

APPENDIX 2

SHEPHERDS BUSH MARKET AREA PLANNING BRIEF – MARKET AND THEATRE LED REGENERATION SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPONSES AND ASSOCIATED ACTION London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham Local Development Framework

Shepherds Bush Market Area Planning Brief – Market and Theatre led Regeneration Supplementary Planning Document: Statement prepared in accordance with Regulation 18(4) (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, this schedule includes:

- (i) a summary of the main issues raised in representations on the council's draft Shepherds Bush Market Regeneration Area Supplementary Planning Document (SPD):
- (ii) how these main issues have been addressed in the SPD which the council intends to adopt.

The Shepherds Bush Market Area Planning Brief SPD was subject to public consultation from 10th September 2010 until 11th October 2010.

This schedule identifies the individuals and organisations that commented on the document. It includes summaries of the representations that were made, together with the council's responses to these representations and details of any amendments to the SPD that were considered necessary.

The Shepherds Bush Market Area Planning Brief SPD provides further guidance regarding the way in which the area should be regenerated and developed in the future. The Market regeneration area is included within the wider White City Opportunity Area identified in the Borough's Local Development Framework Core Strategy Options (consultation June/July 2009) where the preferred option is "to regenerate and provide

an enhanced focus and destination in the western part of the town centre by refurbishing the market and other land as a vibrant mixed use town centre development of small shops, market stalls, leisure uses, residential and offices” It attracted a variety of comments.

In the responses received there was support in principle for the regeneration of the market and especially the retention of the former Shepherd’s Bush Library as a cultural facility. There were many people opposed to the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road due to the loss of the Victorian terrace as well as the shops although the brief allows for their re-provision within the regenerated market. Some were concerned regarding the height of replacement buildings on Goldhawk Road. Market traders expressed concern specifically regarding rents and service charges (these issues will be dealt with at a later stage with the chosen developer) and disruption during the redevelopment process however the brief already says the development should be phased to minimise disruption to the traders. Traders wanted a guarantee that the market would not be diminished in size that has been amended in the brief and parking to serve the market . Lime Grove residents were not supportive of the retention of the Lime Grove hostel to accommodate the relocation of residents from the Broadway scheme.

As a consequence of the representations, a number of changes have been made that clarify the text. However it has not been considered necessary to agree to all of the changes requested in the representations.

Full copies of the representations are available at the Environment Services Department, Hammersmith Town Hall, King Street, Hammersmith, W6 9JU.

NAME / ORGANISATION	NATURE OF REPRESENTATION	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
<p>N0 1 Andrew Jones,</p> <p>General</p> <p>Bicycle Parking</p>	<p>Support with Suggestions</p>	<p>Very much in favour of the redevelopment of the Market and look forward to seeing the final plans and eventually the finished result.</p> <p>Urge the Council to ensure that sufficient high quality, highly visible, cycle parking is provided during the redevelopment and that cycle access is given suitable priority when considering the details of</p>	<p>Response - Support noted Action - No action</p> <p>Response – 4.33 of the brief highlights that “consideration should be given to the</p>

		<p>implementation (pavement treatments etc). The redevelopment would be an excellent opportunity to promote cycling in the Shepherds Bush area. However, the potential will only be fully realised if the idea of “cycling to market” is considered an integral part of the redevelopment plan. Encouraging cycling to the Market should be part of its promotion once the development is underway / complete.</p>	<p>provision of safe secure cycle parking in line with TfL cycle parking standards”. This issue will be considered in more detail as part of any application for re-development in line with the Council’s and GLA’s cycling policies. Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 2 Louisa Mousley,</p> <p>General</p> <p>Facilities for Children</p>	<p>Support with Suggestions</p>	<p>The whole plan to regenerate is great news.</p> <p>We as a family feel that in terms of facilities for children under 5 in winter, the area currently has very little to offer. For example, there are no covered play centres and it would be brilliant if the development could contain something along these lines. Such a facility needn’t be Council funded as we are happy to pay a reasonable fee to attend.</p>	<p>Response - Support noted Action - No action</p> <p>Response - The brief’s key aim is to deliver the regeneration of the market but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, on a very restricted site. When the developer is on board more detail will be developed regarding the specific proposed uses in response to the brief. Action - No action</p>

			<p>outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 4 Collette Moran</p> <p>General</p> <p>Large Empty Building on Shepherds Bush Green</p>	<p>Support with Suggestions</p>	<p>Very pleased for Shepherds Bush Market and the area. The Market is a vibrant place full of character and diversity. The idea of a new public piazza, cafes, shops and restaurants would be excellent for families. An art centre would be welcome as well as it would give something to do for young people and avoid the big mistakes and problems of the big buildings of White Centre that offer nothing to do.</p> <p>What about the big empty building on the Green next to the theatres that should and could be a nice centre for arts, fashions and exhibitions. It is a great pity to leave a building empty in London.</p>	<p>Response - 4.10 and 4.36 provides the development guidelines for public leisure arts, entertainment and cultural use. A key element of this is the re-provision of the Shepherd's Bush library building as a public arts or entertainment facility at the north end of the site.</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response - This building is located outside of the Brief area and its use can not be influenced in this process. However, the comments have been noted.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>

<p>NO 5 Marca Wosoba,</p> <p>General</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Sounds like it could be great news, the plan looks great and I hope that it progresses, is approved and is implemented. The proposal all sounds very positive and could be a substantial improvement, particularly if it could be undertaken in a similar way that has regenerated Spitalfields Market and the surrounding area in East London.</p>	<p>Response - Support noted Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 6 Coli McDonnell,</p> <p>General</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Agree that the market does need attention and investment.</p> <p>I'm very strongly opposed to the demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd. It would be a crime to demolish these buildings; this terrace was built in the early to mid nineteenth century and contains good examples of Victorian shops. They have fallen on hard times, but this is no reason to have them demolished. This should be an opportunity to have them restored to their former charm.</p>	<p>Response - Support noted Action - No action</p> <p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years</p>

<p>Loss of Shops within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>The terrace of shops provides useful services to the area; they bring atmosphere and community to Goldhawk Rd. Not one of these shops is part of a chain, many are family firms, and the pie and mash shop has been in that location since 1899. It would not be the same to simply locate these shops within the Market. There is a danger that we will be turning what is a vibrant and interesting (if somewhat rundown) part of Shepherds Bush into something bland and average.</p>	<p>and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>Height</p>		<p>The Planning Brief describes 30-53 Goldhawk Rd as being of a scale that is no longer appropriate for this part of the Goldhawk Rd townscape, but the height of this terrace is very much part of its</p>	<p>Response - It is stressed in 4.17 that the “scale and height of the new development would need to</p>

		<p>charm.</p>	<p>respond to the context” and it is felt that buildings of 4/5 storeys are appropriate in this location and possibly higher with exceptional design. Pennard Mansions are 5 storeys therefore 4/5 storeys is felt to be appropriate in this location. Action - No action</p>
<p>Architecture</p>		<p>In recent years much good architecture in the area has been lost, such as Shepherds Bush station. Please let’s nurture the remaining good buildings. Just because buildings are in poor condition does not mean one has the right to destroy them. Rather we should be working to have this lovely terrace restored.</p>	<p>Response – While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>
<p>Retention of façade at 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>Would it be possible to retain the façade of the terrace and build the new structure behind it?</p>	<p>Response – As stated in 2.4 of the brief it is also important to include the frontage so that better</p>

			<p>access to the market and central part of the site can be provided, better connecting the regeneration area with Goldhawk Road.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 7 Tania Fullerton</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>It would be extremely short sighted to demolish these buildings, which are examples of Victorian terrace shops. It would be a real discredit to current and future residents, who will at this rate, have an even more tenuous connection to the history of the area in which they live. If we are to expect people to value, look after and respect their environment, shouldn't it at the very least be protected, valued and respected by those whose job it is to do so? Please reconsider.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 8</p>	<p>Object</p>		

			opportunities for independent businesses.” Action - No action
NO 9 Hector McDonnell Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	Object	<p>There is horror at the proposal to demolish this row of buildings. The charm and character of Goldhawk Road has great potential for the future of the area and it would be a very poor decision to demolish these buildings which add a great deal to the appearance of the neighbourhood. They should be refurbished and would then become a much needed draw for small businesses. If they are demolished the street will lose much of its delightful character.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>
NO 10	Object		

<p>Jill Rosenlund</p> <p>Loss of Shops within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>I pass these shops every day and although they are a bit run down they are individual and not just more of the same chain stores that appear in every High Street. Please don't let them disappear. With a little TLC they could help preserve what is left of the character of Shepherds Bush.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 11 S Crowle</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Funds should instead be used for restoration of these buildings.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate</p>

			<p>alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 12 Ameet Marwaha,</p> <p>General</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>While we agree that the market will benefit from extra car parking, atm machines, toilets, security and better drainage, we don't agree that our site needs to be demolished to include flats, offices and other shops. Our concern is what happens to us? We run a family business that is our livelihood; it supports all 5 members of our family. We sell ladies lingerie and nightwear, what happens to us if we are moved? What happens to our stock? Our forward orders? Or customer base? If the market is regenerated taking in all these new developments of shops, offices, etc, where will we be moved to? Space is still at a premium. Is every market trader guaranteed their place back in the Market? All these are questions we have not received a proper answer for.</p>	<p>Response – The brief includes plans for the phasing of the redevelopment to ensure for minimum disruption to stallholders under Objective 7.</p> <p>In response to traders comments a new commitment has been inserted under objective 1 “while seeking to maintain as a minimum an equivalent trading area attributed to the current operational market stalls and units to sustain the traditional role of the market in the community, its long</p>

			<p>term viability and its vibrant diversity”..</p> <p>Action – Objective 1 revised as detailed above.</p>
<p>NO 13 Susanna Swallow</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	<p>Please do not destroy the character and history of the area by pulling down old buildings. I object in the strongest possible terms. Please restore these buildings and incorporate them in the new market.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
NO 14	Object		

<p>Charles Shallow</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>It would be a terrible loss to Shepherds Bush to demolish any more old shops and houses it would result in lost atmosphere to the area. We now have a modern area with Westfield; please can we preserve the rest of the area by restoring the old buildings.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 15 Mary Turner,</p> <p>Loss of Shops within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Please save this parade of shops, which add character to the area?</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the</p>

			<p>comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 16 Shepherds Bush Market Tenants' Association</p> <p>PETITION</p> <p>Deadline for the Brief</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The deadline set by the Council for this Brief of the 11th of October is too early. The Council seem to forcing the pace of this Brief and we are concerned as to why more time is not being given to discuss and consider these important issues. Many matters in the Brief are not to the Tenants satisfaction. It is requested that the deadline be extended to at least the beginning of November.</p>	<p>Response – The market traders have been consulted regarding the future of the market at a meeting held in June 2009 as part of the LDF consultation and during the consultation of this draft SPD in December 2009/January 2010 and September 2010/October 2010. It is considered that a</p>

