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Appendix A: History - Development Of Norland

Cantwell designed an estate based on two principal roads, Addison Avenue running north-south and Queensdale Road running east-west across the estate. In the southwest angle of these he planned a crescent broken in the middle by St. Anne’s Villas to allow unobstructed passage of the Counters Creek sewer. In the south-east quarter he placed Norland Square. In 1839 building buildings leases were taken by Charles Stewart (who took a total of 150 building leases) and who with Richardson’s brother and partners in a law practice was a major speculator in the estate. Stewart had difficulty finding tenants willing to live so far from London, a problem which plagued the early establishment of the estate, and his houses in Holland Park Avenue were not fully occupied until 1845 and those on the east side of Royal Crescent, on which he took building leases in 1842, not until 1848. The western half of the crescent was not occupied until 1856. This restricted Richardson’s ability to raise loans on further building leases. To assist builders in further developing his estate Richardson tried all possible incentives to induce lettings on built properties, agreeing contracts for gas lighting in 1842, mains water in 1843 and promoting an act of Parliament vesting management responsibility for street cleaning, paving, lighting ‘and maintenance of Royal Crescent, Norland Square and St. James’ Square gardens in twelve resident commissioners levying a rate of three shillings in the pound on properties. In 1844 the greatest allurement, a church, was built on a site donated by Richardson and costing £4,941. It was consecrated in July 1845 after difficulties in raising the funds for its completion.

Despite all his efforts the progress of the estate continued to be erratic through lack of funds.

In 1840-43 the sites of twenty two-storey stucco fronted paired houses and a Public House were leased in the southern half of Addison Avenue. The houses were to the design of the tradesmen building them and sold well. In the northern half the ten pairs of houses were to one design tentatively attributed to F.W. Strent and which departed from the traditional two rooms per floor London town house style, having a wider frontage, fewer floors and well proportioned rooms. Considerable delay resulted from the lessee of the West side being unable to keep up his mortgage payments and the leases having to be resold to tradesmen. As a result it was not occupied until 1848, the leases for the east side not being sold until 1850.

Progress in Norland Square was, likewise, unstable: the leases of all 51 plots being granted by 1844 but 32 of these were to Richardson’s joint speculators on the estate who shared his own over-extended financial position. The only multiple lessee who was a tradesman was declared bankrupt in 1845 resulting in houses on the west side not being occupied until 1849 and those on the north side (let to Richardson’s brother) and east side were unoccupied until 1852-53. The houses are typical London terraces style with two rooms per floor on four floors over a basement.

Behind the houses on the north side of Norland Square two ranges of plain brick artisans cottages were leased in 1844-45. Now replaced, they had two storeys over basements and since they backed the Gardens of Norland Square and St. James’ Gardens, had no rear windows and were only 14 feet deep and 24 feet wide, set back on substantial gardens.

In 1843 Stewart had built two terraced ranges of five houses on four storeys in St. Anne’s Villas to continue Cantwell’s Royal Crescent style. As with the Crescent itself he found difficulty in finding tenants and they were not occupied until 1848. He therefore experimented with a new style of semi-detached Tudor Gothic style of houses in a layout design of 1841, for which building leases were granted in 1845-46. Of 24 proposed paired houses north of Queensdale Road only seven were built and six occupied by 1848 and Stewart assigned some of the leases to the other speculators. Building was resumed in 1850 but they were not fully occupied until 1859.
Daw’s map of 1846, a mixture of fact and fabrication.
Other buildings of similar style were the stone faced pair set at an angle on the west corner of Addison Avenue and St. James’ Gardens and the modest stucco-faced mews houses designed by William Carson, Richardson’s clerk of works, and built in 1844 in Queensdale Walk. In 1843 Richardson gained permission to lay sewers for a square to be formed around a church in St. James’ Square. Richardson’s mounting financial difficulties forced him to sell the freehold of a twelve acre brick field north of this planned square. William Morris paid £7,190 in 1844 for the site having previously leased a twenty-two acre area which had also included the site of St. James’ Square for £1000 per annum. In the same year St. James’ Church was built to designs by Lewis Vulliamy, and between 1847 and 1851 five ranges totalling 37 houses were built to designs by John Barnett in the square and financed by one of the five new building societies investing in the estate. These houses were in pairs linked by recessed bays of one or two storeys. The frontages were eight feet wider than Norland Square or Royal Crescent and allowed a more spacious and better proportioned interior with up to four rooms per floor.

By 1848 Richardson became unable to stand the pressure of his personal liability in the estate. He had built sewers on the estate at his own expense and advanced money to the principle builders and lessees to keep development moving. Despite his best efforts lettings of property were slow and he was unable to raise sufficient loans against the ground rents, being unsuccessful in attempting to borrow £120,000 in 1846. By 1849 he had sold at least 270 of the 500 freeholds on the estate and carried on selling piecemeal until 1852. This included all 37 houses and land of St. James’ Square as well as the vacant north side site, sold complete in 1852 and resold piecemeal mostly to shareholders of the original building society.

The building in St. James’ Square had stopped in 1851 with one of the projected terraces not started. The builder of the majority of the houses became bankrupt and the works in progress were completed by a different builder but development did not restart on the northern site until the mid 1860’s. Virtually the rest of the estate was sold to an auctioneer Frederick Chinnock to pay off Richardson’s debts in 1852.

Excluding the north side of St. James’ Gardens and Penzance Street and Place and that area sold to Morris as a brick field the estate was completed by early 1850s. In a dozen years over 500 houses had been built on a suburban estate but Richardson, the prime mover and financier was bankrupt by 1855.

When Morris developed his brick fields he abandoned the original plans to put three roads northward out of St. James’ Square and when building on the north side resumed in 1864 the site of the projected roads was built over leaving only Princedale and St. Anne’s Road as access to his area. The conditions left by his brick field exploits led him to build an estate of modest dwellings crammed with as many terraces as possible on long straight streets. The character of development changes therefore north of the St. James’ Gardens – Darnley Terrace ranges, the line of the present conservation area boundary.
In 1855, little further progress had been made – the major terraces were mostly complete and the gaps between them were being developed as minor streets. The final map shows the dates of the completion of the later terraces. Portland and Princedale Roads were built as part of the Ladbroke Estate, most of these terraces dating from the 1855-65 period.

THE POTTERIES AND NOTTING DALE

Clauses in the ground leases limited egress from the developments of the original Norland Estate northwards into an area known as the Potteries. From 1830 until 1920 this was one of the most depressed areas in London and must have been a thorn in the side of the developers of the Norland and Ladbroke Estates.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the area was pastureland until a chimney-sweep secured a lease of the area west of Pottery Lane and Walmer Road and invited practitioners of similar obnoxious trades to share the site. The colony of pig keepers, brick makers and poor tradesmen thrived, although the residents had a reputation for being violent and Pottery Lane was nicknamed Cut-throat Lane.

