

Representations received by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
 Norland Article 4 Directions

Name	Comments
<p>Christiaan and Romola Zwart</p>	<p>Please find attached our representations in relation to the 1st Draft Norland Neighbourhood Plan. [Separate document attached] They are to be treated as an OBJECTION to the terms as currently formulated.</p> <p>We consider that there is no need for the proposed Article 4 directions in relation to the upper part of Portland Road. Please treat this representation as a representation to the Directions made recently and in relation to which consultation concludes tomorrow, 1st August 2012.</p> <p>Our representations have been circulated locally and drawn support from properties also in the upper part of Portland Road. We understand these may email you separately. To the extent that they are unable (for whatever reason) to do so in the (holiday) time available, please treat our representations as also made by them. In particular, Numbers 120 (Chen), 155 (Hicks), and 167 (Kalisperas).</p> <p>----- Reference: Council's Report dated 6th July 2012 Delegated Decision Report Making non-immediate Article 4 Direction; and proposed Article 4 Directions terms.</p> <p>We live at 165 Portland Road and OBJECT to Report paragraph 7.1 recommendation. We SUPPORT Option 3 at paragraph 5.3 so far as it relates to Portland Road and in particular those properties north of Julies' Bar. This is because it is currently premature for such a direction essentially requiring applications for planning permission for a wide range of matters in a part of the Conservation Area adjacent to the regeneration area and where no harm is identified to existing controls being less than satisfactory.</p> <p>Our reasons include that:</p> <p>a) Paragraph 2.4 expressly requires identification of "potential harm" whilst the Report proceeds on the basis of a draft Neighbourhood Plan whose own terms remains as yet unfixed and to be tested through examination for soundness and also voted upon in referendum. We and others have made representations to the draft Neighbourhood Plan (see attached again) and are supported by other owners (see below). Importantly, the proposed Draft also included no available survey evidence to underpin or identify "potential harm" for Portland Road, and its northern end in particular. Therefore the proposed Article 4 direction is premature further consideration (and indeed a resolution adopting the Plan as relevant policy) and presently without objective basis for our particular part;</p> <p>b) For like reasons the approach in paragraph 4.2 is premature.</p> <p>c) By definition, a non-immediate Article Direction assumes no immediate harm. Therefore, there is currently no objective need for the removal of existing permitted development rights by its terms in Portland Road (and in particular its northern end).</p> <p>d) The NPPF also encourages growth including by housing provision. The Government has relaxed pd rights to enable this national agenda to be achieved during this most austere climate. The Local Plan is to be further considered to ensure consistency with this and the London Plan. Therefore, it is premature that process to make the current Article 4 direction. In particular, the imposition of development restraint across the whole CA freeze frames the current housing stock and its particular character in its state today (including as to colours) without objective evidential basis of planning harm (in particular to the northern end of Portland Road) or proposed "vision" for our own properties in lieu of their current state.</p> <p>The timing of the consultation during August is most unfortunate as obviously people are away. However, we are supported in our objection by residents in the northern end of Portland Road as follows: Portland Road Numbers: 157 (Hicks), 163 (Henderson), 167, (Kalisperas); and by families Chen (124?), Jones, and Chalfen, (copied in above for your information) and (I understand) by Julies Bar.</p> <p>Consequently, this OBJECTION should be considered as objections by those other residents and business.</p> <p>If you are to proceed with your proposal, then we recommend that a new Option 4 be introduced which subsets out/removes at least the parts of Portland Road north of Clarendon Cross from the current proposals.</p>
<p>Timothy and Penelope Hicks</p>	<p>We have read and very largely, strongly support the detailed arguments regarding the objections to this Plan sent to you by our neighbours, Christiaan and Romola Zwart (165 Portland Road).</p>

Celia Carlisle and James Henderson	<p>Please note we have OBJECTIONS to the plan as it currently stands. We have read the representations of Christiaan and Romola Zwart of 165 Portland Road and endorse the contents</p> <p>One of the charms of Portland road is the colour of the houses – again in a grand garden square like Norland it may be more appropriate to ask residents to keep their colours to a certain beige palette but for the modest terraces colour can only add to attractiveness and eccentricity of the street which has historically had gypsy and bohemian antecedents.</p>
Simon and Alessandra Chen	<p>Please find attached our representations [Separate document attached] They are to be treated as an OBJECTION to the terms as currently formulated.</p> <p>We consider that there is no need for the proposed Article 4 directions in relation to the upper part of Portland Road. Please treat this representation as a representation to the Directions made recently and in relation to which consultation concludes tomorrow, 1st August 2012.</p> <p>Our representations have been circulated locally and drawn support from properties also in the upper part of Portland Road. We fully endorse the views already submitted by the Zwaarts (165 Portland Road).</p>
Michael and Julia Chalfe	<p>We thoroughly endorse the views outlined in the counterproposal below [Representation from Christiaan and Romola Zwart].</p>
Luz Vargas Milroy	<p>My understanding on permitted development is that this is a right for which you have to get a lawfulness certificate to be able to build things that are not seen from the street, in other words you do not have to do a FULL PLANNING APPLICATION.</p> <p>I am very very worried about this because i do not wish the permitted development right to be taking away from this property. The reasons for this is we have a young baby and we need to modify the house to suit the new child requirements and also because we can not afford to move away since family houses in this area are very very expensive. We have applied and were giving permitted development certificates to implement a basement extension and to do some changes on the house back elevation and we are aiming to implement this within the next year.</p> <p>My understanding is that under permitted development there is not deadline on when the works can start on site except if there is a change of planning policy and i am wondering whether this is exactly what this street notification intends to do.</p> <p>Because of this I would like to make a representation on this matter.</p>
Dick Hills	<p>I am very pleased that you are doing this.</p> <p>We have had an agreement for at least 20 years that houses in this terrace are uniformly painted. Masonry and woodwork B.S Magnolia, front doors and railings black gloss. I would be very happy if you could include the details for this terrace.</p>
Simon and Siobhan Jones	<p>We would like to support the views outlined by Christiaan and Romola Zwart (165 Portland Road).</p>