Figures		<p>It seems that the interpretations of the Council's consultation have been manipulated to accommodate the Council's own preference.</p>	<p>full and adequate consultation has taken place in line with the regulations. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – These figures come from a survey undertaken by M&N Communications. The survey was undertaken in December 09/ January 10 and focussed around the first draft of the planning and regeneration brief. Action - No action</p>
Car Parking		<p>Due to recent decisions by the Council regarding parking in the local area there is now a lack of trust and confidence from Market traders. The parking regulations (reducing max. stay in a bay from 8 hours to 1 hour) have damaged the Market's footfall severely and the Council's actions have revealed that perhaps the Market's welfare is not their priority. Parking for businesses and customers must be provided.</p>	<p>Response – As stated in the revised brief at 4.28 "Regeneration of the market should provide the opportunity for off street parking at an appropriate level that balances the needs of the retail land uses while not compromising the performance and efficiency of the local and strategic road network. Maximum parking standards exist under current local, regional and national planning</p>

<p>Market Tenants' Livelihoods'</p>		<p>The Market Tenants' Livelihoods' must be protected. Although the concept of the regeneration of the Market is in theory beneficial to the traders, there is concern and unrest that the Council wishes to push the present tenants out of the Market and replace the old tenants with new tenants.</p>	<p>guidance which will influence the final quantum of off street parking, including the white city opportunity area planning framework".</p> <p>Action – Changes have been made to the brief to emphasise maximum parking standards under current local, regional and national planning that a developer will need to comply with.</p> <p>Response – The Vision for the market expresses the aspiration of "retaining the unique essence of the market"</p> <p>In response to traders comments a new commitment has been inserted under objective 1 "while seeking to maintain as a minimum an equivalent trading area attributed to the current operational market stalls and units to sustain the traditional role of the market in the community, its long term viability and its vibrant</p>
-------------------------------------	--	---	--

<p>Rents and Service Charges</p>		<p>The increase in business rates is breaking the fragile businesses of the Market. The Market Tenants' wish the Brief to include some guarantees and stipulations that will reassure the future of the present Tenants. All tenants' leases must be protected under the 1954 landlord and tenant act. Rents must be capped. Service charges must be capped</p>	<p>diversity".. Action – Objective 1 revised as detailed above.</p> <p>Response - Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure. Action - No action</p>
<p>Market Size</p>		<p>The present square footage of the Market should not be diminished.</p>	<p>Response - In response to traders comments a new commitment has been inserted under objective 1 "while seeking to maintain as a minimum an equivalent trading area attributed to the current operational market stalls and units to sustain the traditional role of the market in the community, its long term viability and its vibrant diversity"..</p>

<p>Compensation During Development</p> <p>Meeting</p>		<p>There is concern that minimal compensation will be given to tenants when they are decanted from the site during the build out of the development.</p> <p>Request that all Tenants be invited to a meeting to discuss the Brief.</p>	<p>Action – Objective 1 revised as detailed above.</p> <p>Action – Objective 8 confirms that the redevelopment should be phased so the market can operate throughout, more details will be known when a developer is on board</p> <p>Action – No action</p> <p>Response – There have been numerous meetings and drop in sessions with the market traders. The market traders have been consulted regarding the future of the market at a meeting held in June 2009 as part of the LDF consultation and during the consultation of this draft SPD in December 2009/January 2010 and September 2010/October 2010. In order to provide an opportunity for market traders to find out more regarding the brief drop in sessions have been arranged for 15th and 16th</p>
---	--	--	--

Cabinet Meeting		<p>There is concern as to why the Council is holding a Cabinet meeting on the 14th of October 2010 when the deadline of the Brief is after this date on the 18th of October 2010. Does this mean that decisions will be made by the Council before all the opinions and views of the various parties have been collected?</p>	<p>October in the former Shepherd's Bush Library. Action – Two drop in sessions arranged for 15th and 16th October in the former Shepherd's Bush Library.</p> <p>Response – The deadline for commenting on the brief is 11 October 2010. We will however still be considering comments made after this date. A summary of comments made and responses will be submitted to full council on 27th July 2010. Action – No action</p>
Developer Tender		<p>The Council's tendering process in attracting interesting developers is unclear and raises questions as to whether the tendering process could have been more thorough and extensive.</p>	<p>Response - The brief has been promoted on a wider basis as well as the Council's aspirations for regeneration but Orion is currently the only interested developer. The site is complex to develop with significant land assembly required with risks</p>

<p>The Tenants Wish for the Following to be Included in the Brief</p>		<p>The current floor space of the Market shall not be diminished.</p> <p>Car parking for the businesses and customers of the Market must be provided to avoid additional strain on parking in surrounding streets.</p>	<p>associated with this which may explain the lack of interest. Action – No action</p> <p>Response - In response to traders comments a new commitment has been inserted under objective 1 “while seeking to maintain as a minimum an equivalent trading area attributed to the current operational market stalls and units to sustain the traditional role of the market in the community, its long term viability and its vibrant diversity”.. Action – Objective 1 revised as detailed above.</p> <p>Response – As stated in the revised brief at 4.28 “Regeneration of the market should provide the opportunity for off street parking at an appropriate level that balances the needs of the retail land uses while not compromising the</p>
---	--	--	---

		<p>The future management of the Market should include representatives of the Market to ensure the economical and efficient running of the Market.</p> <p>Diversity of businesses must be ensured within the Market. Any additional businesses introduced into the Market must not compromise the current businesses of the Market.</p>	<p>performance and efficiency of the local and strategic road network. Maximum parking standards exist under current local, regional and national planning guidance which will influence the final quantum of off street parking, including the white city opportunity area planning framework".</p> <p>Action – Changes have been made to the brief to emphasise maximum parking standards under current local, regional and national planning that a developer will need to comply with.</p> <p>Response – This matter is outside the remit of a planning brief and will need to be considered by the chosen developer.</p> <p>Action – No action</p> <p>Response – The Vision for the market expresses the aspiration of "retaining the</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>All tenants' leases must be protected under the 1954 Landlord and Tenant Act.</p> <p>Rents must be capped. Service charges must be capped.</p>	<p>unique essence of the market”</p> <p>In response to traders comments a new commitment has been inserted under objective 1 “while seeking to maintain as a minimum an equivalent trading area attributed to the current operational market stalls and units to sustain the traditional role of the market in the community, its long term viability and its vibrant diversity”..</p> <p>Action – Objective 1 revised as detailed above.</p> <p>Response – This matter is outside the remit of a planning brief and will need to be considered by the chosen developer. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure.</p> <p>Action – No action</p> <p>Response Rent levels and</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 17 Mrs Jo Loxley</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd and Loss of Shops Within</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>One of the great attractions of this area is that it still retains its architectural variety and diversity, which enhances the local culture. These shops are a part of our vibrant heritage and as such it would improve all that we embrace in our area if they were to be restored, rather than demolished. They are entirely appropriate to their location and remain a treasured part of the community.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which</p>

			<p>once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 18 Charlotte Lawrie,</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Disturbed to hear of the plans to demolish this historic terrace, which would destroy the area's innate local charm. Surely it is preferable to restore them to their original Victorian state and to retain the architectural integrity of the neighbourhood. Don't want to see bland modern buildings of no architectural interest.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>

<p>Loss of Shops within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>Relocating the shops would destroy the Shepherds Bush Market area of much of its innate local charm. If the existing shops were to be relocated within the redeveloped Market, what would take their place? Presumably more big chains. The existing shops give a sense of continuity and community to the area – surely this is something to be retained and encouraged. City centres are becoming depressing places with no individuality. Surely there’s enough modern retail space at Westfield? The terrace is renowned among fashion students for its great textile shops and the historic pie and mash shop. There are numerous comments on the internet about the pie and mash shop and textile shops that demonstrate the affection people have for the restaurant that forms part of the history and fabric of the local area.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. The intention of the brief is to ensure “The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration, but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, where independent and specialist small businesses and the creative arts can thrive”. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
---	--	---	--

		road, and thus turn this part of Goldhawk Road into an anonymous and characterless wedge of high rise buildings.	respond to the context” and it is felt that buildings of 4/5 storeys are appropriate in this location and possibly higher with exceptional design. Pennard Mansions are 5 storeys therefore 4/5 storeys is felt to be appropriate in this location. Action - No action
<p>NO 20 Michael Cosgrave,</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	These are historic shops with an interesting architectural heritage that add value and a sense of history to the area. The area is rundown and needs radical improving and development, but demolishing some of the few worthwhile buildings on the road to make way for more of the same generic buildings and shop fronts overtaking the area will further detract from the street. Rather than demolish historical buildings why not start with some of the monstrosities built along the road in the 1970s and 80s.	Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance;

			they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action
NO 21 Ratt Khurana Rent Charged to Market Traders	Queries	In your consultation document it states that the rents for the market traders will not go through the roof. Can you please let me know what percentage of rent increase you consider as not going through the roof? Who takes responsibility for the decision to raise the rent, is it the Council?	Response - Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure. Action - No action
NO 22 Susan Joahill, Loss of housing	Query	If a development goes ahead, does that mean I will be homeless? I am a private tenant.	Response – Discussions with individuals affected by the development proposals outlined in the brief will need to take place when a developer is on board Action – No action

NO 23 Arnie J	Queries and Observations		
Poor consultation		The leaflets provided to occupiers were not sufficient in providing detailed information regarding the proposed plans towards Shepherds Bush Market. It was at times misleading in that the extent of the development was only thought to concern the Market place and not the surrounding areas.	<p>Response – The market traders have been consulted regarding the future of the market at a meeting held in June 2009 as part of the LDF consultation and during the consultation of this draft SPD in December 2009/January 2010 and September 2010/October 2010. The leaflet aimed to advise regarding the broad parameters and copies of the full brief were available for people who wanted to consider in more detail.</p> <p>Action – No action</p>
Incorrect Figures		The figures produced in the Brief that indicated that 69%-75% of residents favour this development are false.	<p>Response – These figures come from a survey undertaken by M&N Communications. The survey was undertaken in December 09/ January 10 and focussed around the first draft of the planning and regeneration brief.</p>

<p>Increase in Rent</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>Paragraph 1 of Revised Consultation Document</p>		<p>Concern that any upgrading will throw the baby out with the bathwater by increasing the costs of the stalls. To retain a variety of traders, particularly those selling fresh produce, the rents must be kept at an economic level so that they can offer a reasonably priced alternative enabling them to compete with the overwhelming financial muscle of the supermarkets. The Council does not have a good record in this respect. Similarly, if the row of shops in Goldhawk Rd are to be demolished, any alternative accommodation offered the occupants should charge no more than existing rents. I'm particularly concerned that the pie shop, one of the few traditional businesses surviving in the area, should be safeguarded.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to provide some preferential treatment for traders in respect of parking since at present they have to pay the full £1.80 ph which makes deliveries etc. prohibitively expensive and difficult.</p> <p>Southfield" in paragraph 1 should read "Smithfield".</p>	<p>Response - Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – Point 4.30 in the brief refers to the requirement for A Servicing Management Plan to fully address the issue of servicing. Action – No action.</p> <p>Response – Noted Action – Change made to replace "Southfield" with "Smithfield".</p>
<p>NO 25 Tom Weldon,</p> <p>Demolition of 30-</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Very strongly opposed to the possible demolition of the terrace of</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion</p>

			appropriate in this location Action – No action
NO 26 Xavier St Clair Loss of Textile Shops at 30-52 Goldhawk Rd Alternative Approach	Object	<p>This is very upsetting, Goldhawk Rd and its many fabric stores are vital part of London, which adds character and charm to the community. Many of the other stores benefit from our travels into the community and by removing these stores the Council is doing a great injustice to the community and the many hard working store owners, who rely on customers to make ends meet. Many customers depend on the great value and close proximity many of the stores provide.</p> <p>Instead the Council can revitalise the area by putting in plants and doing a little renovation of the surrounding streets.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p> <p>Response – Noted Action – No action</p>
NO 27 Lisa Redman	Object		