The area had at times nearly one thousand people crammed into four acres. Many households kept pigs to supplement the income from the short, five-month brick making season, and an 1860’s description by a Potteries’ wife told how carts from the potteries collected refuse from the houses of their wealthy neighbours. These were taken back and sorted for food for the families and their pigs and for re-useable items. With few sewers serving the area, the clay digs filled with sewage, offal and rubbish and the ditches surrounding the area stank. To add to the aroma, green bricks from the workings were stacked in long lines, covered in burnt bricks and fired with ashes and cinders which smouldered for three to six weeks, producing putrid fumes. The result was an area with a high mortality rate of 55.7 per thousand in 1897 against the parish average of 15.6 per thousand.

The diagrams show the progression of development of the estate. Terrace’s shaded green are those completed in the period leading up to the date of the map. In 1845 the Holland Park Avenue frontage was nearly complete, a start had been made on Royal Crescent and the line of Addison Avenue was already defined, leading up to the new church. By 1850, Royal Crescent was still incomplete, St. Ann’s Villas had just begun building, Queensdale Road and Norland Square were in evidence and St. James’s Gardens was taking shape.
NORLAND ESTATE
1879

Dew's map of 1879, the area between the Ladbroke and Norland estates now largely completed.
The Potteries improved as pig-keeping was given up during the 1870s and the brick field worked out during the 1860s. Poor housing remained, however, housing labourers, builders, shoemakers and street traders.

In 1902 Booth’s Survey ‘The Life and Labour of the London Poor’ was published, with information collected over the previous twenty years. This mapped classes 16 of people by area and showed the potteries as a very poor area and an area of five streets around William Street (now Kenley Street) was shown as the lowest class. It was described as the dregs of London, moved on by improvements in other areas and consisting of many temporary residents. He called them an “unexampled concourse of the disreputable classes and as populated with criminals or near criminals which form the most serious mass of the kind of which we have to deal, greater than any now remaining in one spot in Central London”.

The builders of the modest properties in the area found from their completion that they were impossible to sell to respectable families. They became largely boarding houses overcrowded with the large transient population entering London. Employment followed similar lines to the potteries although many women took in the laundry of the west London middle class and a number of men were employed in the stables of the London Omnibus Company in Goreham Place, on the Central London Electric Railway or in the yards of the Great Western Railway.

In 1892 Adams brick field, which separated the two areas and included a stagnant pool known as ‘The Ocean’ was bought by Kensington Vestry. After some costly landscape works this was opened as Avondale Park as an amenity in this predominantly poor area. The Council also purchased some, of the poor properties in Notting Dale in the late nineteenth century, including William Street (Kenley Street) in an attempt to discourage overcrowding. A photo shows the backs of the properties just prior to purchase. This obviously did not alleviate the problem since Booth’s study of 1902 still regarded this area as of the worst kind.

At the time that Richardson was developing the estate, the reputation of the potteries may have hindered the easy letting of completed properties. Early plans to extend the estate northwards from St. James’s Gardens might, therefore, have been doubtful even before Richardson sold the brickfield north of the area to Morris.
Appendix B: Portland Road

The Norland Conservation Area was originally designated (29th January 1969) to include the Norland Estate as built up to 1852, plus the north side of St James’s Gardens, completed later 1864 - 79. Thus the garden walls between Norland Square/Queensdale Road and Princedale Road defined the eastern boundary of the Norland Conservation Area. Map in Norland Conservation Area Policy Statement 1982. Portland Road was not included, as it did not constitute part of the original Norland Estate.

The Conservation Area eastern boundary was extended to include all of Portland Road (up to the garden walls adjoining Clarendon Road), and Clarendon Cross in June 1978. Today, the eastern boundary of our Neighbourhood area is demarcated by Portland Road and the properties abutting its eastern side. To the east lies Ladbroke Estate.

HISTORY

When originally laid out and developed, the eastern boundary of the Norland Estate was demarcated by the houses on the west side of Portland Road up to No 41, and the west side of Pottery Lane. Between this boundary and the Ladbroke Estate was a hinterland, undeveloped except for some stables on Pottery Lane. This hinterland was acquired in about the 1840-1850’s by the solicitor partner to the Ladbroke Estate developers, Mr Richard Roy. To the north west of that hinterland lay the “unmitigated squalor” of the Potteries, where, in the 1840’s, bricks and tiles were made for use in the erection of gentlemen’s residences being built eastwards further up the Hill. Mr Roy on his own account commenced speculative development of this hinterland in the 1850s.

By 1852, 85 Clarendon Road (a three-storey stucco-faced building standing at the junction of Clarendon Road with North Portland Road – currently an old peoples’ home) had been developed as the Clarendon Hotel (until it became a house from 1919) and built by William Reynolds under a lease of 1846 from Richard Roy.

Most of the streets in this locality were named on a whim of the developer or builder concerned. For example, in 1937, Lansdowne Rise was known as Montpellier Road (Montpellier was a popular post-Napoleonic Wars street name). Within Mr Roy’s land, the part of Portland Road between 102-134 (east) and 141 - 179 (west) appears originally named “Montpellier Terrace” but, from about 1865, became known as “Portland Road” (together with the road to its south).

But, in about 1853, the wider area suffered a severe building recession, leaving many buildings as naked carcasses. These included then incomplete buildings on Mr Roy’s land.

From about 1860 onwards, a building recovery occurred and this enabled development of the wider area to be completed. Just as the Ladbroke Estate began to recover, and its property was finished “on the cheap and by a different architect”, unfinished houses were gradually completed, and derelict spaces infilled, so too was Mr
Roy’s development of Portland Road haphazardly completed. Unlike the Norland and Ladbroke Estates, it is impossible to say that his land was actually originally designed or master planned, or even to realize how it originally ought to have been developed. This haphazard completion is reflected in the disparate physical appearance of its particular stretches and (within each stretch) local variation within individual properties still observable today.

In 1886, Charles Booth socially surveyed parts of London including Portland Road and the survey shows a social consequence of the 1850-60s’ boom and slump was to divide Portland Road into 2 social parts: a) a southern part - up to today’s Clarendon Cross - defined as “poverty and comfort (mixed)”; b) a northern part, marked in blue, - defined as “moderate poverty” or “very poor”. This is based on Charles Booth’s map as shown above.

After World War II, the Council demolished the part of Portland Road north of Nos 136 and 179 for its new social housing (and that area was until recently subject to a regeneration order), demolished the large store building west of Nos 134 and 179, and was to demolish by order that between 102-134 (east) and 141-179 (west) until gentrification of that part slowly started from 1967.

