Dear Sir

I wish to confirm support of the Knightsbridge Neighbour Plan submitted for the consultation.

Regards

Jeffrey Ng
To whom it may concern:

I have read with interest your documents for 2017-2037.

I did not see any mention of the garden area backing on Prince's Gate (no 14 to 26?) under the stewardship of the Imperial College.

Presently the "walkway" on the south side of these houses is in need of serious refurbishment - in particular the balustrades in disrepair.

I noted the emphasis on preserving the architectural features of Knightsbridge which is indeed so necessary.

In this respect it would also seem that some sort of control should take place. For instance the school at 23 Prince's Gate has erected a permanent structure on their south facing terrace without any permission. This structure which is bolted on the terrace has now been in place for 18 months. The school has taken no steps to dismantle this ugly "shed" in spite of repeated requests.

Yours sincerely
Robert Clive
8 January 2018

Dear Sir / Madam

Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan Consultation
SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID

National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.

About National Grid

National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customers. National Grid own four of the UK’s gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.

To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.

Specific Comments

An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution’s Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus.

National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Key resources / contacts

National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets via the following internet link:
http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/

The electricity distribution operator in City of Westminster is UK Power Networks. Information regarding the transmission and distribution network can be found at: www.energynetworks.org.uk
Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database:

Hannah Lorna Bevins  
Consultant Town Planner

Spencer Jefferies  
Development Liaison Officer, National Grid

I hope the above information is useful. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

[via email]  
Hannah Lorna Bevins  
Consultant Town Planner

cc. Spencer Jefferies, National Grid
We strongly support the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan. We believe that this plan, if fully implemented will safeguard and greatly enhance the quality of life of those living and working in the area, as well as promoting cultural and educational activity.

Professor and Mrs C J Hinds
Dear Sirs

My wife and I live at Princes Gate Court within the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Area.

Preserving and improving the character and appearance of Knightsbridge is very important to us and we welcome the opportunity to contribute to planning policy and local management through the Plan. The Plan contains many excellent objectives and, without diminishing them by singling out one, we are particularly pleased to note the comments regarding the Hyde Park Barracks land and Air Pollution.

The Plan is needed and it has our full support.

Kind regards

Richard Bond
Hello,

As a resident of Knightsbridge, I would like to express my support for this plan. The area which my family has lived in for over 40 years is in dire need of something like this. I would be so grateful if you could look favourably upon it. I have 3 children under the ages of 6 who I hope will grow up a neighbourhood as proposed. In particular, I worry about the poor air quality and licensing of shops and restaurants/cafes.

Thank you very much.

Raoul Fraser
BY EMAIL ONLY
neighbourhoodplanning@westminster.gov.uk

Dear Mr Walsh

Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 16

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 20th December 2017.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England does not consider that this Neighbourhood Plan poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.

The lack of comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may wish to make comments that might help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of any environmental risks and opportunities relating to this document.

If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.

Yours sincerely

Sharon Jenkins
Consultations Team
Dear Sir,

I live in Knightsbridge and would like to support the Neighbourhood Forum in order to continue to live in a better environment.

Kazuko Yoshida-Bouch
Dear sir/madam,

As one of the younger residents involved with the Knightsbridge Association, I would like to express my support for the Neighbourhood Plan.

I am particularly interested in the culture and education aspect as a current PhD student at Imperial College.

Kind regards,

Luke
Dear Sir or Madam:

I am replying on behalf of sustainability consultations, MSP Strategies to the Consultation to the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan (KNP). We work with clients in the urban sustainability and smart cities space.

I am MSP Strategies’ Principal and served as Deputy Mayor of London for Environment & Energy under Boris Johnson 2012-2016. Our response is focussed specifically on utilities, energy and air quality.

We are broadly in support of KNP and its high ambitions around sustainability. We note that such high ambitions may not be appropriate in all parts of the City of Westminster, Greater London, or the wider UK but for this small area of the capital with its high number of listed buildings, international reputation, high land values and activated community, there is the opportunity to make the area an exemplar of sustainable development.