<p>Loss of Textile Shops at 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>Issue with the proposed 'improvements' to Goldhawk Rd. This terrace contains shops that I use daily and are of great convenience and importance to my business.</p>	<p>Response – We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>These shops are in need of architectural help, they are beautiful Victorian buildings and should be restored to their former glory not demolished and replaced with generic bland architecture. This is another example of taking away the charm that Shepherds Bush has and these individual businesses, which are the heart of the area, should be supported and helped to make a success of the area. When developing an area the heart should be retained, not blown up.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p>

			Action - No action
<p>NO 28 Greater London Authority</p> <p>Relationship of the Market Development With the Wider Metropolitan Town Centre</p>	<p>Observations and Suggestions</p>	<p>Concerned that the brief does not tackle the challenge of positioning the market development within the wider Metropolitan Town Centre, and particularly how development of the market must be undertaken with a view to complementing the other key anchors of the town centre. The GLA have been quite conscious of this need in drafting the White City Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF), and it would be essential to take a consistent approach in the Brief for this site within the OAPF.</p> <p>There is a risk that overly aggressive development on the market will compromise the aspirations for the strengthening and reinvigorating the wider town centre, particularly when referring to new shops, leisure activities, office space, independent and specialist small businesses within the market, as this could be seen as competing with the West 12 centre and the shop fronts along the north of</p>	<p>Response – The Council have explicitly cited in the SPD that the role of the Shepherd’s Bush Market would be seen as complementary to the Town Centre. Paragraph 4.9 states that there should be a mix of mostly small units, and a strategy of encouraging independent and specialist shops. Such mix and type of uses are not seen as being able or capable of competing with the range of uses within Westfield, W12 or the High Street shops in Shepherd’s Bush Green.</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response- The main aspiration of the SPD is to rejuvenate the ailing market place with a newer, improved facility which gives the market stall traders a</p>

<p>Waste and Sustainability</p>		<p>Shepherds Bush Common.</p> <p>The brief should address how this development will not compromise the improvement and strengthening of these other parts of the town centre, particularly the 'night time economy', retail and leisure sectors.</p>	<p>safer and more attractive environment conducive to increased trading. Importantly, the Council wish to seek increase footfall in the Market and to reinstate its previous historic importance within the town centre. The Council consider that the proposed development will bring about significant economic benefits to existing traders which will in turn, increase expenditure in the Shepherd's Bush Town Centre.</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response - With regards to the impact on parts of the town centre, the brief includes provision for additional cultural facilities (such as a theatre at the former Shepherd's Bush Library) which increases the mix of uses within the area and another attraction and focus for the town centre. The additional cafes and restaurants coupled with the</p>
---------------------------------	--	--	---

		<p>The OAPF also will be proposing several approaches to waste that might involve the market, including using organic waste from the market and other sources to create waste derived biogas for a Gas CHP, and increasing the presence of refuse facilities, which often use spaces like railway arches for furniture and electrical refurbishment and sale.</p>	<p>creation of a new public square would be seen to complement the market making it a more attractive and safer environment for visitors and traders. The scale and nature of the uses are seen as being small and independent, and are considered to complement and add to the qualitative retailing on offer within the Town Centre. A management plan is recommended to ensure that the market is secure at night time. The brief does not envisage any additional late-night bars or clubs. Therefore, the contribution to the night time economy will be limited.</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response - The Council would be concerned about any loss of retailing within the arches, as proposed in the possible incorporation within any waste management scheme which</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Similarly the OAPF is exploring the potential for a district energy network – there may be opportunities for the Market to connect to such a network, and proposals should explore those opportunities. The Brief should note that any development on the Market will be subject to the supplementary planning guidance from the OAPF, particularly on waste and energy, when it is published (anticipated June 2011).</p>	<p>would result in the loss of retail within Shepherd's Bush Town Centre. The loss of such retail (which contributes to the qualitative range) would seem to undermine the status of the Metropolitan Town Centre.</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response - The Council would expect all major planning applications to be accompanied by an energy statement and sustainability report which would confirm the details of how the development will reduce carbon emissions and maximise energy consumption from renewable energy sources. LBHF will assess applications based on the relevant London Plan policies at the time of submission. The developer will be advised by the Council of the OAPF and will be encouraged to connect to the wider district energy network, if feasible.</p>
--	--	---	---

			Action - No action
NO 29 Ingrid Kazior	Support and Suggestion		
New Market		Fully support the plans to regenerated Shepherds Bush Market. It desperately needs serious regeneration and investment to make it a much more appealing and engaging space with a better mix of shops that maintain its multicultural and unique features.	Response - Support noted Action - No action
Shepherds Bush Library Building		The restoration of the Shepherds Bush Library building is supported. The Bush theatre is a national treasure and the library would be a perfect building to host cultural events.	Response - Support noted Action - No action
Broadway Centre and Lime Grove Hostel		The Council needs to listen to Lime Grove residents' concerns about the move from the Broadway Centre to Lime Grove Hostel. This move could lead to additional anti-social behavioural problems in an area that already has a lot of antisocial and security issues outstanding.	Response - Consultations have taken place with Lime Grove residents during Dec09/Jan 10 and Sept/Oct 10 regarding the draft brief. Following consultation with Lime Grove residents the brief was changed at 4.34 "all options for improved access, design and management of the hostel would need to be looked at to minimise the concerns of local residents. The Council would expect a developer to negotiate to provide more

			<p>suitable access to the hostel that could replace the existing sole access from Lime Grove, including options for access via the railway viaduct taking place with Lime Grove residents.”</p> <p>In addition Supporting People will be working with St Christopher’s and local residents to ensure the hostel users do not disrupt the local community.</p> <p>Action – Brief was previously amended as above at 4.34</p>
<p>NO 30 Sean Percival</p> <p>General</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>It is understood that the Market area needs to be ‘improved’, but is it really necessary to tear it all down and start again? Can we not merely restore what is already an area that is full of character and individuality? Isn’t it enough that practically every High Street in this country looks the same without creating yet another one.</p>	<p>Response – The intention of the brief is to ensure “The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration, but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, where independent and specialist small businesses and the creative arts can thrive”.</p>

			Action – No action
<p>NO 31 Dehra Mitchell</p> <p>Demolition of Buildings and Shops at 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	<p>It would be a great pity to lose what little individuality is left in the area. The fabric stores in particular are used by locals and students and one can always be assured of receiving care and attention. Moving the shops into the market would mean the possibility of them no longer being in existence, which would be a pity.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 32 Charlotte Crosbie</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops</p>	Object	<p>I use the fabric shops along Goldhawk Road for my work in the film industry. It would be a great shame if they were to disappear as there is nothing else like them in London.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration</p>

			<p>of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 33 Eva Onsrud</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Loss of Textile</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Turning this area into a parking lot would be an incredible waste.</p> <p>The textile shops are extremely beneficial for those that work in the</p>	<p>Response – This is not the intention of the brief. The intention of the brief is to ensure “The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration, but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, where independent and specialist small businesses and the creative arts can thrive”.</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response – The inclusion</p>

			<p>the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 35 Kerry Estick</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash shop within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Can't understand why the Council would like to change everything, the pie and mash shop is a London tradition that has been around for a long time, moving them would mean there will be no traditional London restaurant in the West London area. I've attended this restaurant for 29 years and couldn't imagine not being able to have pie and mash on a regular basis. It is understood that the Council is trying to improve the area, but getting rid of tradition is not the right way of improvement.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>

<p>NO 36 Lisa Fuller</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Do not close this shop it is part of the local community and one of the last places of tradition standing.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 37 Milly Burns</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>There is little enough period architecture left in the area and a regeneration of the market seems a perfect opportunity to restore this row of shops to their former charm. If the terrace were to be restored the building would considerably enhance the area.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we</p>

Height		Totally disagree that the buildings are of a scale that is no longer appropriate for this part of the Goldhawk Rd townscape.	<p>understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response - It is stressed in 4.17 that the “scale and height of the new development would need to respond to the context” and it is felt that buildings of 4/5 storeys are appropriate in this location and possibly higher with exceptional design. Pennard Mansions are 5 storeys therefore 4/5 storeys is felt to be appropriate in this location.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
Loss of Shops		Object to losing these shops that are regularly used and in many	Response - We recognise

<p>Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>cases family owned – not part of a chain. They contribute a lot to the atmosphere of the area e.g. the pie and mash shop, which has been there since 1899, giving a sense of history that would be destroyed by relocating it.</p>	<p>the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 38 Robbie Marwaha,</p> <p>General</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Worried and concerned about the short and long term future of the area. Most of the traders in the Market have been there for decades and their livelihoods depend on it.</p>	<p>Response – The brief’s vision clearly states the Council’s future commitment to the market. “The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration, but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, where independent and specialist small businesses and the creative arts can thrive”.</p>

<p>Questions</p>		<p>The senior members of the Shepherds Bush Market Tenants Association are pro development and are our direct competitors and want us gone, with us gone their business will flourish.</p> <p>We all agree that the market needs improving, we need the following: customer toilets; increased customer parking; atm machines; security; new drainage, pathways and a roof.</p>	<p>Action – No action</p> <p>Response – Noted Action - The brief has been amended to give comfort to the traders in Objective 1 “while seeking to maintain as a minimum an equivalent trading area attributed to the current operational market stalls and units to sustain the traditional role of the market in the community, its long term viability and its vibrant diversity.”</p> <p>Response – Issues regarding toilets are dealt with at 4.25, parking at section E. (Access, parking and servicing), security and pathways at D. (Public realm design and management). These and other details will be dealt with when the developer of the site lodges a planning application. Before this application is lodged the Council will be encouraging the developer to undertake an extensive consultation with all of the</p>
------------------	--	---	---