Therefore, we attribute to Portland Road (north of 102 (east) and 141 (west) a reduced significance of appearance relative to the actual Norland Estate area; and within Portland Road, a graduated significance of character and appearance, where the area of Nos 102-134 (east) and 141 to 179 (west) has the least significance of the Norland Conservation Area. By contrast, the southern part of Portland Road has more significance, relative to the Conservation Area. This graduated approach means that a different vision and approach to the northern part of Portland Road (between Nos 102-134 (east) and 141 to 179 (west) is justified for its sustainable development.

Over time, a variety of Article 4 directions have been implemented on Portland Road, covering different kinds of development. Most recently, the Council has rationalized the Article 4 directions covering the northern part - 102-134 (east) and 141 to 179 (west) so that painting facades other than a pastel shade requires planning permission, and painting brickwork is not permitted, whilst in the southern part Article 4 directions are more extensive, and within the actual Norland Estate more extensive still.
POLICY GUIDELINES FOR NORTH PORTLAND ROAD

The following guidelines are specific to the north end of Portland Road (102-134 (east) and 141-179 (west)), and result from consultation with residents of these houses. Particular local circumstances apply in this part of Portland Road, which make it possible to allow some developments to cater for the needs of growing families more flexibly than elsewhere in the Conservation Area, and at the same time to improve the character and appearance of this part of the Neighbourhood Plan Area.

STREET ELEVATIONS

The facades of properties within Portland Road Nos 102-134 (east) and 141-179 (west) comprise (on the west) stucco and (on the east) stucco with brick above, with some interesting brickwork detailing, with street level railings on both sides of the street.

Colour:

The variation of coloured façades in a range of pastel colours create a harmonious whole. This is a feature of streetscape significance whose local distinctiveness it is desirable to reinforce. The harmony may change over time to reflect individual tastes, and this is acceptable and fun.

The Neighbourhood Plan supports this local “bohemian” distinctiveness, provided only (non-textured) pastel colours are used for stucco façade painting (subject to stucco detailing in white colours), and the use of white colours for fenestration and door surrounds (with doors being coloured at the owner’s discretion).

Railings:

The restoration of railings can do much, here as elsewhere in the Conservation Area, to enhance the street scene. Where these are missing or not in keeping, it will be a condition of any planning permission that railings be made to match in detailed appearance a set currently existing between Nos 102-134 (east) and 141 to 179 (west).

Front stairwells and old coal cellars:

Where existing space allows, the creation of new front stairwells is supported, with the same condition, in order to overcome the existing haphazard range of railing designs.

Most of the properties between 102-134 (east) and 141 – 179 (west) have lightwells (or their remnants) and some coal holes remain in the pavement together with access to former coal cellars which now include utility room areas. The development of these areas for storage and utility rooms (but not living accommodation), and access to them via front lightwell stairs, is supported, subject to satisfaction of the Highway Authority as to safety, and a condition of any planning permission that railings be made to match in detailed appearance a set currently existing between Nos 102-134 (east) and 141 to 179 (west).

This will enable front access whilst securing overall improvement of railing detailing over time.

The importance of brickwork detailing:

Stucco requires painting for weatherproofing, but brick naturally does not. Part of the local distinctiveness in this street comes from brickwork detailing on the East side, at first floor level and above. This should not be painted over, and overpainting of brickwork will in future be prevented by Article 4 direction to make this subject to planning control. Appreciation of this feature of houses on the east side will be emphasised by requiring as a condition of any planning permission for such a property that a contract be let for the restoration (including by paint removal) of its brick upper facades so that the brickwork pattern can be seen again.
Rooflines/parapets:

Properties to the north of No 165 (west) would benefit considerably by the provision of raised parapets, detailed to match currently existing parapets between Nos 141 and 165, so as to improve the appearance of that stretch.

The use of conditions to achieve these matters will enable the continued sustainable development of this part and secure its particular appearance for future generations.

REAR EXTENSIONS

Our vision is to support and enable the sustainable development of homes for families for the longer term by permitting development of Nos 102 - 134 (east) and 141 to 179 (west) within parameters that reflect development previously considered acceptable by the local neighbourhood and Council.

Properties between 102 and 134 (east) include some rear extensions, but very limited outdoor space. These were originally constructed with gardens before they were developed for an open car parking area separated by a common eastern low brick wall (which coincides with the Neighbourhood and Conservation Area boundary). This geography makes these properties susceptible to property crime. Many burglaries and forced entries have occurred. Development can inhibit ease of access and reduce risk of crime. Further extensions eastwards to the rear brick boundary wall are supported, subject to visual subordination being retained by such rear extension not being higher than 300mm below the gutter line, nor greater than half the width of the property, and subject to Local Plan guidelines.

Properties between 141 to 179 (west) comprise terrace properties with gardens whose rear elevations face to their west a 5 m high, windowless solid brick wall which runs the whole length of their western boundary (coinciding with the Neighbourhood and Conservation Area boundary). As a result, these secluded gardens are uniquely private, being unobservable save to a few neighbouring owners, and an enclave of tranquility. The gardens are separated by low brick walls and fencing above and include a mixture of patios, lawned areas, some trees, and sunken areas affording rear access to lower ground floors.

Several of the houses have rear extensions (some up to second floor height), most projecting 3m into the garden space across 50% of the property width.

Because of the secluded nature of these rear gardens, and a substantial number of precedents, further similar rear extensions are supported, provided they do not exceed:

i) 50% of the property width
ii) 3m out from the original rear wall of the house
iii) 600mm below the roof gutter line

subject to the provision of rain water harvesting and a prohibition on extension flat roof use.

In the rear ground floor elevation, the substitution of French outward opening doors for the existing principal ground floor windows is supported. This will enable direct garden access from the ground floor and has no appreciable effect because generally only the upper part of such openings are observable by direct neighbours in the western parts of their garden.

OUTBUILDINGS

A number of properties on the West side (141 - 179) have timber garden sheds of various sizes set against the boundary wall. These appear used for ancillary uses such as garden storage. Against the sheer sides of the western boundary brick wall and its colour, these are unobtrusive, and supported, provided no permanent hardstandings are created, and they are not used as living accommodation.

ROOF EXTENSIONS AND TERRACES

The relatively narrow road between Nos 102-134 and 141-179, and front parapets on both sides of the street, results in the roofscape of each property being essentially invisible to the pedestrian passer-by. Front façade roofscape are generally observable to the opposite neighbour from within their own property only and (therefore) restricted by intervening window mullions and transoms.

Some of the properties between 102 and 134 (east) have developed roof terraces. Further roof terrace development on this side is supported subject to:

a) any enclosures being set back 1m from the western front façade,

b) a condition requiring the Council's approval of enclosure design and materials, landscaping, planting and furniture, in order to avoid compromising roofscape.