Our only disagreement with the KNP is its general assumption against intensification. Knightsbridge is one of the best connected places in London with a number of London Underground stations and close to major National Rail termini. The Piccadilly Line is expected to be upgraded over the next decade greatly increasing capacity, which should allow development for a larger permeant Knightsbridge population. While understanding the sensitive location with the number of listed buildings and it being a major cultural and educational centre we would recommend toward supporting intensification. These new buildings need not necessarily tall but they can and should be dense.

Specifically:

**KBR14** - mindful of the pressures on London’s housing supply, if the Hyde Park Barracks were to be redeveloped we would strongly support it becoming a residential development.

We support the proposal that any new development should be permeable and allow greater access to high quality public realm. We also agree that the development should be mainly or entirely housing.

However, we do oppose the construction of further towers on the site at the same height as the current Barracks building. A small cluster of tall buildings on this site alone would not greatly affect the area and would play its part in alleviating the pressures on the London housing market.

**KBR23** - we support strongly this policy and its reference to the Mayor of London’s Supplementary Planning Guidance around the management of emissions arising from construction and demolition activity.

Technology is now available at a scale and price to enable proposing a hierarchy around supplying temporary power to construction sites and plant equipment. Such a hierarchy is illustrated below showing how temporary building supplies and/or battery storage and mitigate or eliminate the need for diesel powered temporary generators.
KBR 32 - we support strongly the proposal for generally parking-free new developments and the delivery of future-proofed EV charging infrastructure.

However, we note that London’s electricity grid is already under some strain already with the West End being an area of particular concern. The potential up-front costs of upgrading local sub-stations can run into millions of pounds, which can affect the viability of development or the installation of such infrastructure.

Fortunately, technology is available at a price-point that can reinforce the local grid at a much lower cost and can also offer fast frequency response during periods of high stress such as during triads. For example at its Kentish Town depot UPS is electrifying its delivery fleet. However, this required an upgrade to the local electricity grid, which severely affected the business case.

UPS is now working with UKPN to deliver a solution where battery storage along with cloud-based control systems and power electronics can reinforce the grid. Essentially the batteries are charged during periods of low demand and discharge when the vehicles are charging. Fast Frequency Response to the electricity grid are also available if required, value stacking the proposition.


KRB 34 & 36 Similarly such battery technology to deliver local smart grids will allow for development to proceed, which should not affect the reliability of utilities and allow for wholesale usage of renewable energy such as solar PV.
With the rapid reduction in carbon intensity of the national electricity grid, coupled with the huge reduction in cost for solar PV and battery storage technology that there should be a preference toward electrical heating in new developments and major refurbishment. With new entrants to the energy market offering highly dynamic rates depending on time of day and grid demand the payback on building in smart, demand side and storage capability have come down - and will continue to come down - rapidly.

The high land values in the Knightsbridge area mean that the *marginal* increase in capital cost should not affect viability while realising long-term savings in energy costs and emissions.

**KBR 35** We strongly support the policy. The technology to deliver the Air Quality Positive concept exists. New or refurbished buildings already have to follow London Plan’s energy standards and these should lead to an AQ positive outcome.

Mindful of the general under-occupancy of the area and the pressures on London housing we believe that any new or refurbished developments should aim for higher occupancy rates at a greater intensity. This would mean an increase in the permanent population and therefore greater human exposure to the generally poor air quality for the area. This is all the more reason to ensure that the Air Quality Positive concept is delivered.

With best wishes.

Yours faithfully

Matthew Pencharz
Principal
Please note that Ronald and Joy East of (redacted) support fully the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood plan.
Hello,

As a Knightsbridge resident, I strongly support the plan that has been submitted for consultation.

I particularly support part of Knightsbridge becoming a local stress area. I also support the students getting accommodation in the area.

With kind regards

Caroline Stoclin
Thank you for consulting TfL Spatial Planning.

I have provided comments on previous versions of the draft Neighbourhood Plan so I am pleased that the submission versions generally reflects them. I have a few further specific comments as set out below. Please note that these are TfL officer comments relating to transport and, as such, should not prejudice any subsequent Mayoral/GLA position.

