

SITE:

Norland Square Mansions,
53 Norland Square, W11

RBK&C Ref:
DPS/DCN/PP/04/00081/JW

ODPM Ref:
APP/K5600/A/04/1148762

STATEMENT OF CASE

Jonathan Wade

18 June 2004

PUBLIC INQUIRY



TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

NORLAND SQUARE MANSIONS, 53 NORLAND SQUARE, LONDON, SW3

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 78 BY MR. C. OKIN

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE:- APP/K5600/A/04/1148762

RBKC REFERENCE:- DPS/DCN/PP/04/00081

**PRE-INQUIRY STATEMENT OF THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON
AND CHELSEA**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This is an appeal against the Royal Borough's decision to refuse planning permission for the erection of a roof extension to create a self-contained flat with roof terrace and alterations to the elevation of the building at Norland Square Mansions, 53 Norland Square, London, SW3.

2.0 THE APPEAL SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 Norland Square Mansions is a purpose built block of flats constructed in the 1930's and situated on the corner of Norland Square and Holland Park Avenue. The architect was Arthur Ash. The remainder of Norland Square was designed by the architect Robert Cantwell and laid out from 1837 onwards. It consists of traditional early Victorian townhouse properties which have a high degree of uniformity especially with regard to the height.
- 2.2 The property itself is a 5 storey block of flats adjoining 2 mid nineteenth century stucco fronted terraces as described above. These terraces are listed Grade 2 and are three storey with basement and attic. Although Norland Square Mansions is of a much later date compared with the rest of the Square there is a general consistency of roofline on the west side of the Square.
- 2.3 The Norland Square Conservation Area in which Norland Square Mansions is situated will be discussed and described.
- 2.4 The area surrounding the appeal site is predominantly residential in character.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 Relevant previous planning applications will be described which will include the

following:-

- 3.2 The erection of an additional storey was refused in December 1973.
- 3.3 The erection of a roof addition to provide one penthouse flat was permitted in July 1974.
- 3.4 The erection of an additional storey was refused in December 1976. (ref. TP/76/0938).
- 3.5 The construction of an additional storey to provide one penthouse flat and extension of one of the existing top floor flats was refused in May 1980 (ref. TP/80/0441).
- 3.6 An appeal against this decision was dismissed in January 1981. The issues raised by this decision are still considered to be relevant and will be discussed.

4.0 THE APPEAL APPLICATION

- 4.1 The appeal application will be described. It was submitted on 17th December 2003. Feedback was given at a site visit with the applicant's agent on 22nd January 2004 and the application was refused by the Planning Services Committee on 2nd March 2004. The recommendation of the Executive Director, Planning and Conservation was that the application should be refused on the following grounds:-

"The proposal to erect an additional storey and raise the parapet on the mansion block would unbalance the uniform roofline on the western side of Norland Square. On this basis it would be detrimental to the architectural cohesiveness and harmony of the Square and contrary to Policies contained within the Conservation and Development Chapter of the Unitary Development Plan in particular Policies CD27, CD44, CD45, CD46, CD57, CD61 and CD62".

- 4.2 The proposal is for the erection of a roof extension to create a penthouse flat with roof terrace and external alterations to the building which will be analysed and described.
- 4.3 In terms of the design, the proposed rooftop flat is stepped off the frontage to Norland Square by an average of 2.5 metres whilst to the rear a mansard design roof is proposed which is sited immediately behind the existing parapet. The unit, which will have a flat roof is also stepped away from both flanks of the property and will have a timber terrace deck overlooking Norland Square with the southern flank overlooking Holland Park Avenue. In terms of materials there will be an off white render finish to the walls and a new parapet on the frontage varying between 0.45m and 0.65m higher than the existing.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1 The Statutory Plan for the Royal Borough is the Unitary Development Plan which

was adopted on 25th May 2002.

- 5.2 Policies in the Unitary Development Plan which may be relevant to the consideration of the appeal are:-

Strategic Policies - STRAT 1, STRAT 2, STRAT 10, STRAT 11, STRAT 16 and STRAT 19.

Conservation and Design Policies - CD27, CD33, CD44, CD45, CD46, CD57, CD61, CD62 and CD69.