Conversely, the Neighbourhood Plan supports privacy to those terraces by not allowing provision of windows in east facing roofscape of Nos 141-179 (west).
We consider that the above enables sustainable and sympathetic population of roof terraces of houses which otherwise only have severely restricted outside spaces.

On the West side, Nos 141 - 179 face to their west a 5 m high, windowless solid brick wall which runs the whole length of their western boundary. As a result, the rear elevations of these houses are effectively invisible to all except their neighbours. At the front of the houses, the roof ridge line is only visible to the top floors of the houses opposite (on the east side of the street).

This means that attic occupation and lighting, and even the raising of the roof ridge line to enable higher ceilings internally, would have no adverse effect.

The Neighbourhood Plan supports increased provision of family accommodation by permitting for each property:

- the provision of up to two west facing dormer windows, subject to their being constructed from traditional materials. (See for example, Drawing Application reference PP/07/01569/CHSE).
- the raising of its roof profile to not higher than 150mm below each lowest party wall summit, subject to it being constructed in traditional materials and well-insulated.

AMENITY ISSUES

Nos 101-134 (east) and 141 – 179 (west) lie in the Norland Conservation Area. The Neighbourhood supports the prompt provision of traditional York stone paving fronting these properties (including by use of CIL receipts) so that the character and appearance of this part is improved. The Neighbourhood will look favourably upon development that provides for or materially contributes to the provision of such paving.

a) within the setting of the Norland Conservation Area abutting this Neighbourhood Area, the development of the western side of the Neighbourhood Plan boundary brick wall summit west of 141 to 179 (west) by provision of enclosure with rooflights, subject to: i) such enclosure or rooflights being constructed from traditional materials and woodwork painted in white colour; ii) such structure not extending above 150mm below the existing brick wall summit; iii) any openable part not extending above the said summit; and iv) access to the top of the structure being not other than for maintenance purposes.
Appendix C: Heritage Assets and Double Glazing

1. Introduction

Windows represent one of the most important, key visible external elements of a historic façade. The variety of different period window types and glazing patterns, their spacing and the proportions of the openings, their three-dimensional modelling with often deep finely sculpted glazing bars, as well as the uneven lively character of multi paneled window with the characteristic glitter of the individual panes of historic glass, all contribute to their special historic character and significance.

Apart from the considerable charm of historic windows they provide one of the main tools to date a historic building. Window alterations can have a dramatic impact on the building’s appearance as well as the character of the townscape of which it forms part. Historic fabric is a precious and finite resource that should be preserved for future generations and the loss of the surviving historic windows may result in a significant erosion of the building’s special architectural and historic character.

Climate change issues are also high on the agenda and consideration of the principles of energy efficiency and conservation has to be extended to our historic environment.

Windows can be improved in ways that are sustainable but not harmful to the special architectural or historic character or appearance through the loss of historic material. This could include:

- Repairing cracks and eliminating gaps
- Using existing shutters
- Using secondary glazing
- Installing blinds or heavy curtains or
- Sophisticated draft-proofing systems, such as Ventrolla

These can all improve thermal performance and a combination of these methods will bring a significant reduction in droughts and heat loss.

2. Listed buildings

There is a strong presumption against the replacement of historic windows in listed buildings with double glazed units. The main reasons for this are:

- The loss of the original historic fabric and historic authenticity
- The visual changes to the external and internal appearance including visible spacer bars and sealants on the edge of the glass panes and the necessary inclusion of a prominent individual sealing cap on each pane of the vacuum glazing units
- The dangers of future internal fabric decay within the building as a consequence of removing ventilation
- The significant weight difference of double glazed units that impose increased loading on the original frames
- These all have a detrimental effect on the appearance and overall character of the listed building.

3. Unlisted buildings in conservation areas

As with listed buildings, there are important conservation benefits in retaining the original historic fabric in unlisted buildings in conservation areas, including the windows. When considering their replacement the primary consideration is the material effect on the external appearance of the building and the consequent effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area. The result of this assessment may vary and will depend on the age of the buildings, the degree of the survival of the original windows and the detail of the particular window.

Any replacements, single or double glazed, should aim to:

a) Retain the original main window frames and replace only the sashes or glass if possible
b) Use slim profile double glazing systems - they are always preferable to the more chunky conventional double glazing

a) Copy the original opening mechanism (sash for sash, casement for casement)
b) Copy the original glazing patterns
c) Replicate the original materials (timber for timber, metal for metal), except where UPVC windows are being replaced with timber
d) Replicate the original external profile of the glazing bars
e) Retain the original depths of the external reveals within the brick openings are replicated
f) Use Crown effect glass to the outer panes to avoid the dead, lifeless appearance of modern plate glass and the consequent loss of character.
Although particularly relevant for listed buildings, this would be welcomed also for double glazed units in unlisted buildings in conservation areas.

4. When is planning permission needed?

Replacing single glazed windows with double glazed windows may result in changes to the proportions or thickness of the glazing bars and window frames. These changes are ‘development’ where they materially affect the external appearance of the building.

Where windows are replaced on a strictly ‘like for like’ basis in terms of both the material and appearance, planning permission is not required.

For single family dwellings, external alterations (including replacement windows) may be ‘permitted development’ provided that the materials used are of similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing house. (Refer to Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended).

Many properties within the Borough’s Conservation Areas are subject to Article 4 Directions. These directions may have removed ‘permitted development’ rights for elevation alterations including replacement windows.

In all other cases where double glazed window materially affects the external appearance of the building, planning permission will be required, including flats and non-residential buildings.
Appendix D: A Guide to the care and maintenance of stucco


Types of Stucco

The constituent materials of historic stucco varied considerably. However, between 1775 and 1850 when stucco was most popular, there were four principle types, with many variations within each type:

a. Lime/sand stucco: Lime and sand mixes have been used for many centuries for exterior rendering. One of the earliest examples in Westminster is at Inigo Jones’s Queen’s Chapel (1623-25) at St. James’s Place. This type was the most readily available throughout the 18th and 19th centuries.

b. Oil based stucco: This type includes many variations, patented and used in the 18th and the 19th centuries. One of the best known variations - Liardet’s mix - was produced and used by the Adam brothers, for example in Portland Place, Westminster. The critical constituent of this mix, boiled linseed oil, was used instead of water to make the mixture workable.

c. Roman cement stucco: This type dates from the late 18th century and was a mix of naturally hydraulic lime mixed with sand. In Westminster it was used, for example, by John Nash in the building of Park Crescent and in many other buildings in the Crown Estate. Its use became very popular throughout the first half of the 19th century. Some buildings in Westminster still retain Roman cement stuccos, which are characterised by their rich brown colour.

d. Portland cement stucco: Portland cement is a hydraulic binder produced by firing a mix of clay and limestone. It was not widely available until the 1850’s, when stucco was falling out of fashion; it was however used extensively by developers, for stucco cornices, window surroundings and other stucco decoration.