		<p>The following is what we don't need: flats and apartments; offices; coffee shops (there are tens of them on Uxbridge and Goldhawk Rd); and more retails shops.</p> <p>The statistics saying that 75% of the traders are in favour of redevelopment is ridiculous, we carried out a questionnaire of the stallholders to be affected by the plans and 95% were against it.</p>	<p>existing businesses to determine their needs and requirements. Action – No action</p> <p>Response – The area is identified in the Borough's Local Development Framework Proposed Submission Core Strategy (October 2010). That document sets out the proposed policy as: "Regeneration of the market and other adjacent land to create a vibrant mixed use town centre development of small shops, market stalls, leisure uses, residential and possibly offices; Action – No action</p> <p>Response – These figures come from a survey undertaken by M&N Communications. The survey was undertaken in December 09/ January 10 and focussed around the first draft of the planning and</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>What would happen to us if the plans go ahead?</p> <p>What will happen when works are complete?</p> <p>Are we guaranteed our spots back in the market?</p>	<p>regeneration brief. Action – No action</p> <p>Response – The developer would undertake significant consultation with local residents, groups and traders when developing the scheme in line with the parameters within the brief. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – Details regarding phasing and the eventual layout of the market will be further developed when a developer is on board. Management arrangements will also be discussed when the developer is on board. Action – No action</p> <p>Response – In response to traders comments a new commitment has been inserted under objective 1 “while seeking to maintain as a minimum an equivalent trading area attributed to the current operational market</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>What rents would we be paying when the works are complete?</p>	<p>stalls and units to sustain the traditional role of the market in the community, its long term viability and its vibrant diversity". Details regarding phasing and the eventual layout of the market will be further developed when a developer is on board. Action – Objective 1 revised as detailed above.</p> <p>Response - Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure. The Vision for the market Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 39 Julie Bennett</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Will the Peabody Trust and Broadway Centre get a market rate for their properties that were recently built? The Brief gives the</p>	<p>Response – It is anticipated that a developer would</p>

<p>General</p>		<p>impression that if they do not agree they could have an order placed on them. If paid a going market rate they may have better uses for it. Homeless people do not appear to be wanted in this Borough.</p>	<p>undertake the land assembly required to deliver the project and enter into negotiations with the various landowners. Action – No action</p>
<p>NO 40 Catherine McDonald</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Would like the shops kept and refurbished.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As</p>

			<p>mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 41 Mr Solomon-Sampson,</p> <p>General</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Would like to limit the number of bars and shops selling liquor, there are already enough in the surrounding areas. Would like to see more well maintained public lavatories and better lighting for the entry and exit areas of the Market to increase security.</p>	<p>Response – Comments noted.</p> <p>At 4.25 in the brief it states “Toilets would need to be successfully integrated into the new layout”.</p> <p>Proposals for lighting in the regenerated market are covered at 4.24 “Lighting can enhance the character of the market and add to the quality of the space. A consistent approach to the lighting of both the existing market area and new development should be explored, avoiding local light pollution but providing sufficient light for CCTV cameras to operate</p>

			effectively. “ Action – No action
NO 42 Bennett,	Observations and Suggestions		
Paragraph 1.1		I am pleased with the additional information in red especially that on the Market background history.	Response – Support Noted Action – No action
Paragraph 2.3		Can we assume that both Broadway and Peabody Trust will get a realistic price if they do not wish to relocate to Lime Grove? It appears that Lime Grove residents are not happy for Broadway to extend their premises there to accommodate part of their activities, excluding the day care provisions. As homeless people are not welcome in this Borough, both organisations may prefer, in view of the current financial situation, to use the money on another site outside the Borough, although this would be very sad for all their clients.	Response – The existing hostel at Lime Grove has been decommissioned and discussions are taking place with Broadway to relocate their residents into Lime Grove hostel as detailed in the brief. Action – No action
Paragraph 4.25		There is no mention of disabled toilets or the needs of wheelchair users to be taken into account by any future developers.	Response - 4.32 in the brief confirms that any scheme would need to comply with the Council’s Access for All SPD Action – No action
Paragraph 4.28		It is accepted that parking is a problem. Developers should consider	Response – As stated in the

<p>Paragraph 4.31</p>		<p>creating a 2 or 3 storey car park with a discount for those spending a certain amount in the Market. The entrance could be on Market Lane and connected to the development on the Laundry site recently bought by the Council. It would bring in regular income, attract more customers to the market and be an attraction when the Bush Theatre moves to Shepherds Bush Library. It could also improve the pedestrian access to the Market on the Laundry site.</p> <p>The Borough signage strategy is not good (Fulham Palace & Bishops Park) so this is a very important point.</p>	<p>revised brief at 4.28 “Regeneration of the market should provide the opportunity for off street parking at an appropriate level that balances the needs of the retail land uses while not compromising the performance and efficiency of the local and strategic road network. Maximum parking standards exist under current local, regional and national planning guidance which will influence the final quantum of off street parking, including the white city opportunity area planning framework”. Action – Changes have been made to the brief to emphasise maximum parking standards under current local, regional and national planning that a developer will need to comply with.</p> <p>Response – Already covered in 4.32 of the brief “Pedestrian access is the primary route into the site</p>
-----------------------	--	---	---

			hence the need to clearly identify and signpost the entrances and routes through to the development". Action – No action
NO 43 Edward Lawrence Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	Object	Object to the proposed demolition of this terrace.	Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action – No action
NO 44	Object		

<p>Vivienne Jones</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>I work in the film industry as a costume designer and regularly use the fabric shops in this area, many of which have contributed greatly to British films such as Harry Potter, Bridget Jones, Gladiator, Troy etc. I would be very disappointed if these shops were to go and end up in a faceless market with none of the space, daylight or convenience that this terrace of shops provides.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market.</p> <p>As stated in the brief’s vision “The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration, but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, where independent and specialist small businesses and the creative arts can thrive”.</p> <p>Action – No action</p>
<p>NO 45 Tim Healy,</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Concerned for the preservation of the best of the ‘Quirky’ character of the area and this terrace in particular is of some value. I am amazed and shocked that a demolition of this nature is being considered. Once demolished the character of the streetscape will no longer have historic local ‘anchors’ on which to build the future. Giving the terrace some much needed tender love and care should be the goal.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we</p>

			<p>understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action – No action</p>
<p>NO 46 Annie</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops and Building at 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Impressed by the charm and quality of the shops and are upset to learn the plans to demolish them. Although we are aware that provision would be made for these businesses to continue, it would not be the same. Goldhawk Rd would lose some of its charm and originality.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops</p>

			<p>within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 47 Fanoula Ziouzia,</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The properties are run down, but there is more value to having them restored and letting people maintain their family business than a demolition, or even relocation.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the</p>

<p>Loss of Traditional Market</p>		<p>This part of Shepherds Bush is full of history and has a unique character. It is really important for the Market to co-exist with the modern end of Shepherds Bush that is Westfield.</p>	<p>local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p> <p>Response – As stated in the brief’s vision “The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration, but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, where independent and specialist small businesses and the creative arts can thrive”. Action – No action</p>
<p>NO 48 Lindsay Kirby,</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>These premises should be preserved for aesthetic and historical reasons as well as for the community.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential</p>

<p>Viability of the Additional Commercial Units Proposed</p> <p>No Need for Additional Housing</p>		<p>The community will not gain much if the existing commercial units are replaced considering we already have a number of commercial units empty.</p> <p>If the Goldhawk Industrial Estate goes ahead then we will have plenty of housing in the surrounding area including The Vale and Emlyn Rd.</p>	<p>to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action – No action</p> <p>Response – The majority of shops and stalls within the Brief are occupied. The Council envisages that a regenerated Market will encourage a greater footfall in the locality, which will provide a more viable market.</p> <p>Action – No action</p> <p>Response – As well as meeting housing need the inclusion of housing above</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>ground floor levels adds vitality and supervision to the market through providing a mix of uses including housing.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 49 Susan Kulkarni,</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>My team and I always shop there for our fabric needs and its demolition would be a great loss to all designers and people who sew. Fabric shops in London are few and far between and it would be a terrible blow to lose all of the best shops.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>

<p>NO 50 Giacomo Barisone,</p> <p>New Market</p> <p>Shepherds Bush Library Building</p> <p>Broadway Centre and Lime Grove</p>	<p>Support with Suggestions</p>	<p>Welcome the proposed new plan of Shepherds Bush Market, the current market has deteriorated over many years into a very depressed, run down and unappealing place. It is currently a magnet for the drug dealing community of the area and would benefit tremendously from an improved cultural and commercial layout.</p> <p>Fully support the use of the old Shepherds Bush library building as the new Bush theatre premises and hope that the commercial profile of the shops will maintain its unique multicultural appeal that characterises the area and won't become a bland impersonal setting for the usual shop chains that inhabit the nearby Westfield.</p> <p>Fully support the Lime Grove residents who've voiced concerns about proposals to move some services from the Broadway Centre to the nearby Lime Grove hostel. I would expect the Council to carefully address the issues raised by the residents.</p>	<p>Response – Support noted Action – No action</p> <p>Response – As stated in the brief's vision "The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration, but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, where independent and specialist small businesses and the creative arts can thrive". Action – No action</p> <p>Response - Consultations have and are taking place with Lime Grove residents during Dec09/Jan 10 and Sept/Oct 10 regarding the</p>

			<p>draft brief. Following consultation with Lime Grove residents the brief was changed at 4.34 "all options for improved access, design and management of the hostel would need to be looked at to minimise the concerns of local residents. The Council would expect a developer to negotiate to provide more suitable access to the hostel that could replace the existing sole access from Lime Grove, including options for access via the railway viaduct taking place with Lime Grove residents."</p> <p>In addition Supporting People will be working with St Christopher's and local residents to ensure the hostel users do not disrupt the local community.</p> <p>Action – Brief was previously amended as above at 4.34</p>
<p>NO 51 Arcadia Fletcher,</p>	<p>Object</p>		

<p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>Please do not allow the demolition of this terrace, these are Victorian buildings and in destroying them we will destroy the true character and history of the area. Anywhere can be modern, but it is impossible to create old buildings. Once removed the area loses its link with history and hence loses the richly layered character that only time can give it.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action – No action</p>
<p>NO 52 Shirley Dines Loss of Pie and Mash Shop within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Please do not close this shop it has been there for years and I enjoy my meal there twice a week.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops</p>

			<p>on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 53 Astellla Mullen,</p> <p>Loss of Shops</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The stretch of road with pie and mash shop, fabric shops and the old Irish pubs, not to mention the Market is fabulous. They are family businesses that have been there for years and must remain for many years to come. The area should not be regenerated to provide for yet more Starbucks, Café Rouge or other bland chains.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p> <p>Response – Objective 4 in</p>

<p>NO 54 Christopher MacKerness</p> <p>General</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Been using this area since the early 40s and it would break my heart to see it all disappear.</p>	<p>Response – Objection noted Action – No action</p>
<p>NO 55 Fadi Kabbani</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Concerned about the loss of quality English textile retailers.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 56 Toby Belshaw</p> <p>Demolition of 30-</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The area is steeped in local history and this terrace helps make the area as vibrant and robust as it currently is. Should they go the</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the</p>

52 Goldhawk Rd		replacement modern buildings will not only spoil the aesthetics, but also drive local businesses out.	demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4
NO 57 Rikki Clark	Object	Against the planned demolition of this site.	Response – The inclusion

<p>NO 58 John Spinks</p> <p>General</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash shop within 30-52 Goldhawk</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The proposed development of Shepherds Bush Market is welcomed.</p> <p>Strongly object to the demolition of this terrace.</p> <p>The terrace contains one of the few remaining pie and mash shops in London. Cooke's is an institution, a landmark, an icon and should remain exactly where it is. Most High Streets are full of bland chain stores, however places like Cooke's have genuine individuality and</p>	<p>Response – Support noted Action – No action</p> <p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the</p>

