types of green infrastructure (see clause F) where feasible. new trees should be planted in accordance with the principle of 'the right tree in the right place' and should be selected according to criteria including:</u></i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i><u>Species diversity and biodiversity;</u></i> • <i><u>Other ecosystem services, for example air quality, pollution absorption;</u></i> • <i><u>Soil characteristics and below ground constraints;</u></i> • <i><u>Size, form and canopy shape;</u></i> • <i><u>Townscape heritage and urban design considerations;</u></i> • <i><u>Suitability for specific site constraints and wider city environment;</u></i>

Reference	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Climate change resilience;</u> • <u>Aesthetic qualities;</u> • <u>Specific negative characteristics for example brittle branches or surface rooting; a</u> • <u>Biosecurity</u> <p><i>The planting of street trees is encouraged to follow the guidance provided by the ‘Trees in the Public Realm’ document (or any successor guidance) and the ‘right tree in the right place’ principles.”</i></p>
Policy BEL12 (D)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This clause should be deleted as it is considered to be ineffectual and duplication of higher level policy as trees that require permission are already subject to validation requirements under The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation)(England) Regulations 2012.
Policy BEL12 (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This clause should undergo minor textual amendments to reflect that many types of development contain landscaping proposals and this clause should not solely relate to major development. • Revised wording to be as follows: <i>“Landscaping proposals for major developments should seek to provide trees on-site and make suitable provision for their long-term maintenance. Demonstration of such provision through compliance with a submitted Tree Management Plan is encouraged.”</i>
7.4 - Streetscapes	
Policy BEL13 (A)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This clause should be amended to tighten the terminology and reflect that high quality paving may not always be suitable, such as in situations where durability and/or structural integrity is required. • Revised wording is as follows: <i>“Proposals to improve paved spaces (which may, where planning permission is required, include footways or carriageways) through the use of high-quality paving <u>where appropriate</u> and coal hole covers that are in keeping with that in the surrounding area and through reducing street clutter will be encouraged.”</i>
8.2 - Requirements for Major Development Sites	
Policy BEL14 (A)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final sentence of this clause starting with <i>“Development proposals should not harm Strategic Views...”</i> should be made a standalone policy for legibility by inserting a new Policy BEL14(A)(c) and reordering subsequent clauses.
Policy BEL14 (A)(e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final part of the clause should be amended to include the wording ‘where feasible’ to account for situations where a site is completely built out to the boundaries (i.e. there are not setbacks provided that would allow for landscaping of the edges of the site). • It is also strongly recommended that the clause introduces a requirement for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and flood risk mitigation given that the most recent Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) has identified that most of the area is now an area of high risk from surface water flooding where drainage should be prioritised. • Revised wording is as follows: <i>“Development should include the provision of publicly accessible open and green space as part of comprehensive landscaping proposals to enhance the local environment, including tree planting, <u>sustainable drainage systems</u> and appropriate softening of the edges of the site <u>where feasible</u>.”</i>
9 - Neighbourhood Infrastructure: Priorities for Neighbourhood CIL Funds	

Reference	Comment
Point 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This point should be deleted as the replacement of concrete (with high embodied carbon) by other carbon intensive materials has a very high carbon cost and should only be done if there is a clearly identified need. As a general rule, existing materials should not be replaced with an alternative which is more carbon intensive than the existing and every effort should be made to provide an alternative which is a lower carbon solution compared to the existing. We consider the replacement of such materials as proposed by this clause should only be done when this is part of a wider improvement scheme that has its own carbon management plans. We also recommend referencing the Council's soon to be revised Standard Details for Highways when considering materials for improvements to surfaces.
Glossary	
'Class'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We suggest inclusion of the word 'Use Class' in lieu of 'Class' for clarity.
Design Codes	
Design Principle 1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This clause is overly restrictive and has the potential to restrict roof extensions contrary to City Plan Policy 40(E). Whilst it is noted that reference to Paragraph 40.11 of the City Plan, this applies to a very specific scenario where unaltered rooflines exist and there may be other cases where roof extensions are appropriate with the Neighbourhood Area. Additional flexibility in the application of this policy should be introduced through minor amendments to the terminology. Revised wording is as follows: <i>"Consistent rooflines are to should be preserved with no visible structures or projections above the average roof or parapet height, Westminster City Plan Clause 40.11 should be noted in this regard."</i>
Design Principle 8.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wording of this clause should be strengthened as it currently reads as a statement rather than policy criteria. It is recommended to include reference to general discouragement as this is considered to strike the right balance between limiting this form of development and allowing the flexible application of Policy 45 of the City Plan relating to Basement Developments. Revised wording is as follows: <i>"It should be recognised that basements in mews are not historically typical <u>and are generally discouraged.</u>"</i>
Section 2.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section should be amended to include reference to townscape value in the final paragraph where the benefits to landscaping treatments are discussed to reflect that this is one of the primary benefits provided by trees and green spaces. Revised wording is as follows: <i>"The biodiversity, sustainable urban drainage and contributions to townscape and to public realm comfort which can be made by landscape within the urban environment... in additional urban greening."</i>
Design Principle 10.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor textual amendments should be made to this clause in order to include reference to townscape and amenity benefits provided by green infrastructure, as well as to include reference to trees in the latter part of the clause rather than simply landscaping. Revised wording is as follows: <i>"Larger scale developments should consider, and positively contribute to, the quality of the public realm. Good public realm design should be informed by the quality of public space, the potential for new permeability, the selection of appropriate ground floor uses and the importance of good microclimate conditions. The contribution to <u>amenity, townscape, biodiversity and sustainable urban drainage provided by trees and landscaping should be recognised.</u>"</i>