Regards

Andrew Hiley | Principal Planner (Spatial Planning) | TfL City Planning
Transport for London

Page 21 POLICY KBR2: COMMERCIAL FRONTAGES, SIGNAGE AND LIGHTING
Support policy h. (signage on the public pavement). Signs/advert boards placed on the highway can cause obstruction to pedestrians and wheelchair users.

Page 22 POLICY KBR4: PUBLIC REALM AND HERITAGE FEATURES
Welcome the citation of TfL Streetscape Guidance and inclusion of a hyperlink to the Streets Toolkit.

Page 26 POLICY KBR8: PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENT ALONG, ACROSS AND ADJACENT TO MAIN ROADS
Welcome the acknowledgement of TfL as highway/approval authority for the major roads in the Neighbourhood Area.

Page 27 POLICY KBR9: ADVERTISING
Welcome specific policy support for controlling advertising, including on phone kiosks, where it would obstruct pedestrian routes. This is a particular issue in central London.

Page 34 POLICY KBR14: THE HYDE PARK BARRACKS LAND
Welcome the requirement that car parking for residential use should ‘aim for significantly less than one space per unit’. However, suggest this goes further to specifically support ‘car-free’ (bar Blue Badge) development. This is in line with emerging draft new London Plan policy, would support policies elsewhere in the plan that seek to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality, and would be more consistent with Policy KBR 31 A (motor vehicle use).

Pages 55/56 POLICY KBR28: ENABLING ACTIVE TRAVEL/POLICY KBR29: PEDESTRIANS WITHIN THE MOVEMENT HIERARCHY
Support these policies, which are in line with the Mayor’s ‘Healthy Streets Approach’.

Page 56 POLICY KBR31: MOTOR VEHICLE USE
Support the encouragement of car free (bar Blue Badge) development and freight consolidation. As the draft Plan points out elsewhere, congestion, particularly on the major road network, is a key issue. Car free development is clearly desirable so as not to exacerbate this.
Page 60 POLICY KBR32: ELECTRIC VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE
Part C mentions ‘electric cycle hire’. No such scheme currently exists yet in London, so perhaps the supporting text could clarify this policy?

Page 87 Appendix C — Knightsbridge construction standards and procedures C3.3
Welcome the requirement for construction vehicles to be Silver or Gold level Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) accredited, and to have the latest applicable Direct Vision Standard. High levels of cycling and pedestrian activity in the area means that construction vehicle safety is a key consideration.

Page 91 Appendix D — Walking and cycling priorities and projects
D2.0 a. mentions Superhighway CS10. The cycle superhighway along South Carriage Drive, which has already been implemented, is the East-West Cycle Superhighway, or CS3. CS10 no longer exists as a named project on the TfL website.
The St John’s Wood Society’s executive committee supports the evidence based policies contained within the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan. We consider that the plan will encourage responsible sustainable development, preserve the heritage and character of the area and improve air quality for residents.

Christine Cowdray
Planning Committee Chairman
St John’s Wood Society

Are you a member?
If you are not already a member of the St John’s Wood Society please follow the link to http://www.stjohnswood.org.uk/ to see what we do for the local community and join today. The more members we have, the stronger our voice is at Westminster City Council and elsewhere.

The St John’s Wood Society
Dear Neighbourhood Planning,

I am writing to express my support for the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan which is currently under consideration. It is an important contribution to maintaining and enhancing the character of Knightsbridge which is a unique area for its culture, education facilities and heritage. The emphasis on environmental health and good utilities is vital for both residents and visitors and will help to encourage and develop the community spirit in the area. With best wishes,

Olivia Cox

Resident
Dear Sirs,

As a resident of the Knightsbridge Appartments, I am writing to confirm my entire support for the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan which is enclosed. The proposed plan seems to address the most important issues in Knightsbridge. I also support the proposed Neighbourhood Management Plan in Part Two and I believe it reflects the views of local residents.

Regards

F. Corbesier
Dear colleagues

As a resident who also works in Knightsbridge, I wish to write with the utmost support for the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan as a whole. It is a most impressive document that can help us shape the area over many years into the future.

I wish to make particular reference to several items, in particular the character and environment.

Character
KBR1: I strongly support maintaining the character, design and materials in the area. We work and live in a conversation area, where many of the buildings are listed. It is important that we maintain the character of the area in all of our planning.