Housing Policies :- H2

- 5.3 The Council may refer to the published advice of Central Government circulars and Planning Policy Guidance Notes; in particular PPG1, PPG3 and PPG15.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 It will be contended that the proposed development fails to comply with Council Policy with regard to the provision of additional storeys and roof level alterations and on the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 6.2 The visual harm of the additional storey will be discussed in detail. The principle of an additional storey is not considered appropriate. It will be demonstrated that it will have a greater visual impact than suggested by the applicant.
- 6.3 It will be demonstrated that the proposed roof extension will have a harmful effect on the skyline, the visual uniformity of the Square and the character and appearance of the Norland Square Conservation Area.
- 6.4 The Council's case will also demonstrate that the issues raised above outweigh other alleged benefits offered by the applicant which principally relate to changes to the external appearance of the property, or any other benefits such as the provision of an additional residential unit.

7.0 DOCUMENTS

- 7.1 The following documents may be referred to or put in evidence at the Public Inquiry by the Council's witnesses:-
- 7.2 The Unitary Development Plan 2002.
- 7.3 The Mayor of London's Plan February 2004.
- 7.4 Planning Policy Guidance Notes, in particular PPG1, PPG3 and PPG15.
- 7.5 CABE "By Design - Urban Design in the Planning System: Towards Better Practice" 2000.

- 7.6 Survey of London. Volume XXXVII Northern Kensington.
- 7.7 The background history of Norland Square Mansions and the surrounding area including photographs.
- 7.8 The Norland Square Conservation Area Proposals Statement.
- 7.9 The contents of file Ref. PP/04/00081. The contents of file ref TP/80/0441 may also be specifically referred to including the subsequent appeal decision and any policies applicable at that time.
- 7.10 The Council reserves the right to add to, refer to or produce any other document or amend this statement should it prove necessary.

ROLFE JUDD

STATEMENT OF CASE FOR THE APPELLANT

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

APPEAL BY CHARLES OKIN

AGAINST THE REFUSAL BY ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON &

CHELSEA OF PLANNING PERMISSION IN RESPECT OF

NORLAND SQUARE MANSIONS

53 NORLAND SQUARE

LONDON W11 4PY

Appeal reference: APP/K5600/A/04/1148762

LPA reference: DPS/DCN/PP/04/00081

Rolfe Judd Reference: NS/RA/P2181A

JUNE 2004

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	The Appeal Site	5
3.	The Proposal	7
4.	Pre-application Discussions	8
5.	The Local Planning Authority's Decision	10
6.	Relevant Government and Local Planning Policy	12
7.	Summary	16
8.	Supplementary Matters	17
9.	List of Documents	18

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The appeal is submitted by Charles Okin ("the Appellant") against the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea ("the Council") refusal to grant planning permission the following planning application:

'The erection of a roof extension to create a self-contained flat with roof terrace and alterations to the elevation of the building, at Norland Square Mansions, 53 Norland Square, London, W11 4PY'.

- 1.2 Planning permission was refused on the following grounds:

'The proposal to erect an additional storey and raise the parapet on the mansion block would unbalance the uniform roofline on the western side of Norland Square. On this basis it would detrimental to the architectural cohesiveness and harmony of the Square contrary to Policies contained within the Conservation and Development chapter of the Unitary Development Plan in particular Policies CD27, CD44, CD45, CD46, CD57, CD61 and CD62.'

- 1.3 The evidence to be presented to the Inquiry will demonstrate the following:

- The proposed improvements to the mansion block and roof top flat will enhance the character of the appeal premises and enhance the character and appearance of the Norland Conservation Area.
- That the proposal is consistent with Government and local planning policy providing additional housing on a previously developed site, and of a high quality design in keeping with the surrounding area.

- That the proposal will not adversely affect the amenity, character or functioning of any surrounding residential properties and therefore fully complies with the requirements of adopted UDP policy.
- That the proposed scale, design, height and materials are wholly in keeping with the existing building and will enhance the overall architectural composition of the building and its wider setting.
- That the proposed development is generally consistent with the aims and objectives of all other relevant planning policies and standards.

1.4 The evidence to be presented to the Inquiry will therefore demonstrate that in accordance with Section 54 A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, the application was in accordance with the adopted UDP and that material considerations exist to indicate planning permission should in any event be granted.