Rd		quality.	local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4
NO 59 William Wall Loss of Pie and Mash shop within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	Object	This area of London is unique with many shops having been there over a hundred years, this business is part of local people's lives with many meeting here before the football at Loftus Road. To move it to a soulless shop somewhere in the vicinity would destroy it.	Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4
NO 60 Nicola Hardy	Object	The shop has been here for years and is a little part of history that is	Response – The inclusion

<p>Pie and Mash shop within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>left in this country with all the high rise buildings and new developments. It's a big part of many family's lives and creates a lot of happiness, people look forward to their weekly pie mash and liquor.</p>	<p>of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 61 Sam Slattery</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash shop within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>This establishment has been a happy part of our lives for many years and we have had some good times there, we do not want it closed.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the</p>

			<p>aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 62 Zandra Rhodes</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Loss of Textile</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Plans to knock down these shops is madness.</p> <p>I have been using these shops for over 20 years and do not want them to close down. Every fashion house that manufactures or at</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – We recognise the importance of the shops</p>

<p>Shops within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Increase in rents</p>		<p>least samples in London goes there. The reason we use these shops is because their prices are much lower than in the west end.</p> <p>If the site is developed rents will go up, as will the prices the textile shops charge.</p>	<p>on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p> <p>Response - Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 63 Beth Tilley</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Concerned about the proposed demolition of the terraces.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we</p>

<p>Loss of Textile Shops within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>The removal of these shops will affect my work at Rose Burford College. The competitive prices created by such a number of shops in one location would be lost, having a huge knock on effect on what I am able to produce greatly affecting my learning and future work.</p>	<p>understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 64 Maya Jani Loss of Shepherds Bush</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Concerned about plans to eradicate these businesses to make way for car parking. The loss of these businesses would be a great loss to the community.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52</p>

<p>Market</p>			<p>Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 65 Brenda Murphy</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Concerned about the closure of the fabric shops on Goldhawk Rd.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p>

			Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.
<p>NO 66 Andy Newman</p> <p>Loss of Shops within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	Concerned about the knocking down of these shops to make way for a car park.	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 67 Steve Russell</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	Appalled at the plans to knock down these wonderful Victorian buildings, which should be protected.	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration</p>

			<p>of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 68 Martin Precival</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Disappointed to hear the planned demolition of these buildings, Victorian buildings such as these should be preserved and refurbished, they are valuable local heritage.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the</p>

<p>Loss of Shops within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>Cooke's pie and mash shop has been trading from this terrace since 1899. This is a well loved eatery amongst the local community, especially the elderly. To lose this along with the other shops within the terrace would be a travesty. It is appreciated that the Council would like to support Shepherds Bush Market, but this should not be at the cost of losing these retail premises.</p>	<p>architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 69 Leila Wallis</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Like many long term residents of Shepherds Bush I have greatly appreciated the new additions to our neighbourhood, like Westfield, with its many amenities. However, it would be heartbreaking if, in an attempt to modernise this part of the Borough, we destroyed the</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential</p>

<p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>people and businesses that made this area so special. It is understood that Shepherds Bush Market needs modernising, however the destruction of the terrace would be a tragedy.</p> <p>The loss of this shop would be a great tragedy – my family and I have been going for over thirty years. This shop can not be replaced by some American multinational fast food outlet – Cooke’s is a living tradition of genuine London food.</p>	<p>to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response – We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 70 Larry May</p>	<p>Object</p>		

<p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>Object to the disgraceful consideration of destroying a landmark area of Goldhawk Rd. This Victorian example of architecture should be embraced and protected for future generations.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 71 Linda Favell</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Feel strongly that some parts of the local area's identity need to be preserved. Over the years the Market has changed significantly as a result of changing pitch holders and customers. However to lose the identity of the Market by demolishing the Victorian fabric of the area is unacceptable. We have been forced to accept Westfield in Shepherds Bush, however the Market can not be accepted in the same vein. The terrace buildings mark the approach to the Market and their facades are in keeping with the very ethos and feel of the</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic</p>

		<p>Market. It will be a travesty to allow the identity of the area to change beyond all recognition. The Market doesn't need updating.</p>	<p>importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 72 Brian and Simon Paterson</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The proposed development is not needed, not required and is ill thought out. If the pie and mash shop has to close down or move it will do untold damage to the local community, which will never be repaired.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p>

			Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.
<p>NO 73 Scott Hampton</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	Please reconsider as this would be a great loss to the community and many QPR fans.	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 74 Flora McLean</p> <p>Loss of Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	Horrified about the loss of the important textile shops that are used by many designers and producers. This is a vibrant part of London with a heady cultural mix that works for so many people of all ages and ethnicities which should not be destroyed. Do not understand the constant desire local Council's have to make generic	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the</p>

		<p>homogenised high streets with no character. This is very short sighted as in a few years time they will be trying to create exactly what was taken away.</p>	<p>comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 75 Michael Raeburn</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Strongly object to the proposed demolition of these fine buildings, the description of them as of poor quality and inappropriate scale is false and tendentious. Shepherds Bush remains a vital area with a strong local character, thanks in part to exactly the businesses that the Council is planning to kick out. We don't want more Westfield's and sanitised pedestrian areas that are more appropriate for Basingstoke or Luton. The only way the proposals can possibly make financial sense at the present time will be by getting rid of small shops and businesses in favour of profiteering large businesses.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years</p>

			<p>and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 76 John Terry</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Surely it is better to keep and regenerate this terrace rather than keep bulldozing heritage.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 77</p>	<p>Object</p>		

			<p>local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 78 Neil Wassell,</p> <p>Height</p>	Object	<p>In favour of a redevelopment that will benefit Shepherds Bush and the Market traders, as a resident I must object to the southern aspect that will demolish this terrace. I'm on the second floor of Goldhawk Rd, and enjoy a view across the market skyline that benefits from good light, great sunsets and even views of the Wembley arch. All these benefits will be lost if the proposed development were to rise above the present 2 storey height. Do not object to the demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd, but strongly object to the prospect of the new development rising above the present 2 storey height.</p>	<p>Response – It is stressed in 4.17 that the “scale and height of the new development would need to respond to the context” and it is felt that buildings of 4/5 storeys are appropriate in this location and possibly higher with exceptional design. Pennard Mansions is 5 storeys therefore 4/5 storeys is felt to be appropriate in this location.</p> <p>Action – No action</p>
<p>NO 79 Dawn Wise</p> <p>Loss of Pie and</p>	Object	<p>Please do not demolish this shop, there are so few original shops left</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion</p>

<p>Mash Shop within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>and people travel from far and wide just to experience the tremendous atmosphere in this shop.</p>	<p>of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>Would be a total travesty if this row of lovely Victorian shops was pulled down to make way for modernisation of the market. The market is absolutely fine as it is.</p>	<p>Response – While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>

<p>NO 80 Ron</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>This establishment is part of the character and history of Shepherds Bush which needs to be retained.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 81 Pat & Bob</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The terrace should remain as is.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. Action - No action</p>

<p>NO 82 Mary Forestier-Walker</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The textile shops on Goldhawk Rd are a valuable contributor to British fashion and up and coming designers, with accessible rates on cloth. If they are re-housed in the new scheme they won't be able to afford the rents and will have to charge more for their fabric. To demolish such an established reputation would be a disaster and a huge loss to this area. There is no way a new covered market will bring in many crowds considering that Westfield is always pretty empty and it's much closer to transport link than the Market.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4.</p>
<p>NO 83 Aniza Meghani,</p> <p>PETITION</p> <p>Loss of Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Would like Goldhawk Rd to be preserved and the shops in this terrace to be retained. Don't want these businesses or the Market Traders to leave.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52</p>

<p>Incorrect Figures</p> <p>The Market Traders Will Not</p>		<p>In the Brief the Council claims that 69% of people support the proposals – perhaps you misled them and never gave a clear vision and are now trying to rapidly move plans forward. You have all lost the plot.</p> <p>We will not be moving into large enough space. What guarantee is</p>	<p>Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response – These figures come from a survey undertaken by M&N Communications. The survey was undertaken in December 09/ January 10 and focussed around the first draft of the planning and regeneration brief</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response - We recognise</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>Have Sufficient Space to Move Into</p>		<p>there that this development will be successful and that we will be offered Market space in the new development?</p>	<p>the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4 Regarding market traders the brief has been revised under the first objective to state "while seeking to maintain as a minimum an equivalent trading area attributed to the current operational market stalls and units".</p>
<p>Rents</p>		<p>What guarantee is there that we will not be charged over the top rates, rent and service fees?</p>	<p>Response – Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure.</p>

<p>Impact on Market During Construction</p>		<p>What will happen to the market during the years it will take to construct this development?</p>	<p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response – One of the Brief objectives is for the development will be phased so that the Market can operate throughout the construction period.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>Bankrupt Developer</p>		<p>What will be the impact on the Market if the developers go bankrupt halfway through construction?</p>	<p>Response – These considerations are outside the scope of a planning brief.</p> <p>Action – No action</p>
<p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>This historical terrace should be retained; it does not have a poor appearance.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which</p>

<p>Loss of Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Community Consultation</p>		<p>This is the only pie and mash shop in central London and is over 100 years old, this piece of British history should not be lost.</p> <p>Inadequate community consultation has taken place.</p>	<p>once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p> <p>Response - We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p> <p>Response – Last December 2009/January 2010 extensive consultation took place regarding the draft planning and regeneration brief. Drop in sessions were held at the former Shepherds Bush Library throughout December and January, M&N Communications undertook a survey, there were meetings with residents groups and the market</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>Car Park, Youth Centre, Culture Centre</p>		<p>If the Market is to be developed why not make it into a youth centre, a culture centre or a car park?</p>	<p>traders. All responses and comments on the draft brief were recorded and considered. During September/October 2010 another similar round of consultation has taken place. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – The library will be retained and maintain its cultural role in the community. The Councils preferred option for the Shepherd’s Bush Market that it has consulted on under the LDF Core Strategy Options 2009 is “to regenerate and provide an enhanced focus and destination in the western part of the town centre by refurbishing the market and other land as a vibrant mixed use town centre development of small shops, market stalls, leisure uses, residential and offices”. Action - No action</p>
---	--	--	--

Car Parking		After Westfield was opened last year the Council reduced the parking area time limit. This was done to reduce passing trade to the businesses around Shepherds Bush.	<p>Response –The parking controls in the surrounding streets are outside the scope of the area covered by the planning and regeneration brief.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 84 Louisa Young,</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	Very concerned to hear that part of the renovation of the Market may involve the demolishing of the terrace. These buildings have lovely Victorian character, and should be retained and refurbished. Their removal will have a negative impact on the character of the neighbourhood. The area does not need more modern buildings.	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p>

<p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Height</p>		<p>This shop has been a London tradition for over 100 years and should be retained.</p> <p>The existing 2 storey buildings at 30-52 Goldhawk Rd have a height that reflects the character of the area.</p>	<p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p> <p>Response – It is stressed in 4.17 that the “scale and height of the new development would need to respond to the context” and it is felt that buildings of 4/5 storeys are appropriate in this location and possibly higher with exceptional design. Pennard Mansions is 5 storeys therefore 4/5 storeys is felt to be appropriate in this location.</p> <p>Action – No action</p>
<p>NO 85 Jane Makower</p>	<p>Object</p>		