Environment
KBR35 to KBR37: as a scientist by training I am now responsible for the education of our future engineers at Imperial College London. I strongly support the initiatives in KBR35 to 37 to conform to Sustainable city living by complying with international laws, standards, guidelines and best practices.

In particular, I would like to support KBR37: the retrofitting of historic buildings for energy efficiency.

A. The sensitive retrofitting of energy efficiency measures in historic buildings, including the retrofitting of listed buildings in conservation areas, provided that it safeguards the historic characters of these heritage assets.
B. The requirements in Part A of the policy could be achieved through:
  a. Measure to reduce heat loss, such as double or secondary glazing with wooden windows that meet the latest relevant British standard

Paragraph 10.18 goes on to say that the retro-fitting of such measures must be undertaken sensitively.

On 15 June 2009 my architect made a planning application to Westminster Council for the installation of double glazing to my first floor flat. Secondary glazing is not possible as I wished to maintain the heritage shutters, part of the character of the buildings in the garden squares.

The proposal was to replace any decayed timber frame and cill sections with new timber of exactly the same external profile and fit gas filled double glazing of 11 mm overall thickness to all glazed areas within the existing timber frames.

The west facing wall of my flat is 60% glazing and this proposal would have brought the carbon loss and U values close to the government's permitted levels as well as providing a considerably improved internal environment.

The Council planners ignored the thin nature of the proposed glazes units and persistently claimed double glazing would produce internal reflections when the elevation was viewed from externally but were unwilling or unable to produce examples and an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate was rejected in early 2010.

Since 2010, the quality of double glazing, and glass in particular, has improved significantly, with units less than 11 mm overall thickness.
Provided that the work is undertaken to the highest possible specification, with sensitivity, and with regard for our character and environment, I commend the authors of the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan for including this within their document and urge Westminster Council to support the document as a whole, and KBR37 in particular.

With kind regards

Prof Lorraine Craig
Dear Westminster council,

Thank you very much for this tremendous work done for our Knightsbridge community.

I just want to express my full support for the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan and the proposed Neighbourhood Management Plan in Part Two. Both address the most important issues for Knightsbridge and some thoughtful proposals.

Best regards
Stephane Bianchi
We have been resident in Knightsbridge for about 12 Years, and we are writing in order to declare our full support for the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan.

Although we fully support all of its proposals (having been fully consulted from the time that the first draft of the plan was drawn up), we would in particular like to emphasise the following points.

The plan proposes measures to enhance and improve the special character of Knightsbridge, (including Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens Metropolitan Open Land and the Hyde Parks Barracks land), promote the sense of community and protect and enhance existing residential amenity and mix.

We feel that emphasis on these issues is particularly important given the amount of commercial and residential development which has occurred in Knightsbridge over the last decade and is still continuing apace. Of course sensible and sustainable development is necessary for the area, but it must be carried out within a framework which ensures that excessive and insensitive development does not prejudice these important values and cause Knightsbridge to lose its unique character.

Kind regards

Richard and Tasoulla Christou
Response to Westminster City Council’s (WCC) Statutory consultation on the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan).

Background in relation to Friends of Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens (Friends HPKG)

We have been consulted by the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Forum (KNF) as they prepared the Plan on several occasions and have had the opportunity to visit exhibitions mounted to inform and consult local residents and groups. We have had a meeting between the Chair and Secretary of the KNF and three trustees including myself as Chair of Friends HPKG.

We will restrict our comments to those which particularly affect the two Royal Parks, Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens and the immediately adjacent area.

Part One

List of Policies

KBR 12/13/14

Protection and Maintenance of Local Green Spaces

The two Royal Parks are historic Listed Grade I green spaces in very close proximity to the communities which they serve on all sides. They are special to the local communities and hold a particular local, national and international significance for their outstanding recreational, rich flora & fauna and historic significance, beauty and tranquillity.

Protect and Enhance Metropolitan Open Land (MOL)

A part of the Plan covers MOL which is in Kensington Gardens (KG), west of West Carriage Drive, and Hyde Park (HP), east of West Carriage Drive.
The whole ethos of the Friends HPKG is based on supporting and maintaining the areas of these designations.