2.0 THE APPEAL SITE

2.1 The site is located at the south west corner of Norland Square, with the junction of Holland Park Avenue, over looking the predominantly early Victorian Square and lies within the Norland Conservation Area. Adjacent to the site lies terrace housing along both the west side of Norland Square and Holland Park Avenue, which are Grade II listed buildings. Terraces along both the north and east sides of Norland Square are also Grade II listed.

2.2 The site originally comprised a boy's school as part of the development of the Norland Estate in the mid-1800's. This was occupied by the Notting Hill and Bayswater High School for Girls in 1873 until 1930. The site was then redeveloped as the mansion block which currently exists. Norland Square itself forms part of the wider Norland Estate, which was designed by the architect Robert Cantwell and laid out from 1837 onwards.

2.3 The existing building is a ground and four storey interwar art deco mansion block designed by the architect Arthur Ash and was erected in 1935. The property comprises 28 residential units, with a shop unit at ground floor, currently accommodating Marsh and Parson's estate agents along the Holland Park Avenue frontage. A car parking area and garages lie to the rear of the property.

2.4 A full history of the site will be presented to the Inquiry. The planning records note that four applications for the erection of roof extension have been submitted between 1973 and 1980, these are set out below;

Application & Date	Proposal	Decision	Reason
12 570/1083 10 Dec 1973	Additional storey	Refused	Building would appear to dominant, over development of site and visually obtrusive protrusion on skyline.
7201/3A 19 Jul 1974	Erection of a roof addition	Approved	
76/933/12570/579 14 Dec 1976	Erection of an additional storey	Refused	Building would appear too dominant, visually obtrusive on the skyline and would be over development of site.
TP80/441/KZ/14/94 15 May 1980	Additional storey to provide one penthouse flat and extension to one of existing top floor flats	Refused	Building would appear too dominant, visually obtrusive protrusion in skyline, over development on site and increase pressure on existing car parking facilities.

2.5 The applications submitted in 1973, 1976 and 1980 were all of a similar nature and for relatively large roof extensions. The approved roof extension was significantly smaller, of a more appropriate design and contained a significant set back from the roof edge. This development was taken into account during the evolution of the appeal proposal.

2.6 We note that the Planning Officer's committee report states that the Council have 'taken a consistent approach in the past and refused permission for roof extensions on the block', though the report does refer to the exception in 1974 when an application for a roof extension was approved. The officer's report claims this permission considerably predates policies on roof extensions. Notwithstanding this, the reasons for refusal for the applications both before and after the 1974 approval are exactly the same, suggesting that the Council gave consideration to the same criteria in all of the applications (i.e. with regard to being over dominant in relation to neighbouring buildings, being over development and the visual impact on the skyline). By approving the application in 1974, the Council therefore considered that specific proposal to be acceptable in terms of its visual impact on the skyline and its relationship to the neighbouring buildings. We note in both the officers report and the previous Inspector's decision that the Council set out other financial and legal considerations, which they assert account for this approval, though are apparently unable to set out what these might have been. Nevertheless the fact remains that the design was considered appropriate and the previous approval is therefore a material consideration.

3.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposed scheme involves the removal of redundant tank rooms and ancillary accommodation at roof level, replacing them with an additional element of usable residential accommodation to form a self-contained three bedroom residential flat.
- 3.2 The proposed roof level flat aims to provide a well proportioned resolution to the 'cut off' appearance of the existing roofline, which currently exists. The proposed roof level flat is designed as a subsidiary element and would be set back from the edge of the roof at the north, east and south elevations, ensuring that its contribution to the building is only visible from a limited number of views; these views will be referred to within evidence. It should be noted that the proposed roof top flat would be more prominent in winter than summer, as tree foliage screen a number of views. The design of the proposed roof level flat and the palette of proposed materials have taken cues from the existing detail to ensure that the proposal would be wholly in keeping with the original design of the mansion block and to assist in unifying the new and existing building details.
- 3.3 The proposed residential unit would include a roof terrace, sited towards the south east corner of the building to prevent overlooking or disturbance. The appellant owns a vacant garage within the block of garages adjacent to the mansion block, and it is proposed that this would provide car parking space for the residential unit.
- 3.4 The proposal also includes improvements to the mansion block including an improved entrance with new planters, lighting and rendering over the canopy, an improved shopfront in terms of a new canopy, signage, lighting and planting and improved common parts including the renewal of the existing lift. It is also proposed to improve the façade by rendering the rear panels of the balconies to allow the brick projecting bays to be read more coherently. The heavy dark panels on the Holland Park Avenue façade would also be rendered in white to balance the composition on this elevation.