Repair

Stucco was always made as a combination of a ‘base’ material (varying from sand to powdered marble and pulverised glass) mixed with a bonding substance (from egg-white to lime or artificial cement) and oil or water. Often reinforcing materials were added such as hair, straw and wire-mesh. Each type of mix produced stucco particular texture, colour, strength, structural compatibility with other building materials, water resistance, etc. Many of these types of mix can be produced and used today to repair old stucco.

In modern times many artificial bonding materials and emulsifying additives have become available for use in rendering and stucco work. In repairing old stucco, these should be used with extreme caution and never without expert specifications and confirmation that they can be used in a way which is compatible with the old materials.

If you wish to repair stucco, it is very important to establish the type of the original mix. Use of an incompatible type is likely to result in ‘patches’ which look different to the rest of the facade and may cause cracks and serious deterioration.

The Council’s conservation officers or English Heritage experts will be pleased to advise you; their telephone numbers are given at the end of this Guide under Contacts.

The following two pages give information and explain repair procedures for two types of stucco (Lime/Cement Stucco and Oil Mastic Stucco) which are appropriate for many, but not all, buildings in Westminster. This information has been extracted from J. and N. Ashurst’s book ‘Practical Building Conservation (*).’

However, it is emphasised again that this information should not be used indiscriminately without a specialist’s approval in respect of a specific stucco building.
General Maintenance

Regular maintenance of the building is vital as stucco deteriorates rapidly once the surface is broken or if lack of repair enables water to damage the structure. As a general rule, repair works should be carried out to match the original works and where possible, missing details should be reinstated.

Stucco Mouldings and Other Details

Where moulded decoration has deteriorated, it should be repaired rather than removed. The reinstatement of missing stucco details such as balustrades and cornices is very important in building conservation and is becoming increasingly popular as it improves the appearance and value of a property. Occasionally, these details can be reproduced in modern materials but the use of traditional materials is favoured and may be required on listed buildings. In reproducing mouldings in original materials, it is very important to use the traditional method of ‘running’ mouldings in situ, using a ‘horse mould’, i.e. a stencil with the profile of the moulding carefully cut out; this is mounted firmly in a frame which is run between guides fixed on either side of the cornice.

Stucco Walls

The original purpose in the use of stucco was to resemble the appearance of distinguished traditional forms of stone masonry, often by imitating intricately cut and wrought stone blocks.

The following are examples of such type of stuccowork; their names are usually derived from corresponding forms of stone masonry. Repairs of each type requires application of different techniques, and the use of experienced plasterers and specialist advisers is highly recommended.

Painting of Stucco

Stucco buildings need regular repainting to preserve their appearance and weather resistance. Buildings that form part of a unified group should always be painted in the established colour. The generally recommended colours for external stucco (under British Standards No. BS 4800) are BS10B15, BS08B17 and BS08B15, the choice depending on the predominant shade of a particular group or terrace. Landowners of extensive estates in Westminster exercise satisfactorily control over stucco painting of their buildings. For example, stucco buildings owned by the Georgian Estate within Belgravia are consistently painted in ‘Magnolia’.

Generally ‘Brilliant White’ should be avoided, except where this is the established colour for the terrace. The paint finish should be gloss or egge shell, never a textured paint, and excessively glossy finishes should be avoided. Moulded stucco details should not be highlighted in different colours, as this can upset the balance or continuity of the group. Fairface brickwork should never be painted and timber door and window frames should be painted to match the prevailing pattern, generally gloss white or on some buildings black. Any original stucco which has not been painted in the past, should, subject to its general condition, remain unpainted.

Heavily textured paints, whether applied by brush, roller or spray gun should not be used. These finishes completely alter the character of a building by obscuring fine detail and by changing the smooth surface. The textured finish rapidly accumulates dirt in the urban atmosphere, leading to an expensive cleaning operation if the building is not to appear drab. For these rea-
sons, on listed buildings the City Council may take enforcement action to secure the removal of unauthorised heavily textured paint. If you are in doubt, please contact the City Council prior to starting work. Similarly, enforcement action may be taken if a listed building is painted in an appropriate colour.

Attention is drawn to health hazards involved in the removal or finishing (especially mechanical standing) of lead based paints, as well as to existing legal restrictions on the use of such paints.

Recently restored balustrade and classical details to porch of stucco property in Bayswater.

Inappropriate replacement of ‘bottle’ balusters with railings and crude simplification of stucco detail.
Pending Confirmation
Introduction

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, which are set out below.

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Section 15
(2) In this regulation “consultation statement” means a document which—
(a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
(b) explains how they were consulted;
(c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
(d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

Background

The Norland Neighbourhood Plan is a culmination of many years work by the Norland Conservation Society. The Society approached the Council in 2008 with the wish to update the Conservation Area Proposals Statement for Norland, and over the last four years, has been preparing and developing the neighbourhood development plan.

The Norland Conservation Society has a vital role to play in guiding best practice and promoting quality, as well as developing the policies and guidance set out in this Neighbourhood Plan. We have 43 years experience of working to preserve and enhance the area, representing residents’ interests to Council Members, Officers and other bodies in the face of increasing development pressure.

Building on Existing Resource

The Norland Conservation Society is open to all those living and working within the Norland Conservation Area. It is fully constituted and has a membership of 350, which represents local interests to authorities such as the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Thames Water and the Greater London Authority and acts on behalf of residents on issues such as inappropriate building development, traffic noise and illegal advertising.

The Society has a continued commitment to positive change in the area and engages with local residents, businesses and Councillors through regular meetings and newsletters.

Our ongoing programme of work includes:
- Reviewing and commenting on planning applications.
- Lobbying and working with council members, officers and representatives of other authorities such as Thames Water, The Great London Authority, TfL, English Heritage, local churches and other religious bodies.
- Working with developers, house owners and architects.

Specifically the Norland Conservation Society has effected important improvements in the area including:
- the pedestrianisation of Clarendon Cross, cutting off the flow of traffic through the heart of the area;
- challenging inappropriate building developments and alterations;
- developing guidelines for control of alterations to buildings;
- securing the replacement of garden square railings;
- unified external decoration schemes in Royal Crescent and Norland Square.
- reinstating York paving on many pavements;
- saving the St. James’s church tower from collapse by fundraising;
- new street tree planting, and saving important trees;
- securing FLIP protection for houses most prone to flooding;
- securing refusal of permission for back-lit advertisement hoardings around Shepherd’s Bush;
- setting up our Annual Lecture and Summer Garden Party to foster a real sense of community.
Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

Aims of Consultation
The principal aim of consultation undertaken during the preparation of our neighbourhood plan was to reach a plan that the whole community is happy with that will deliver positive development within the Norland Plan area and build on what makes it a desirable place to live and work.