The MOL designated sections of both HP and KG have always been part of HP and KG and are not in any way separate from the larger areas of these parks. They are maintained, planted and tended as part of the Royal Parks estate.

The trees on this area of MOL are regularly checked and maintained by fully qualified arboriculturalists who are part of a team of TRP tree officers. Trees in these areas of HPKG are part of TRP’s tree management plans, and control of the tree management on MOL should remain with TRP.

**Hyde Park Barracks Land**

The Barracks are built on land given in the 1700’s by the King to serve as a barracks and this land is part of Hyde Park.

The existing barracks development has a tower, significantly higher than anything else along the south perimeter of both HP and KG. It is visible above the trees from most of HP and although considered by most to be an eyesore, its mass is not so great and therefore it does not cast an overlarge shadow over HP.

Any proposal for change of use of the Hyde Park Barracks would be strongly resisted by Friends HPKG and we would support TRP if they were also of similar mind.

We have already suffered the result of “White Elephant” development at No 1 Hyde Park which overshadows and benefits from HP.

**KBR 26/27**

**Existing and New Development within the Strategic Cultural Area**

This area (1851 Royal Commission Estate) is mostly not in Kensington Gardens.

However the Albert Memorial (AM) is in KG, and is maintained by TRP and extensive planting and elaborate flower beds, plus the South Flower Walk and some new catering facilities provide a close backdrop to the AM. These are maintained, planted and run as part of KG. The area is locked up at dusk as is the whole of KG and is not available for public access during the hours of darkness.

The Royal Albert Hall (RAH) is not part of KG and is separated from KG by a busy road, pavements with high kerbs and iron railings.

**Public Realm in the Strategic Cultural Area**

The link between the RAH and the AM is not satisfactory at the moment (see above).
Friends HPKG have been presented with proposals and kept informed of possible improvements to the access between these two Grade I Listed monuments. The Friends HPKG would not resist these but it should be borne in mind that the area surrounding the AM is part of KG.

**KBR 35**

**Healthy Air**

The neighbouring roads around three sides of both HP and KG (together) suffer from extremely heavy traffic and, therefore, very high levels of pollution, way above acceptable WHO levels. West Carriage Drive, since the construction of Cycle Superhighway (CS3) and ancillary works has resulted in nearly permanent traffic tail backs at both the N and S Park gates. Pollution, therefore, in this area in the middle of the Parks has increased.

Research however has shown that air quality improves very significantly only a short distance in from the perimeter pollution. Any actions taken to reduce/limit the pollution within and surrounding HPKG are to be welcomed.

**KBR 37**

**Retrofitting Historic Buildings for Energy Efficiency**

There are several Listed lodges along the perimeter of HP. The Friends would support TRP if they were able, within their financial constraints and straitened budgets, to improve energy efficiency levels, heat loss and emissions from the properties on their estate.

**KBR 39**

**Trees**

The tree stock on MOL in the area is the responsibility of TRP and their team of highly trained and qualified arboriculturalists and tree officers. TRP has an extensive programme of tree planting and assessing tree health in the cases of tree diseases, limb loss, root rot etc. There are many veteran trees which are an important element of the stock which is recorded, checked and actively managed by TRP and should remain so.

**KBR 42**

**Sustainable Development and Involving People**

The Friends HPKG thank and congratulate the KNF for the immense amount of hard work and extensive consultation of the communities which are at the heart of this neighbourhood.
plan. Not only is this work and these proposals key to the health, prosperity and happiness of the people who live in the area which it covers but it is also an example of how to work constructively with this same community.

Friends HPKG has over 600 members, all of whom are passionate about supporting HP and KG, the preservation of the peace and beauty of the Parks and maintaining them for all visitors to enjoy. These are amongst a list of published aims of the Friends HPKG.

**Developer Contributions**

WCC will be well aware of the tragic consequences of the neighbouring Borough of its apparent failure to funnel developer contributions into supporting local communities, improving the lives of the families who live in those communities. And WCC will also be aware of the need to support balanced communities, promoting the ability of all sections of society to live healthily within the Knightsbridge area. Developer contributions, and the sensitive use of these are key to sustaining live communities. We commend KNF for emphasising this.