4.0 PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Prior to the submission of the planning application, the appellant undertook pre-application consultations with:

- Cllr. Walker-Arnott, Ward Councillor
- Residents of Norland Square Mansions
- The Norland Square Conservation Society
- Norland Square Garden Committee

4.2 The appellant met Councillor Walker-Arnott, on site on 8 October 2003, and explained his proposals. The appellant and Councillor Walker-Arnott visited the roof of the mansion block and walked around the site to get a clear understanding of the key views and the impact of the proposal on these. Councillor Walker-Arnott subsequently wrote to the planning department to support the proposals, and further emailed his colleague Councillor Ahern, the Chairman of the planning committee, to ask that the application be determined by Members, when he learned that Officers intended to refuse the application under their delegated powers.

4.2 The appellant met with David Potter, Chairman of the Norland Square Garden Committee, on 24 October 2003 to discuss the proposal. Norland Square Garden Committee subsequently made no objection.

4.3 The appellant wrote to the residents of the mansion block in November 2003 detailing the proposals and including a summary of key questions and answers. Initial drawings were placed in Marsh and Parsons (the estate agents at the ground floor of the mansion block), along with a summary of measure to ensure quality of life during construction statement, to provide residents with the opportunity to view the proposed scheme. In a direct response to the concerns expressed by one of the residents the appellant personally visited her to reassure that the bush outside the property would not be removed as part of the proposal.

- 4.4 The appellant met with representatives of the Norland conservation Society, on 3 November 2003, and discussed the scheme with them. Subsequently, the Society raised no objections, and upon discovering that the application was scheduled to be determined under officer's delegated powers also requested that the application be determined before committee.
- 4.5 As a consequence of this programme of consultations, before this application was lodged further modifications were made to the proposal. In particular the extent of roof terrace proposed was revised and reduced.
- 4.6 This approach is entirely in line with the approach of draft PPS1 'Creating Sustainable Communities', which encourages community involvement within the planning process and specifically highlights that communities should be involved in proposals in good time and enable them to participate in developing proposals rather than simply commenting on these once these are fixed.

5.0 THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY'S DECISION

5.1 A planning application for the proposed roof extension to create a self-contained residential unit and improvements to the mansion block was submitted on 17th December 2003.

5.2 The Chairman of the Planning Committee requested that the application be considered before the Planning Committee. The application was then subsequently refused at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Planning Committee on 2nd March 2004. The Committee was presented with a Planning Officer's Report, which recommended that the application be refused (full reason for refusal set out in 'Introduction').

5.3 The appellant submitted an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate against the refusal of planning permission on the planning application on 23 April 2004.

5.4 The Planning Officer's Report presented to committee discussed a number of significant issues in relation to the development, which should be noted;

- The design of the proposed roof extension is 'not necessarily unsympathetic' or 'out of keeping' with the design, age and character of the building.
- The repairs and enhancements to the mansion block are welcomed.
- The proposed roof terrace is not considered to result in a detrimental loss of privacy as it will overlook communal gardens within the Square.
- No transport objections are raised on the basis that the vacant garage owned by the appellant would provide car parking accommodation for the proposed residential unit, and convenient bicycle parking would be provided by condition attached to any permission.
- Noise and disturbance, including temporary car parking controls (as detailed within neighbour objection letters) will be addressed by other legislation.
- No loss of sunlight or daylight to occupiers of the flats would occur.

- 5.5 On this basis, it is clear that the Council consider the proposal unacceptable solely on the basis that the additional storey and raising of the parapet would be harmful to the composition of the Square as a whole and in particular the west side of Norland Square because of the general uniformity in height.
- 5.6 The proposal complies with a number of policies of the Unitary Development Plan, which are not referred to in the Council's committee report or decision notice, including STRAT 1, STRAT 2, STRAT 16, STRAT 17 and CD58. The proposed development would both enhance the residential character and would increase the provision of residential accommodation on land currently within in residential use. The proposal would also contribute to the improvement of the environment within the conservation area, consistent with policy CD58.