The designated neighbourhood forum set out to achieve this through:
• raising local awareness of neighbourhood planning in terms of how it can be used and what it can deliver through sustainable development in this area
• talking to residents in Norland about their aspirations, issues and concerns
• working with the Council to explore heritage and planning matters and issues that could be addressed through this plan
• conducting a detailed audit of the streets and buildings in this area

The consultation targeted all those with an interest in the area. This included surrounding amenity societies, as well as residents and businesses within the area. The Norland Conservation Area is predominantly residential and responses and interest are thus primarily from local residents.

Steering Group
The Norland Conservation Society set up a Steering Group of five members and began to undertake work on the plan with support and input from a pool of 350 local residents.

Partnership
The Society has a long history of working with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. Laying the groundwork for the plan, members of the Society worked with Council officers looking at the provision of Article 4s in the area.

Members of the Steering group have had regular meetings with Council officers from the Neighbourhood Planning and Conservation teams over a period of four years, during the preparation of the plan.

The group worked with the Council to apply for central government funding through the Frontrunner programme. This was secured during the fifth wave in January 2012.

Collecting an Evidence Base
Local residents and members of the Society volunteered to become street representatives and conducted a heritage audit of the area. The survey was conducted by these representatives in 2009-10. The buildings in each street, square and crescent are described in detail with recommended actions to enhance the character and quality of neighbourhood and individual buildings, as well as the overall ambience and the street scene. These street reports are supported by photographs illustrating all the buildings; they highlight problems to be resolved and suggest actions for improvement. It recognises existing Article 4 directions and, where applicable, recommends new ones. This document supports the Norland Neighbourhood Plan.

Designation Consultation
The Council consulted on the designation of the Neighbourhood Area and Forum in April 2012. Response was wholeheartedly in support and the area and forum was designated on 15th June 2012. Membership of the neighbourhood forum is open to anyone living or working in the area.

Consultation on Pre-submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan
The Sedley principles of consultation require that:
• consultation must be at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage
• the proposer must give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit of intelligent consideration and response
• adequate time must be given for consideration and response
• the product of the consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any proposals.

As part of the preparation of this plan, the following consultation was carried out with the local community in Norland.

Communication and Publicity
The Neighbourhood Forum was able to use some of the Frontrunner funding to prepare some consultation materials. This enabled us to reach all households and businesses in the area. An illustrated four-page colour leaflet (Appendix A) was prepared setting out the Norland Conservation Society’s (as the Neighbourhood Forum) proposed vision and aims for the area. The leaflet asked for views on the draft plan and proposals in it by post or online (via the Norland Conservation Society’s website) and included a short questionnaire for this purpose. It was posted personally by members of the Forum Committee to each of the 1900 properties in the Neighbourhood Area.

The draft Neighbourhood Plan was available for consultation and comment between 20 June and 1 August on the Norland Conservation Society website. A hard copy of the draft neighbourhood plan was available at the Town Hall and in local libraries:
- Kensington Town Hall, Planning Information Desk
- Kensington Central Library
- North Kensington Library

Responses were encouraged:
Online - through our website www.norlandconservationsociety.co.uk
By post - using the short questionnaire
In person - at a walk-in public consultation event

The Council promoted the draft plan via its weekly Planning bulletin, and there has been information available on the Council’s website since the autumn of 2011.

The draft plan was also promoted through the Norland Conservation Society’s existing contact base. A request for views and input was made through the Norland Conservation Society’s newsletter and at the AGM in June 2012, at which some 80 members attended. The Council’s Neighbourhood Planning team introduced the neighbourhood planning process, and members of the Neighbourhood Forum’s Steering group presented their work on the Neighbourhood Plan to date. Attendees were reminded of the importance of this consultation and entreated strongly to respond. Shortly before the consultation period ended all members of the Norland Conservation Society with email subscription were again contacted about the consultation and the importance of their responses.

A walk-in public consultation event was held in St James’s Church 4:30pm - 7:30pm on 9th July 2012, visited by residents, officers from the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea’s Neighbourhood Planning Team and representatives from the Department of Communities and Local Government.

Consultation Strategy Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>June – September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>20th June – 1st August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>21st June, 7.30pm St James’ Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norland Neighbourhood Plan Submission  June 2013

Email newsletter to Norland Conservation Society members the consultation and the importance of their responses. August 2012

Public Meeting A walk-in public consultation event was held in St James’s Church. 4:30pm - 7:30pm on 9th July 2012.

Results

In total, 53 responses to the questionnaire were received: 34 through the website and 19 by post. The results are summarised graphically in Appendix B.

The main issues broadly focused on extensions and modifications to properties; sustainable materials; roads and movement; streetscape; and the management of the area. More detailed comments and responses are included below.

As a result of the walk-in session, a group of residents became involved in the development of the plan after the consultation closed. Whilst generally few concerns were raised about the proposals’ particular approach to development, the group of respondents, at the north end of Portland Road, considered the proposals too restrictive for their area to particular local circumstances. Discussions were held, and, as a result, a number of modifications were made to the Neighbourhood Plan and included in this second draft.

There were further suggestions for modifications, which have been addressed in the revised plan; several letters of appreciation and thanks were also received.

Addressing Responses

The following table lists the concerns and suggestions raised, and how these have been addressed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue raised</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Forum Response / How addressed in Neighbourhood Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Portland Road</strong></td>
<td>Meetings held with representatives from North Portland Road, at which detailed case was made for treating North Portland Road differently in these respects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This street should be excluded or the plan modified to allow different standards to apply to different parts of the neighbourhood. Historically all the houses in the neighbourhood were built at different times and in different circumstances and the plan should allow for this. Further consultation should be undertaken and the views of others taken on board.</td>
<td>This case is made in detail and at length in a special Appendix D to the report, and modifications included in the main report text to include these policy exceptions. Guidelines specific to North Portland Road are included in Appendix D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation area boundary</strong></td>
<td>We should look into this, but not within the drafting of the neighbourhood plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The west side of Norland Road should be included within the conservation area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double glazing in listed buildings</strong></td>
<td>We have included a paragraph: “In the interests of energy conservation, our intention is to investigate the availability of double glazing systems which would be acceptable to English Heritage for use in Listed Buildings. To the extent that such are available, we will recommend them for use in both Listed and Unlisted buildings in the Conservation Area.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Materials in rear extensions**  
Glass panels allow massive light improvement with consequent energy saving. Sympathetic use of glass can also enhance the quality of living spaces. There should be no such presumption against the use of glass in rear extensions.