<p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>These businesses will be destroyed to make an indoor market – how will this help these shops? Classic Textiles is our customer, only a few years ago the owner of this business invested considerable sums in refurbishing his shop, now the owner is really worried.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 86 W. Searle, Loss of Textile</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Concerned about the demolition of these shops. I shop at these</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion</p>

Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd		stores whenever I'm in London and it would be disappointing if they were lost.	of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4
Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd		The terrace should be retained and restored. Their demolition and replacement with modern buildings would change the character of this area and would be disappointing and could change this from a busy textile quarter to something else.	Response – While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action

			on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4
NO 88 Carl Dixon Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	Object	Concern that this historic parade, which gives London its character is being jeopardised by developers. It would be better if the Council gave the owners a grant to refurbish and retain these wonderful buildings.	Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action
NO 87 Nicholas Immaculate	Object		

<p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>Shocked to hear about the proposals to destroy a major part of Goldhawk Rd.</p> <p>Shocked to hear about the loss of several fabric shops which have been in the area many years. I visit these shops weekly and they are a big draw for my industry. When we come we also spend our money at other local shops, restaurants and within the Market. A small amount of money could restore these buildings without destroying these long standing businesses and business they bring to the area.</p>	<p>Response – Noted Action - No action</p> <p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 88 Susan Joahill,</p> <p>Loss of Housing</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>We've been living in this terrace for 7 years with 2 children, we</p>	<p>Response - ?</p>

<p>in Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>are very worried about what will happen to us and the shops along the road if the proposal to demolish goes ahead. I'm concerned that we will be made homeless, if the development was cancelled we could live here for many years to come. What will happen to us?</p>	<p>Action - ?</p>
<p>NO 89 Bernard Lambert</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Understand the need for progress and the modernisation of the Market area, but the demolition of these Victorian buildings seems such a shame. This would remove local history and heritage – surely there must be an alternative.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 90</p>	<p>Object</p>		

<p>Claire Summers,</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>The loss of these shops would be a great shame to the small time workers such as myself and others across London who travel here. This is a great place for quality fabrics within a reasonable budget.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 91 Katherine Chiswell Jones</p> <p>Demolition of Market</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The Market is the only charming element of Shepherds Bush, instead it should be retained and refurbished.</p>	<p>Response – The aim of the brief is that the railway arches are retained and refurbished. The redevelopment of the wider market provides an opportunity to vastly improve</p>

<p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>Retaining the history of buildings and regenerating and refurbishing the existing building fabric will stop the soul and character of the area being demolished along with it.</p>	<p>the environment for traders, residents and visitors. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 92 Mrs R Brown and Mrs P Chield,</p>	<p>Object</p>		

			Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4
NO 93 Jasper Garvida, General	Object	Devastated with the current plans that would see people's livelihoods being demolished.	Response – We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4
NO 94 Mick Kavanagh General	Object	Please think about a unique chance to keep a piece of historic west London.	Response – Objection noted Action – No action
NO 95 Oliver Tuck Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	Object	Agree that the Market is badly in need of improvement and regeneration, but see no reason whatsoever why any plans should impinge onto destroying the frontage of Goldhawk Rd.	Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the

			<p>comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p>
<p>NO 96 Graham Smith</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The terrace is an important part of history.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which</p>

			once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.
<p>NO 97 Peter Bready</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Loss of Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	<p>To replace this Victorian terrace with faceless characterless blocks of masonry in an effort to preserve the historical heritage of the area is plain daft.</p> <p>The shops contained within this parade are a part of Shepherds Bush folklore.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response – We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the</p>

			<p>local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 98 Gary Pickett</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	<p>Can see no advantage to the local community of this area to redevelop a very colourful and authentic part of old Victorian London into another faceless, characterless block of concrete such as Westfield.</p>	<p>Response – Noted Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 99 Rob Laf</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	<p>Please do not demolish this shop.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p>

			<p>understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 101 Paul Kirby</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	Against the demolition.	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which</p>

			<p>once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 102 Bob Jelley</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	<p>These establishments are irreplaceable, they are part of old London, we are losing our heritage.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 103 Tom North</p>	Object	<p>A Market such as this depends on a certain amount of confusion and</p>	<p>Response – Noted</p>

			<p>are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 104 Rachel Crookes</p> <p>General</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Demolition of 30-</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Very excited about the plan to develop and improve the market.</p> <p>It is one of the last remaining shops of its kind; the shop front is quaint and adds so much character to the row of shops.</p> <p>Concerned about the demolition of this terrace, it has character and</p>	<p>Response – Support noted Action - No action</p> <p>Response – We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p> <p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the</p>

52 Goldhawk Rd		there are far worse buildings along the street.	demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action
Disruption During Development		There will be a huge amount of inevitable disruption when the Market is rebuilt.	Response – One of the Brief objectives is for the development to be phased so that the Market can operate throughout the construction period Action - No action
Library		It would be disappointing if the old library on Uxbridge Rd were to be demolished.	Response – The brief specifies that the former Shepherds Bush Library should be retained and

			<p>maintain its cultural role in the community. Action – No action</p>
<p>NO 105 William Rowe</p> <p>Broadway Centre and Lime Grove Hostel</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The updated Brief has made progress, but the issue of transferring the services from the Broadway Centre to the Lime Grove Hostel is very bad for both the clients of the Centre and Lime Grove residents.</p>	<p>Response – Following consultation with Lime Grove residents the brief was changed at 4.34 “all options for improved access, design and management of the hostel would need to be looked at to minimise the concerns of local residents. The Council would expect a developer to negotiate to provide more suitable access to the hostel that could replace the existing sole access from Lime Grove, including options for access via the railway viaduct taking place with Lime Grove residents.” In addition Supporting People will be working with St Christopher’s and local residents to ensure the hostel users do not disrupt the local community.</p>

			<p>architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 107 Laura McCullagh</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	<p>The shops attract a diverse customer base, add character to the area and are an important reminder of its heritage. The loss of these shops will have a negative impact on the community and the local economy.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
NO 108	Object		

<p>Tiia Ylosmaki</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>These shops are an extremely valuable resource for all students and professionals who work in the creative field.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 109 Sara Hall</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Please don't demolish these shops, there is no other place in London which can provide the goods they do.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the</p>

			<p>local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 110 Rachel Robertson</p> <p>General</p>	Object	The proposals will damage the area.	<p>Response – Objection noted</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 111 Annabel Luton</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	<p>Fashion students need the cheap shops in the terrace to remain. Please do not remove the character of this charming and useful part of London and turn it into something modernised expensive and useless to students.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development</p>

			on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4
<p>NO 112 Amy North and Hugo Sintes Pons</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Loss of Shops</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>It is essential that the Market is nurtured and protected. While the Brief states that the unique character and diversity of the existing Market should be at the core of regeneration, the proposed changes set out in the Brief do not suggest that this will be the case. The suggestion that the terrace should be replaced is extremely worrying, these Victorian properties are some of the earliest in Shepherds Bush and have historical significance for the area. The terrace should be retained and restored.</p> <p>The terrace houses independent family businesses, many of which</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – We recognise</p>

<p>Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>have been operating in the same location for decades. Moving these businesses would not be acceptable and they would probably not survive the relocation process.</p>	<p>the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>Promotion of Standardised Shop fronts in the Brief</p>		<p>Concern with the promotion in the Brief of standardised shop fronts that promote uniformity. Much of the charm and character of the current Market is precisely this lack of uniformity and the individuality of the different shops and stalls, reflecting their unique histories and heritages.</p>	<p>Response – The shops within the railway viaduct are where it is intended to see new standardised shop fronts of an attractive fully glazed uncluttered design to greatly improve on the current poor quality façade. The detail of the remainder of the scheme will be further developed when a developer is on board. Action – No action</p>
<p>Rents</p>		<p>The result of similar regeneration efforts tend to be a loss of existing stall holders, as they can not afford rises in rents or find that their businesses can not survive the adverse effects of long periods of building work</p>	<p>Response – Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of</p>

			<p>a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure.</p> <p>At 4.4 in the brief there is an emphasis on phasing of the development to minimise disruption to the operation of the market.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 113 Lee Eldred</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>It seems crazy to remove something that could quite easily be renovated.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>

			on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4
NO 115 Julie Taylor Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	Object	Historic buildings in the area are rare.	Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action
NO 116 April Carter, Demolition of 30-	Object	Love the character and history of the old shop fronts.	Response – The inclusion

52 Goldhawk Rd			<p>of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 117 Mark Delvin</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	<p>Agree that the Market could do with a facelift, but this part of London is full of history that we should all be proud of - the terrace should be retained and refurbished.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor</p>

			<p>appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 118 Hannah Cooper,</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>These buildings are part of the unique character of Shepherds Bush and provide much needed balance to the modern Westfield development. The replacement of the historic terrace with modern buildings would be a travesty.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of</p>

			disrepair. Action - No action
NO 119 Mike Wendling Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	Object	Generally in favour of a sympathetic revamp to the Market, however object to the fact that the Council plans to demolish the terrace. The terrace contains characterful and distinctive buildings which should be retained and not replaced with modern buildings.	Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action
NO 120 Pat Harman Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	Object	Sad to see wonderful old buildings oozing with character and history, replaced with featureless box like structures, which lack any craftsmanship and constructed by people who have little or no pride in their work.	Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential

			<p>to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 121 Liz Donker Curtius</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Don't knock the terrace down</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate</p>

<p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>The textile shops are the main source of material for most consumers and fashion students in London.</p>	<p>alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 122 Helena Brown,</p>	<p>Object</p>		

<p>Demolition of the Pie and Mash Shop front</p>		<p>Please don't destroy this shop front.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 123 Donna Salter Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>There is no place like this in London, these shops wouldn't be the same experience if they were moved into the Market</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops</p>

			<p>on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 124 Vicki Morley</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Opposed to the redevelopment of the Market, specifically the loss of the pie and mash shop.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 125</p>	<p>Object</p>		

			<p>within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 126 Christopher McCoy</p> <p>Loss of Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Please consider refurbishing these shops instead of relocating them. We should be celebrating this part of the area's history. My family have been using the pie and mash shop for generations and I would like to continue this tradition.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 127 Alison Simmons</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Please do not demolish this terrace.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion</p>

<p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>			<p>of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. Action - No action</p>
<p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>These shops are a magnet for anyone seeking fabrics and haberdashery.</p>	<p>Response – We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>Rents</p>		<p>Many of the shops at 30-52 Goldhawk Rd would not be able to afford the rents in the new development.</p>	<p>Response – Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure.</p>