6.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL PLAN POLICY

6.0.1 The evidence to be presented at the Inquiry will focus on the Council's reasons for refusal and will demonstrate that the proposal will not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building or of the Norland Conservation Area. It will be demonstrated that the proposals are wholly in accordance with national guidance on developments within conservation areas (PPG15), regional and strategic guidance (The London Plan) and adopted UDP policy.

6.1 National and Regional Guidance

6.1.1 It will be demonstrated that the scheme accords with the guidance set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 – Planning and the Historic Environment, in respect of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

6.1.2 Reference will be made to the guidance on development within London set out in The London Plan, and in particular guidance on design and conservation.

6.1.3 Other national, regional or strategic guidance will be presented where relevant to the case.

6.2 Adopted UDP Reasons for Refusal

6.2.1 The Council refused the application on the basis of the effect of the proposed roof extension and raising the parapet on the uniform roof line of the western side of Norland Square, on the basis that it would be detrimental to the architectural cohesiveness and harmony of the Square and contrary to the Policies contained within the Conservation and Development chapter of the Unitary Development Plan, in particular CD27, CD44, CD45, CD46, CD57, CD61 and CD62. It will be demonstrated at the Inquiry that the proposal is consistent with these policies of the UDP, and overall would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

6.2.2 The proposed roof top flat would involve the removal of the existing unsightly and redundant tank rooms and other ancillary accommodation at roof level, and these would be replaced with a further element of useable residential accommodation. It will be demonstrated the proposal would in this respect be consistent with the approach of STRAT 19 and Policy H2, which seek to increase the number of residential dwellings within the Borough.

6.2.3 It will be demonstrated that the proposal for a roof top flat, including raising the parapet would be sensitive to the scale, height and bulk of the surrounding. The proposed roof extension would be set back from the eaves level to ensure it relates to the adjacent building and enables the roofline to be read as it presently does from near views. It will be demonstrated that the proposal would provide a beneficial opportunity to enhance the architectural composition of the building as a whole and enhance its contribution to the Norland Square Conservation Area, consistent with policy CD27 which seeks to ensure that all development is compatible with the character of the surrounding area.

6.2.4 Policy CD44 of the UDP seeks to resist roof extensions and roof alterations in a number of specific circumstances. It will be demonstrated that the proposal is consistent with this policy as it does not fall within the applicable circumstances where roof extensions will be resisted. In summary;

- **Where complete terraces or groups of buildings are unimpaired by extensions** – The proposal building is significantly separated from the adjacent terraces physically and in terms of design, style, materials and age; we therefore do not consider the mansion block to form part of a group. The building is also currently impaired by the existing roof structures.
- **Buildings that include a roof structure or form of historic or architectural interest** – the proposal building does not have a roof structure of historic or architectural interest. On the contrary the building has a number of visually obtrusive roof structures, which would be removed as part of the proposal.

- **Buildings that are higher than surrounding neighbours** – Norland Square Mansions does have a higher parapet than others on the Square, though during the original construction of the estate the site historically held a much taller building for a significant period of time. The proposed roof extension would not increase the overall height of the building as it would generally be no higher than the existing roof structures and tank rooms.
- **Building or terraces where the roof line is exposed to long views from public spaces and which would have an intrusive impact on that view or impede the view of an important building or open space beyond** – the proposal would not have an intrusive impact on long views nor would the proposal impede on any views to other important buildings or spaces.
- **Mansion blocks of flats where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition** – the proposed roof extension has been designed to be a subsidiary element, and thus not adding significantly to the bulk. The design of the proposal would compliment the original architecture and provide a well proportioned resolution to the building, overall creating a balanced architectural composition.

6.2.5 Policy CD45 sets out circumstances in which additional storeys and roof level alterations will be permitted, and it will be demonstrated at the Inquiry that the proposal would be sympathetic in terms of its architectural design to the age and character of the building, (the Planning Officers committee report agrees that the proposed design would not be 'out of keeping' with the existing design'), and that the proposal would not harm the character of the building, improving the overall architectural composition of the building and its setting in the skyline, consistent with the criteria set out within this policy. The proposal also complies with the thrust of section a) of the policy in that it would resolve the visual clutter which currently compromises the roof of the mansion block.