The presumption is against “predominantly” glass structures – in other words, the kind of greenhouses which have recently been attached to the rear of houses (often Listed Buildings) as family room extensions, quite out of keeping with their surroundings. NB an exception is made for infills between two existing rear extensions. Most recently, these are not being allowed on grounds of poor energy efficiency/loss of heat through the glass. Most recently, these are not being allowed on grounds of poor energy efficiency/loss of heat through the glass.

**Solar panels**  
These are again positive for the environment. There are many buildings (eg Norland Square west side) with centre gulley roofs where solar panels could make a worthwhile contribution without adverse visual impact. There should be no presumption against solar panels.

The plan does not “presume against” solar panels: it proposes that they should only be permitted in discreet locations that would not harm the setting of any listed buildings or vista within the conservation area. This is supported by RBKC Conservation Officers, and in line with best practice.

**Flooding**  
There is a minor statement about flooding in the subterranean section but it is not enough. Flooding through the area has been a major problem for years. Even though it may be a sore spot and there is the fear of harming property values, it should be mentioned in relation to promoting permeable surfaces and sustainable drainage devices. Not mentioning it is a bit of head in the sand.

In 4.2.8, we have now included: This is reinforced by concern about the effect of subterranean developments on natural watercourses, as pointed out in the Baxter report. Both considerations are particularly important to reduce risk of sewage flooding, which has been a major problem for years.

The Society will object to any planning applications which adversely impact the extent of permeable surfaces, and encourage their re-instatement wherever possible.

**Extensions/Modifications to Properties**

- **Roofline alterations/additions**  
  Objections to no roofline alterations/additions (North Portland Road) - as indicated in Section 4.2.1 Roofline developments, and the Roof Guidance Proposal map. Dormers should be allowed on west-facing roofs on the west side of North Portland Road (where they could not be seen from anywhere in the CA).

  Meetings held with representatives from North Portland Road, at which detailed case was made for treating North Portland Road differently in these respects.

  This case is made in detail and at length in a special Appendix D to the report, and modifications included in the main report text to include these policy exceptions. Guidelines specific to North Portland Road are included in Appendix D.

- **Rear extensions and garden buildings**  
  Objections to restrictions on rear extensions and garden buildings in Sections 4.2.2 Rear Extensions and 4.3.4 Outbuildings (for North Portland Road)

  See above.

- **Extensions**  
  Insufficient emphasis on retaining families/continuity of ownership, by allowing extension of houses, up, out and down to accommodate growing families (not supported by all).

  The importance of retaining families in Norland is given additional emphasis under Vision. But in principle we oppose subterranean development where houses already have deep basements. This will be addressed within revised Basements policies being included in the Local Plan.

- **Interiors**  
  We do not understand the need to control the inside of the houses. This is not a planning matter and should not form part of the plan. If a house has a graded listing then this should deal with the matter of internal architectural details.

  The plan proposes “encouragement” to retain original features and room layouts; and admits this is not a matter for planning control in Unlisted building.

- **Terraces**  
  And in addition, there should be some restrictions on the creation of terrace on the ground floor when granting rear extensions. The statement “To protect neighbours’ privacy, and the appearance of rear elevations, balconies on top of rear extensions will not

  Added to last paragraph of section 4.2.2 of the plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normal text</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normally be permitted needs to add terraces after balconies</td>
<td>What controls could be introduced? Could this be considered as covered by Class A Part 1 Schedule 2 - &quot;The enlargement, improvement or other alterations of a dwelling house&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exterior lighting</strong></td>
<td>I do not see anything about exterior lighting. There are several cases on the southern end of Addison Avenue where exterior lighting has been added. Though opposed by many including the Kensington Society, the planning department said there are no controls over such inappropriate, modern lighting. This should be added to the controls.</td>
<td>The Art 4 directions will specify Hopsack BS4800 10 B 17 for 2A – 28 Queensdale Road, and Norland Place, in addition to Norland Square. Elsewhere (except Royal Crescent of course), owners will be free to choose their own “pale pastel colour”. In addition white or an off-white stone colour will be specified for stucco decoration/detailing throughout the CA, which you agree with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exterior Painting</strong></td>
<td>While agreeing with the principle that listed terraces such as Norland Square should follow a single colour scheme I do not agree that article 4 directions should apply elsewhere. This is an undesirable bureaucratic constraint on peoples’ freedom to express themselves. I do, however, agree that the principle of maintaining the integrity of mouldings and other features is important.</td>
<td>At these meetings, the intentions behind the paint colour proposals were clarified, and accepted. (There was apparently some misunderstanding of what was intended.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof planting and furniture</td>
<td>Within the brief statement on (d) Roof gardens and terraces there should be mention of roof planting and furniture. Walk down Princedale Road and unfortunate appearance of variety of umbrellas, heating units, and plants which destroy the line of the terrace. Even 43 Portland Road with its poodle plants is unattractive and distracting to the architecture. There should be controls in place where any terrace must be set back from the road by 1m and no plants, furniture, umbrellas etc. visible from the street.</td>
<td>We wanted to include just that, but they are not subject to Planning Control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Roof terraces will be subject to a condition requiring the Council’s approval of enclosure design and materials, landscaping, planting and furniture, in order to avoid compromising rooflines.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We wanted to include just that, but they are not subject to Planning Control.</td>
<td>This is covered in Chapter 4 – ‘Wrong or missing railings/enclosures’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is taken care of by proposed Article 4 Directions Class A Part 1 Schedule 2: “The enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwelling house”</td>
<td>Yes, good points. Included in Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, good points. Included in Chapter 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, good points. Included in Chapter 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Hoardings</td>
<td>Advertisements on hoarding should not be allowed. The plan might want to review the problem with 168 Holland Park Avenue where Mr Coey says “there are no provisions in the legislation to enforce removal of these advertisements” in the front of the listed building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Proposals to use Community Infrastructure Levy to fund various street scene improvements, extension of pedestrianisation at Clarendon Cross, measures to reduce rat-run traffic through Clarendon Cross.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>3.2.3 provides that protected trees should be felled only when dangerous. I disagree. In the case, for example, of Norland Square, it would make sound arboricultural sense to phase the removal and replacement of the mature trees (now well over a century old) over a long period to avoid too much devastation when the existing trees come to the end of their natural lives. This is a long term policy, but trees last a very long time, and tend to die off together. Trees in Square Gardens are a matter for the Square Garden Committee, subject of course to permission for felling, pruning and replacement from the Arboricultural Officers. Of course, individual owners are responsible for their own trees. The NP concern in 3.2 is to protect against wanton removal of trees in private gardens to make room for subterranean developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/Movement</td>
<td>Traffic statement altered as follows: &quot;traffic from the east heading north, by-passing Holland Park Avenue by taking Pottery Lane or Princedale Road, and the north side of St James’s Gardens&quot;. We would endorse any plan to slow down traffic travelling down Clarendon Cross and support the Zwart’s suggestion for more raised paving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Royal Crescent: Though mentioned in the parking section, there should be some comment here about the threat to the residential parking which Westfield has caused. With an increase of 45% of the shopping centre recently receiving planning permission, the situation will only worsen. We cover this as far as we can for now in Section 3.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>We support the parts of the plan that refers to tidying up of streetscapes. And we would endorse any plan that could reduce vandalism, particularly of trees planted in the pavements and better manage litter dropping or dog fouling though we would hesitate to endorse cctv cameras unless they were well and discretely positioned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Enforcement**