			Action - No action
NO 128 Transport for London (comments from Corporate Finance Property Development, as landowner).	Support with suggestions		
General		Supportive overall of the ambitions to redevelop the Market.	Response - Support noted Action - No action
General		Provided that the commercial viability of the market to TfL is not diminished in any way.	Response - This will be the subject of negotiations with TfL and the developer. Action - No action
Section 3 – Site Constraints and Opportunities, 3.3		The operational safety, security and integrity of the railway must not be compromised.	Response – Access for maintenance is mentioned at 3.3. Action – No action
General		The brief lacks any reference to how the project will be delivered which is especially important as it is in mixed ownership.	Response – Section 2 Sites and Surroundings refers to the different sites and their ownership, however land assembly is ongoing hence it

			has not been possible to be prescriptive regarding delivery. Action – No Action
<p>NO 129 Kelly Kemp</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	The shop has been frequented by 6 generations of my family and should not be removed.	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 130 Rhiana Nelson</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-</p>	Object	Please do not force these stores to close, they are too valuable and a part of London's history.	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52</p>

52 Goldhawk Rd			<p>Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 131 Tracey Scoffield</p> <p>General</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The Market deserves a facelift, but not at the expense of the surrounding area.</p> <p>This area is primarily residential and this row of Victorian shops really adds to the character and domestic scale of the area. This part of the road with the railway bridge going over the top, has incredible charm and should be sensitively restored rather than allowed to decay and be replaced with a modern building.</p>	<p>Response – Noted</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have</p>

			<p>suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. It is stressed in 4.17 that the “scale and height of the new development would need to respond to the context” and it is felt that buildings of 4/5 storeys are appropriate in this location and possibly higher with exceptional design. Pennard Mansions are 5 storeys therefore 4/5 storeys is felt to be appropriate in this location. Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 132 Mr Allbuit</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>This historic terrace should be retained and refurbished not demolished.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration</p>

			<p>of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance , they are also in a state of disrepair Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 133 Lynette Southall</p> <p>General</p>	<p>Suggestions</p>	<p>The regeneration of the Market should focus on less of what exists and move more towards upgrading the area towards a rich, cultural bohemian mix. Think of future retail environments and the needs of a changing society.</p>	<p>Response – The vision already expresses this aim “The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration, but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, where independent and specialist small businesses and the</p>

Private Enterprise		Private enterprise should be encouraged, there are no such facilities currently in the area.	creative arts can thrive. Action - No action Response - Comments noted Action - No action
Leisure Facilities		A health and fitness club, alternative health centre, dance studio and a creative arts centre should be provided.	Response - Comments noted, the old Shepherds Bush Library will be maintained as a cultural resource Action - No action
New Market		There should be a plant or garden centre, farmers market provided, and shops that sell innovative products. There should be a section of the market that changes frequently e.g. market stalls whose use varies twice a week.	Response – The details regarding the market redevelopment will be further developed at planning application stage. Action - No action
Resident Concerns		Privacy to the rear of the houses in Pennard Rd.	Response – Objective 4 in the brief refers to development respecting the local context, in particular the environmental amenity of adjacent residential properties on Pennard Road, Pennard Mansions and Lime Grove.

<p>Security</p> <p>Noise</p> <p>Housing</p>		<p>The Market should have gated access with CCTV and security.</p> <p>Noise should not prove to be an issue.</p> <p>New residential accommodation should be kept to a minimum and should only be available to key workers. The area is already densely populated.</p>	<p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response – Point 4.24 in the brief refers to CCTV</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response - Comments noted</p> <p>Action - No action</p> <p>Response - Comments noted</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 134 Peter May</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>It would be devastating to lose these shops as they provide my business with all its fabrics.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops</p>

			<p>within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 135 Peter Dooley</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>This is unnecessary, the buildings are good examples of their type and add to the unique character and diversity of the area. Restoration not demolition is preferable.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action - No action</p>

Height		A 5 storey building is too tall.	<p>Response – It is stressed in 4.17 that the “scale and height of the new development would need to respond to the context” and it is felt that buildings of 4/5 storeys are appropriate in this location and possibly higher with exceptional design. Pennard Mansions is 5 storeys therefore 4/5 storeys is felt to be appropriate in this location.</p> <p>Action – No action</p>
<p>NO 136 Oliver Hinton,</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	Object	Sorry to see these terrace buildings go, they may be down at heel, but they have character and suitable scale and house individual businesses rather than chains. The terrace should be preserved.	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops</p>

			<p>within the main development on suitable terms. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 137 Mr and Mrs Coningsby</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Please save these shops, which are a breath of fresh air in the area.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the</p>

			<p>local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action – Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>NO 138 Beryl Clark</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The money would be better spent on refurbishing the existing premises.</p>	<p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the</p>

			<p>architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>No 139 Sunil Kapoor New Shepherds Bush Market Traders Association</p> <p>General</p> <p>New Market</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The markets do indeed need a new lease of life.</p> <p>Concern that the Traders will not benefit and that new Traders will come to the Market to replace many of the current Traders.</p>	<p>Response – Noted Action – No action</p> <p>Response – The vision already expresses this aim “The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration, but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, where independent and specialist small businesses and the creative arts can thrive.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>

Car Parking		<p>The recent parking restrictions have added to the grief of Traders. Want a more relaxed parking regulation for potential customers.</p>	<p>Response – As stated in the revised brief at 4.28 “Regeneration of the market should provide the opportunity for off street parking at an appropriate level that balances the needs of the retail land uses while not compromising the performance and efficiency of the local and strategic road network. Maximum parking standards exist under current local, regional and national planning guidance which will influence the final quantum of off street parking, including the white city opportunity area planning framework”.</p> <p>Action – Changes have been made to the brief to emphasise maximum parking standards under current local, regional and national planning that a developer will need to comply with.</p>
Construction		<p>Many Traders will not be able to survive the construction period.</p>	<p>Response – At objective 7</p>

<p>Meeting</p>		<p>More open consultations carried out with the tenants and their representatives at the planning level as well as in the future. Request that all Tenants be invited to a meeting to discuss the Brief</p>	<p>Action – No action</p> <p>Response – The market traders have been consulted regarding the future of the market at a meeting held in June 2009 as part of the LDF consultation and during the consultation of this draft SPD in December 2009/January 2010 and September 2010/October 2010. It is considered that a full and adequate consultation has taken place in line with the regulations.</p> <p>Action - No action</p>
<p>No 140 The Hammersmith Society</p> <p>General</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Welcome the Brief's references to the Market's historic identity and the planned use of the old Shepherds Bush Library as a public arts facility and theatre.</p> <p>Brief contains the subjective claim that these properties are of poor visual quality and of a scale no longer appropriate for this part of Goldhawk Road. Terrace has intrinsic value to the local townscape</p>	<p>Response – Support Noted</p> <p>Action – No action</p> <p>Response – While we understand the historic importance of this row of</p>

<p>Loss of Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>and any development should retain the terrace's façade.</p> <p>Alternative premises would be more expensive and not benefit from the Goldhawk Road exposure which the current premises have.</p>	<p>shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>It is stressed in 4.17 that the "scale and height of the new development would need to respond to the context" and it is felt that buildings of 4/5 storeys are appropriate in this location and possibly higher with exceptional design. Pennard Mansions are 5 storeys therefore 4/5 storeys is felt to be appropriate in this location.</p> <p>Action – No action</p> <p>Response - Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation.</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>Paragraph 4.17 of the Brief</p> <p>Hostel Accommodation</p>		<p>The reference that exceptional design may enable greater height in part is an invitation to a developer to increase the height here to an unacceptable and inappropriate degree and we object very strongly to this reference.</p> <p>The proposal simply shifts the problems associated with the hostel in the Market to Lime Grove, freeing the developer of the east side of the Market from the difficulties associated with the hostel. The present site within the Market is the best solution to this difficult problem.</p>	<p>When the developer is on board he will further develop the options regarding the future layout of the scheme. Action – No action</p> <p>Response - Noted see response above regarding height. Action – No action</p> <p>Response - The land east of the railway viaduct including the Broadway/Peabody sites are important to the redevelopment of the market. The existing hostel at Lime Grove has been recently decommissioned hence the decision to move the existing Broadway clients into Lime Grove. Supporting People will be working with St Christopher's and local residents to ensure the hostel users do not disrupt the local community. Action – No action</p>
--	--	--	--

Market Traders Accommodation		Will they be guaranteed their place in the Market after the redevelopment works?	<p>Response – In response to traders comments a new commitment has been inserted under objective 1 “while seeking to maintain as a minimum an equivalent trading area attributed to the current operational market stalls and units to sustain the traditional role of the market in the community, its long term viability and its vibrant diversity”. Further details regarding the proposed layout of the new market will be further developed when the developer is on board.</p> <p>Action – Objective 1 revised as detailed above.</p>
Construction Period		Where will the Traders go during the construction period?	<p>Response – The brief includes plans for the phasing of the redevelopment to ensure for minimum disruption to stallholders under Objective 7.</p> <p>Action – No action</p> <p>Response - Rent levels and</p>

Rents		What will the future rents be? A gentrified Market would not be likely to include the present stall holders could afford.	service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure. Action – No action
<p>NO 141 Hammersmith and Fulham Historic Buildings Group</p> <p>Character of Market</p> <p>Paragraph 1.2 of</p>	Object	<p>Welcome the reference to the market’s history and character, but do not think its particular quality has been captured. We support a degree of upgrading but continue to be concerned that improvement will overwhelm the spirit of the market and destroy its character and undermine its role as a low cost feeder for incoming traders.</p> <p>Para 1.2 should include the sentence from the UDP Policy: ‘The</p>	<p>Response – The vision has already been amended to “The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration”. which is felt to adequately emphasise this issue? Action – No action</p> <p>Response – This issue is already adequately covered</p>

the Brief		continuation of the market as a vibrant facility is very important to the sustainability of the town centre.'	in the vision. Action – No action
Construction Period		We understand that traders are concerned that the proposed development may damage their businesses and possibly put some of them out of business. If necessary acceptable alternative sites should be made available for them during the work to enable continuity of trading.	Response – The brief includes plans for the phasing of the redevelopment to ensure for minimum disruption to stallholders under Objective 7. Action – No action
Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd		Opportunity should be taken to restore the façade of this terrace which would be a link with the past and retain the character and sense of place of this part of Goldhawk Rd. A set-back additional floor might be an acceptable possibility.	Response – While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action – No action
Loss of Shops		These historic uses, which add to the vibrancy of the market area,	Response - The inclusion of the land vacated by the

<p>Overloading of Existing Water and Sewerage Networks</p>		<p>be stated within the document that developers will need to demonstrate that adequate capacity exists within the water and wastewater networks, both on and off site, to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users.</p> <p>In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed developments will lead to overloading of the existing water and sewerage networks. Where a capacity problem is identified and no improvements are programmed by the water company, the developer needs to contact the water authority to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.</p>	<p>dealt with at planning application stage. Action – No action</p> <p>Response – Compliance with policy in this area will be dealt with at planning application stage. Action – No action</p>
<p>No 143 Tamara Kovnay,</p> <p>Design of Development</p> <p>Market Diversity</p>	<p>Suggestions</p>	<p>The Market should mix the old and new, so it enhances its historical heritage, rather than a modern development similar to Westfield.</p> <p>The new Market needs to maintain its diversity of shops, cafes and restaurants that reflect the multicultural diversity of the area. It should have a unified appearance similar to French markets. It should have a diversity of shops similar to Portobello Market.</p>	<p>Response – The detail regarding the design will be further developed when a developer is on board. The developer will undertake consultation with the local community. Action – No action</p> <p>Response – the vision already stresses the qualities to retain and enhance regarding the future</p>