6.2.6 It will be demonstrated that raising the parapet would be architecturally sympathetic enabling the side bays to be distinguished in contrast to the central bay, as an

appropriate resolution to the building and in keeping with the original architectural design. It would in any case be possible to introduce a roof extension without raising the parapet if this were considered desirable, and the appellant is willing for this to be the case, should the Inspector be minded to allow the appeal.

6.2.7 The other policies referred to in the Council's reason for refusal, namely Policies CD57, CD61 and CD62 of the UDP, relate to proposed developments in conservation areas. It will be demonstrated that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area, and that on the contrary the proposed improvements to the mansion block and rooftop flat would enhance the conservation area in that it would improve the overall appearance of the mansion block and would enable the existing roof structures to be replaced with an attractive and architecturally sympathetic rooftop flat, which relates to the original architectural design and materials of the building.

6.2.8 The appellant intends to call professional witnesses to submit evidence giving:

- A descriptive analysis of the appeal site and the wider context in which the site is set within the Norland Conservation Area to assess the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
- A commentary upon and summary of relevant national and local design policy, other guidance and good practice;
- An assessment of the appeal scheme against the contextual analysis, policy and all other relevant and material planning considerations.
- A descriptive analysis on the appropriateness of the design and the likely visual effect of the appeal scheme on the building and its wider setting from both near and long views.

7.0 SUMMARY

- 7.1 The principal policy basis for refusing this application, appears to be the perceived harmful effect the proposed roof extension and alterations will have on the roofline of the west side of Norland Square and on the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- 7.2 The evidence to be presented will demonstrate that the proposed works to the building and the proposed extension to the roof will restore and enhance its appearance to the benefit of the conservation area.
- 7.3 In addition to addressing those policies of relevance to the specific reasons for refusal, evidence will be given of support and encouragement for the proposed development in the context of other UDP policies.
- 7.4 It will also be submitted that the proposal is in accordance with Government policies contained within PPG 15 for developments within conservation areas, and guidance set out within The London Plan, which encourages additional and high density housing on brownfield sites in accessible locations.
- 7.5 In summary, evidence will be put to the Inquiry on the appellant's behalf, to demonstrate that the proposal is in accordance with the Council's adopted UDP policies and that the application should therefore have been permitted.

8.0 SUPPLEMENTARY MATTERS**I) Third Party Objectors**

8.1 Several objections were received from third party representations to this proposal at the application stage. All the objectors were local residents, who expressed concern principally about noise and disturbance during construction, architectural composition of the original building and the Square, loss of existing Art Deco lift, possible loss of a bush and loss of sunlight and daylight. Issues raised by local residents will be fully addressed in evidence to be presented.

II) Further Information

8.2 The appellant wishes to reserve the right to produce further evidence not referred to in this statement in relation to any other matters, which may be raised, by the Council or third parties prior to the Inquiry.

III) Matters Not in Dispute

8.3 The appellant will, in consultation with the Council, prepare at the appropriate time a Statement of Common ground outlining those matters, which are not in dispute between the parties.

9.0 LIST OF DOCUMENTS

9.1 The following documents and other material are intended to be produced and referred to at the Inquiry. Items noted in 9.3 and 9.4 to be submitted and agreed with the Council for the Statement of Common Ground

9.2 Appeal Application Documents submitted 17 December 2003 (PP/04/00081)

- i) Application documents, including accompanying reports;
- ii) Application drawings;
- iii) Planning Committee Report relevant to the appeal application and background papers;
- iv) Appeal application decision notice;
- v) Relevant Correspondence and drawings;
- vi) Appeal forms, Certificates and Site Plans.

9.3 Background Documents (Relevant Extracts Only)

- i) The London Plan;
- ii) Planning Policy Guidance Notes 15 and draft Planning Policy Statement 1
- iii) English Heritage Guidance
- iv) Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea UDP April 2002;
- v) Norland Conservation Area Statement
- vi) Other relevant national, regional and local documentation.

9.4 Supplementary Documents

- i) Planning History of the Appeal premises;
- ii) Photographs of appeal site and surrounding area;
- iii) Photo Montages of the appeal site illustrating the proposed works;
- iv) Pre-application letters sent to residents and 'Key Questions and Answers'
- v) Quality of Life During Construction Statement