There must be a system which ensures enforcement of the agreed regulations. This does not appear to exist at present. Examples are the telephone box advertising, bad double glazing in Norland Square, use of non-standard paint colours in Norland Square, posting of flyers etc on railings and lamp-posts. If the regulations cannot be enforced they should not be set out as mandatory rules, but as principles for neighbourly behaviour.

You’re absolutely right about the need for enforcement; we are constantly only too aware how short-staffed the planning authority’s Enforcement team are. This is where our, and our Members’ vigilance is important, firstly to draw enforcement’s attention to breaches (eg Newsagent at end of Addison Avenue which is currently being pursued by Enforcement at our request), and second to follow up to make sure of the right resolution.
Appendix A: Consultation Publicity

Leaflet

---

Norland Neighbourhood Plan

A Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared and is available from 20 June to 1 August for consultation and comment:

On our website: www.norlandconservationsociety.co.uk
As hard copy at: Town Hall Planning Information Desk, Kensington Central Library, Philomena Walk, W8 7RJ; North Kensington Library, 108 Ladbroke Grove, W11 1PZ

Let us have your views!

Online: through our website www.norlandconservationsociety.co.uk
By post: using the short questionnaire below, to: Libby Kinmonth, Chairman, 32 Royal Crescent Mews, LONDON W11 4SY
In person: A walk-in consultation will take place in St James’ Norland Church, 4.30 – 7.30pm on Monday 9th July. Members of the Committee of the Society, and representatives from the Council will be on hand to answer questions.

Overall, do you agree with the Neighbourhood Plan proposals to preserve and enhance the Conservation Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate 1-5</th>
<th>(1=disagree strongly, 5=agree strongly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- for subterranean developments provide sufficient control to mitigate adverse impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for rear extensions and conservatories will adequately protect gardens and backs of houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for exterior painting will enhance the Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for outbuildings will adequately protect valuable open spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for gardens and trees will adequately protect and enhance the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for protecting architectural features provide sufficient control to mitigate adverse impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for new building provide sufficient control to mitigate adverse impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for reducing traffic and noise will be effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for roofline alterations will provide adequate protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any other issues or concerns? If so, please tell us what they are (on a separate sheet of paper: not more than 200 words, please use bullet points)

---

You live in a very special part of London

It was always so, but 43 years ago, when the Norland Conservation Society was founded, the area was in a bad way. 800 vehicles an hour thundered through Clarendon Cross; many houses were devastated with falling cornices; many railings were missing; the square gardens were surrounded by wire netting. There was a proposal to demolish the eastern end of St James’ Gardens; Addison Avenue front gardens invaded by parked cars; Norland Road was in ruins. There was extensive multiple occupation in Royal Crescent and Norland Square, multiple colour schemes, many houses in poor repair with cornices missing; a threat of five tower-block hotels round Shepherd’s Bush roundabout.

Since 1969, the Norland Conservation Society has fought to make Norland a much-loved place to live, representing your interests to Council Members, Officers and other bodies in the face of increasing development pressure. As a result, Norland is now the place you love to live in.

Specifically, we have secured the closure of Clarendon Cross, cutting off the flow of traffic through the heart of the area; challenged inappropriate building developments and alterations; developed guidelines for control of alterations to buildings; supported and secured replacement of garden railings; achieved unified decoration schemes in Royal Crescent and Norland Square; We have protected front gardens in Addison Avenue from car parking; got many pavements reset with York paving; saved the church tower from collapsing by fund-raising; achieved new street tree planting, and saved important trees; secured refusal of permission for back-lit advertisement hoardings around Shepherd’s Bush; and fostered a real sense of neighbourhood and community through our Annual Lecture and Summer Garden Party.

Norland Neighbourhood Plan

To continue and build on the conservation work of the past 43 years, we are making use of new neighbourhood planning powers. The Norland Conservation Area has been designated a neighbourhood area and the Norland Conservation Society as the neighbourhood forum for this area.

Our vision

- Enhance and protect the character and historic features that define Norland’s sense of place: townscape, streetscape, landscape, and neighbourhood
- Protect our listed buildings, and the architectural features important to the character of Norland
- Protect and enhance our open spaces, gardens and trees
- Discourage and reduce traffic noise and disturbance through residential areas
- Strive for retention of local and heritage characteristics - both architecture and local and social amenity (shops, pubs, post offices)
- Make it easy for pedestrians to move freely and safely in Norland
- Manage new development to conserve local character
- Maintain a mix of uses - retain a diverse range of small businesses

The aim of the Norland neighbourhood plan is to protect and enhance the character and historic features that define Norland’s sense of place - in terms of townscape, streetscape, landscape, and neighbourhood, by means of:

- Guidelines for rear extensions, conservatories and garden buildings (including sheds) to protect gardens and the backs of houses
- Guidelines for exterior painting to enhance the conservation area
- Guidelines to protect and enhance our open spaces, gardens and trees

Further action to mitigate traffic problems

To support our neighbourhood plan the Council is consulting from 20 June - 1 August on removing permitted development rights (these are things that can normally be done without planning permission) through Article 4 Directions for:

- External painting; alterations to architectural features; large garden sheds and other garden buildings; removing front garden enclosures for car parking
Appendix B: Questionnaire Results

Where do respondents live?

Do you agree with the aims and policies of the neighbourhood plan?
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Relative importance of conservation issues

Of these, which is most important?

- Protect our fine buildings and streets: 17%
- Protect and enhance Norland's character and historic features: 37%
- Reduce street crime: 9%
- Reduce traffic and noise: 9%
- Protect against undesirable development: 8%
- Controlling/preventing subterranean development: 14%
- Retain local heritage characteristics (shops, pubs, F0, etc.): 6%
Effectiveness of neighbourhood plan policies

![Bar chart showing the effectiveness of various plan policies.](chart.png)