<p>Loss of Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>These shops attract a lot of customers from the fashion industry and should be retained.</p>	<p>market. Action – No action</p> <p>Response - The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action – Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>Office Accommodation</p>		<p>Office accommodation should be provided in a similar vein to that available at Westbourne Studios or Worlds End Studios in Chelsea, which are great examples of a funky and vibrant office environment.</p>	<p>Response – Office accommodation is mentioned in the brief but the location of the space and design will be further developed when a developer is on board. Action – No action</p>

Market Promotion		Promotion is very important; there should be a dedicated website that features the shops available.	Response – Noted Action – no action
No 144 Helen Matthes	Support and Suggestions		
General		The Market desperately needs investment and redevelopment. Many of the facilities are outdated, but this and the culture of the area could be usefully reviewed.	Response – Noted Action – no action
Camden Market		A public/private partnership aiming to create an artisan market similar to Camden Market would be preferable.	Response – Noted Action – no action
Current Marke		The current Market is tatty, tacky, outdated and probably in contravention of H&S and Trading Standard legislation. The basic structure of the railway arches would be ideal as workshop or retail space - a new market could act as an effective hub for economic growth both for the area and individuals.	Response – noted Action – no action
No 145 Rhys Jones	Object		
General		Happy for the market to be redeveloped, but strongly oppose the demolition of the terrace at 30-52 Goldhawk Rd. The terrace should be retained and restored. The Council contributed to the appearance of these shops by removing the cornicing	Response – While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years and have lost most of the

<p>Height</p>		<p>The prevailing height of the adjoining buildings is 2 storeys, don't want buildings any taller.</p>	<p>architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair. Action – No action</p> <p>Response - It is stressed in 4.17 that the “scale and height of the new development would need to respond to the context” and it is felt that buildings of 4/5 storeys are appropriate in this location and possibly higher with exceptional design. Pennard Mansions are 5 storeys therefore 4/5 storeys is felt to be appropriate in this location. Action – No action</p>
<p>Loss of Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>		<p>The proposal will destroy these businesses, some of which have are very popular.</p>	<p>Response - The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops</p>

			<p>on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action – Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>
<p>No 146 Delyth Smith</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Without these facilities I would be travelling great distances to purchase textiles.</p>	<p>Response - The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms.</p> <p>Action – Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p>

<p>NO 147 Colin Vine</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I would like to register my objection to the demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Road.</p> <p>The buildings concerned should not be demolished as they are the base of many businesses that that are now part of the local culture. One business in particular Cooke's Pie and Mash shop is a part of the history of the area and attracts many people such as myself to return to our roots.</p> <p>Shepherds Bush had changed dramatically from my childhood days but this is a change that must not happen. There are many examples of Victorian buildings that have been incorporated into modern developments and there is no reason why this should not happen in this case.</p>	<p>Response – Noted Action – No action</p> <p>Response - The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action – Emphasised shop relocation at 2.4 and 4.4</p> <p>Response – While we understand the historic importance of this row of shops, they are now of poor appearance. They have suffered from inappropriate alterations over many years</p>
--	----------------------	--	---

			<p>and have lost most of the architectural detailing which once contributed to their character and appearance; they are also in a state of disrepair.</p> <p>Action – No action</p>
<p>No 148 Mercy Umeh</p>	<p>Suggestion</p>	<p>It is vital that the Shepherds Bush Market retains its authenticity and characteristic.</p>	<p>Response – The Vision states that “The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration”</p> <p>Action – No action</p>
<p>NO 149 Environment Agency</p>	<p>Suggestions</p>	<p>Flood Risk Issues – take into account surface water flooding.</p>	<p>Response – 4.38 in the brief refers to flood risk. Detailed assessments regarding flood risk will take place at the time of the planning application.</p> <p>Action – No action</p>

		<p>Green Roofs - should be encouraged</p> <p>Water efficiency</p> <p>Groundwater and Contaminated Land</p>	<p>Response – to be dealt with at planning application stage Action – No action</p> <p>Response – to be dealt with at planning application stage Action – No action</p> <p>Response – to be dealt with at planning application stage Action – No action</p>
<p>No 150 Pennard Road Residents Meeting – 28 Sep '10</p>		<p>Desire to see the access into the former laundry site from Pennard Road blocked off.</p> <p>Concerned about the potential scale of residential development on the former laundry site and overlooking/privacy</p>	<p>Response – 4.30 already states that consideration should be given to either closing this entrance completely or maintaining it as a limited pedestrian and cyclist entrance only Action - No action</p> <p>Response - It is stressed in 4.17 that the “scale and height of the new development would need to respond to the context” and “the bulk of the new buildings must be set back from the rear gardens of the houses in Pennard Road, to</p>

		<p>The market offer is not diverse enough and needs to be better reflective of the locality</p> <p>Concerned about drug dealing and ASB in the market area. Also worried about noise from the Walkabout bar.</p> <p>Concerned about the construction work and potential noise/disturbance from future development.</p>	<p>address issues of privacy, overlooking and daylight/sunlight”. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – The intention of the brief is to ensure “The unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at the core of regeneration, but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, where independent and specialist small businesses and the creative arts can thrive”. Action – No action</p> <p>Response – This would need to be considered in the future by the developer who comes forward to develop the site. Action - No action</p>
<p>NO 151 Lime Grove Residents Meeting – 22 Sep ‘10</p>		<p>Concerns about the current management of the flats at 47 Lime Grove and temporary use of the Hostel</p>	<p>Supporting People will be working with Broadway to address the immediate issues Action - No action</p>

		<p>Questioned the rationale for proposing to regenerate the market at all. Some residents prefer to keep it as is.</p>	<p>June 2009 as part of the LDF consultation and during the consultation of this draft SPD in December 2009/January 2010 and September 2010/October 2010. In order to provide an opportunity for market traders/residents to find out more regarding the brief drop in sessions have been arranged for 15th and 16th October in the former Shepherd's Bush Library.</p> <p>Action – Two drop in sessions arranged for 15th and 16th October in the former Shepherd's Bush Library.</p> <p>Response - The brief's key aim is to deliver the regeneration of the market but be enhanced and complemented by new shops, residential, leisure and cultural activities, on a very restricted site. In 1.4 further emphases has been added "the unique character and diversity of the famous existing market should be at</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Some comments suggested that regeneration will push out existing traders and there will be rent increases.</p>	<p>the core of regeneration”. Action - No action Response - Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure. Action - No action</p>
<p>No 152 Traders Association Meeting on 6 October 2010</p>		<p>Want greater assurances about the future of the market and protection of the existing market footprint</p> <p>Concerned over the potential scale of the regeneration proposed. Claimed that previous consultation suggested refurbishment rather than redevelopment</p>	<p>Response – The Vision for the market expresses the aspiration of “retaining the unique essence of the market”. In response to traders comments a new commitment has been inserted under objective 1 “while seeking to maintain as a minimum an equivalent trading area attributed to the current operational market stalls and units to sustain the traditional role of the market in the community, its long</p>

		<p>Requested that the controlled parking arrangements be reconsidered</p> <p>Request to extend the consultation period and asked for a public meeting</p>	<p>term viability and its vibrant diversity”.. Action – Objective 1 revised as detailed above.</p> <p>Response – Controlled parking arrangements outside the area of the brief would need to be considered separately. Action – No action</p> <p>Response – There have been numerous meetings and drop in sessions with the market traders, businesses and residents. The market traders have been consulted regarding the future of the market at a meeting held in June 2009 as part of the LDF consultation and during the consultation of this draft SPD in December 2009/January 2010 and September 2010/October 2010. In order to provide an opportunity for market traders, businesses, residents to find out more</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Owners of the Goldhawk Road Shops questioned the consultation process with them and objected to the demolition of shops and the proposed relocation within the market area</p> <p>The process of selecting Orion as the preferred developer was questioned</p>	<p>regarding the brief drop in sessions have been arranged for 15th and 16th October in the former Shepherd's Bush Library. Action – Two drop in sessions arranged for 15th and 16th October in the former Shepherd's Bush Library.</p> <p>Response – The inclusion of the land vacated by the demolition of 30 – 52 Goldhawk Road is essential to achieve the comprehensive regeneration of the market. We recognise the importance of the shops on Goldhawk Road and the service they provide to the local community. As mentioned in 2.4 and 4.4 the aim is to relocate the shops within the main development on suitable terms. Action - Emphasised shop relocation at 1.4, 2.4 and 4.4</p> <p>Response - The brief has been promoted on a wider basis as well as the</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Concerns about future rent/rates and protection of existing traders</p> <p>Lime Grove residents did not support the proposal to knock down the Market Lane hostel and relocating some services to Lime Grove hostel</p>	<p>Council's aspirations for regeneration but Orion is currently the only interested developer. The site is complex to develop with significant land assembly required with risks associated with this which may explain the lack of interest.</p> <p>Action – No action</p> <p>Response - Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure.</p> <p>Response – Additional guidance added in 4.34 in connection with the proposed relocation of some of the existing services from Broadway Centre into the Lime Grove hostel “all</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>options for improved access, design and management of the hostel would need to be looked at to minimise the concerns of local residents. The Council would expect a developer to negotiate to provide more suitable access to the hostel that could replace the existing sole access from Lime Grove, including options for access via the railway viaduct”.</p>
<p>NO 153 Meeting with NSBMTA and SBMTA to 13th September 2010</p>		<p>A query was raised regarding the inclusion of the private market in the draft brief,</p>	<p>Response – The desire for the private market to be regenerated is already included in the brief. Objective 8 in the brief states that the private market will be encouraged to join the overall market regeneration process. Action – No Action</p>

		<p>Queried Orion's interest in the site and how they identified the opportunity.</p> <p>The traders confirmed they have strong views only some of which have been changed in the brief. They are very concerned regarding the future management of the market and guarantees regarding rent and service charge levels. They want to see guarantees to the traders strengthened.</p> <p>Concern that businesses were suffering and trade diminished substantially since parking controls in the surrounding streets had</p>	<p>Response - The brief has been promoted on a wider basis as well as the Council's aspirations for regeneration but Orion is currently the only interested developer. The site is complex to develop with significant land assembly required with risks associated with this. Action – No action</p> <p>Response - Rent levels and service charges are not matters for a planning guidance document to advise on, such matters are outside the remit of planning legislation. We have identified our expectations of a developer at Point I where we refer to an appropriate management structure. Action - No action</p> <p>Response – Controlled parking arrangements outside the area of the brief</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>been changed from 8 hours to 1 hour. Traders are concerned that businesses will not survive long enough to see the regeneration.</p> <p>Requests for an extension to the deadline for comments on the brief.</p>	<p>would need to be considered separately. Action – No action</p> <p>Response - There have been numerous meetings and drop in sessions with the market traders, businesses and residents. The market traders have been consulted regarding the future of the market at a meeting held in June 2009 as part of the LDF consultation and during the consultation of this draft SPD in December 2009/January 2010 and September 2010/October 2010. Action – No action</p>
--	--	---	---