**Appendix E**

**Tree Management Plans (TMP)**

Friends HPKG endorse the TMP contained in the Plan and would recommend the TMP and strategies for managing tree diseases, veteran trees, ageing stock replacement, new planting and dangerous trees adopted by TRP on their estates be used as a template and an example of good practice.

Finally, we congratulate KNF for this extensive paper and, on behalf of Friends HPKG thank them for taking into account the vital part of our two Royal Parks play in the health, happiness and well being of not only the communities all round both Parks and London but for the visitors from both the UK and the whole world who enjoy these great historic Parks.

Susan Price
Chair
Friends Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens
Neighbourhood Planning,
Policy and Strategy,
Westminster City Council,
6th Floor,
5 Strand,
London, WC2N 5HR

30th January 2018

Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2037 - Submission version

Dear Sirs

I write as a member of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Parks & Gardens Trust (LPGT). The LPGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LPGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of TGT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the London Inventory (see [www.londongardensonline.org.uk](http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Assets Register (HAR).

I have read the above document and I am familiar with the area.

My comments on behalf of the LPGT focus only on those policies relating to open space and greening. They are as follows:

**Policy proposals KBR10, KBR11 and KBR12**

We support the objectives of these policy proposals to improve rooftscapes, facilitate urban greening and to protect and maintain local green spaces.

**Policy proposal KBR13**

We support the objectives of this policy proposal to protect Metropolitan Open Land from development. Further, we support the objective to protect views from and to Metropolitan Open Land.

**Policy proposal KBR14**

We support the objectives of this policy that development at the Hyde Park Barracks should include open and green space. Further, we support the objective that development should enhance views through Metropolitan Open Land to Hyde Park.

**Policy proposal KBR38**

We support the objective that development should maintain and enhance the natural environment.
Policy proposal KBR39

We support the objective that the tree population should be maintained that proposals to plant new tree should be strongly encouraged.

We would be grateful if you could notify us of the Council’s final decision in relation to the plan.

Yours Sincerely,

Hazel Morris DipBldgCons MRICS

For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group

London Parks & Gardens Trust

Cc Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer, The Gardens Trust
I support the plan for the 2 following reasons;

1- It will set stronger condition in terms of air pollution, therapy limiting the pollution we suffer from.
2- More importantly part of Knightsbridge will become the neighborhood stress area which will make it harder for late licenses to be granted.

With Kind Regards
A Sherkat
Dear Sir / Madam

As a resident of Knightsbridge living in the area of the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Forum with my wife and children, I express my very strong support for the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan.

The issues raised are pertinent and the solutions proposed very reasonable.

In particular I find the policies dealing with air pollution, the future of the Hyde Park Barracks and the Neighbourhood stress area around Raphael Street and Knightsbridge Green very helpful.

Yours Sincerely

Najy Nasser
Dear Madam / Sir

I support the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan.

Living in Knightsbridge with my husband and children, I find that the concerns raised by the plan are very relevant and I agree with the proposed solutions and policies.

I find all the policies and proposals very helpful, especially on air pollution, the future of the Hyde Park Barracks as well as the Neighbourhood stress area around Raphael Street and Knightsbridge Green.

Yours Faithfully

Caroline Lemaire
I am a Knightsbridge resident living in Ennismore Gardens, and I am writing to give my support to the proposed Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan.

In my view it raises some very important issues in relation to the future of Knightsbridge and formulates some serious policies to deal with them. In general there are none of the Policies which I do not support, but I highlight the following which have my particular support:

KBR 14 Hyde Park Barracks in relation to the importance of the cavalry to the local character and heritage of the area, and there to be no increase in the footprint, height or bulk.
KBR7 Tall buildings – as these are not suitable in the Conservation Area.
KBR 1 Design and materials should respect the character of the Conservation and adjacent areas.
KBR2 All retail/commercial facades should display the street no. and design of street frontages should be of a high standard of design.
KBR4 Old unlisted phone boxes should be removed and other historic features restored and repaired (lighting for instance).
KBR15 Neighbourhood Stress Area – some excellent proposals.

I also support

the Neighbourhood Management Plan in Part Two.