

ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON & CHELSEA

AUG 12 1999

REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLANNING & CONSERVATION

260
269

APP NO. PP/99/00996/27/MNW
PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE 12/08/1999 AGENDA ITEM NO. 115

ADDRESS

60 Bassett Road,
Kensington, W10 6JP

APPLICATION DATED

RECOMMENDATION
ADOPTED.

APPLICATION COMPLETE 18/05/1999

APPLICATION REVISED 07/07/1999

APPLICANT/AGENT ADDRESS:

CONSERVATION AREA Oxford
Gardens

CAPS Yes

Howard Sharp &
Partners,
79 Great Peter Street,
Westminster,
London,
SW1P 2EZ

ARTICLE '4' Yes

WARD Kelfield

LISTED BUILDING NO

HBMC DIRECTION NO

CONSULTED 123

OBJECTIONS 1

SUPPORT 0

PETITION 0

Applicant A M Rentoul, C P Rentoul and J A Rentoul

PROPOSAL:

Erection of a rear extension at basement, ground, first and second floor levels to accommodate a secondary stair.

RBK&C Drawing No(s): PP/99/00996/A

Applicants Drawing No(s): 351/12B

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Refuse planning permission

REASON FOR REFUSAL

27
261

By reason of its size, location and detailed design, the proposed extension would detract from the appearance of the building and its neighbours to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Oxford Gardens St. Quintin Conservation Area of which these premises form a part. Therefore the development is considered to conflict with Council policy as stated in the Unitary Development Plan, notably Chapter 4 and Policies CD25, CD41, CD52 and CD53 and the Oxford Gardens St. Quintin Conservation Area Proposals Statement.

262

271

1.0 THE SITE

- 1.1 No. 60 is located on the northern side of Bassett Road between the junctions with St. Marks Road and St. Helen's Gardens.
- 1.2 The building is a detached house, built circa 1880, comprising basement and three storeys, part of a group of similar properties at this end of Bassett Road.
- 1.3 The premises are used as a school.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 It is proposed to erect a rear extension on basement to second floor levels to accommodate an additional staircase. The extensions would be centrally located, brick faced, project approximately 3.8 metres with canted bay type rear face and would have small windows on both flanks. It is noted that while the floor plans indicate a proposal for three windows at each level in the rear bay elevation, the intention is to have one window as shown on the submitted elevation.
- 2.2 The applicants state that this secondary staircase is required for fire escape purposes to enable use of the top floor by pupils.
- 2.3 The school has 117/125 primary school pupils aged 3 to 8 years. There are a total of six classrooms on basement, ground and first floors. The top floor is currently used as a staff room, head teacher's room, art materials store and dyslexia/specialist support coaching room (used for individual tuition). The applicants state that the secondary means of escape would enable use of the art materials store and coaching room for groups. The intention is to allow for more flexible use of the premises rather than to increase the school's capacity.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 Town Planning records indicate that use of parts of the premises as a school began in 1947. The use gradually expanded with the benefit of a succession of personal and/or limited period planning permissions between 1955 and 1969.
- 3.2 In 1981 a permanent and non-personal permission was granted for school use of various rooms on the ground and first floors. At that time it was noted that two ground floor rooms and one basement room had already acquired use rights as a school. The 1981 permission was accompanied by an informative that it was granted:-

272
263

"... on the understanding that the whole of the second floor will be retained and available for solely residential purposes."

3.3 However, residential use subsequently ceased and a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use was issued in respect of use of the whole premises as a school on 14 May 1998.

3.4 On 9th November 1998, planning permission was refused for the erection of a rear extension at basement, ground, first and second floor levels to accommodate a secondary stair. The reason for refusal was:

"By reason of its size, location and detailed design, the proposed extension would detract from the appearance of the building and its neighbours to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Oxford Gardens St. Quintin Conservation Area of which these premises form a part. Therefore, the development is considered to conflict with Council policy as stated in the Unitary Development Plan, notably Chapter 4 and Policies CD25, CD41, CD52 and CD53, and the Oxford Gardens St. Quintin Conservation Area Proposals Statement."

This scheme was almost identical to the current application, except that it features a windowless curved rear face instead of a canted bay, projected 4 metres instead of 3.8 metres and flank fenestration was different.

3.5 An appeal was made against this refusal on 19 January this year. The Council's Appeal Statement has been submitted but the Planning Inspectorate has decided to hold the appeal in abeyance for three months pending the outcome of the current application.

4.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 The main issue in this case is considered to be the effect of the development upon the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the Oxford Gardens St. Quintin Conservation Area. This must be weighed against the benefits that may accrue to the school and the service it provides as a result of the increased use of the top floor.

4.2 Relevant Unitary Development Plan Policies are:

CD25 (Standards of design and compatibility with surroundings)

CD41 (Rear extensions)

CD52 (Preservation or enhancement of conservation area character or appearance)

CD53 (Standards of design and compatibility with surroundings in conservation areas)

264

273

SC1 (Resistance to social and community facilities for non local demand)

SC5 (To permit social and community facilities for local demand subject to certain criteria)

SC10 (Resistance to education/training facilities unless primarily for local needs or for an established institution of national significance)

4.3 The Oxford Gardens St. Quintin Conservation Area Proposals Statement contains the following policy relating to rear extensions:

"Proposals will not be permitted if they would compromise architectural character or contribute to a serious loss of garden space." (C.A.P.S. p20)

4.4 No. 60 is one of a row of six buildings in this part of the street which are flat backed, with only shallow projection (i.e. 1.5 metres) basement and ground floor rear extensions. The proposed extension would be of much deeper projection (i.e. 3.8 metres), it would enclose the space between the property's original canted and rectangular bay extensions and would extend up to within 200mm of the building's main rear eaves roofline. The extension would appear out of character, both in terms of its scale and its detailed design.

4.5 The variations of the current application from the appeal scheme do not overcome the main problem which is one of unacceptability in principle. The Design Officer comments that the proposal is for a very strange, narrow, deep "tunnel" of an extension ending in a bay. Bays are usually attached to linear walls, not to deeply projecting extensions. At most, they might terminate a shallow rectangular projection, but will not extend across the whole width of such projection (as in the current application) Consequently, the Design Officer considers the proposed form odd and alien to the original architectural style and geometry. The resulting composition would still totally overpower the original low level shallow projection bays on this row of buildings. It would be out of keeping in scale and detail and would unbalance the group. The Design Officer concludes that the proposed development would certainly not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

4.6 It is considered that the extension would also set an undesirable precedent for further such extensions to the group of buildings, to the detriment of their appearance and further harming the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

4.7 Therefore, the proposed extension is considered to conflict with the above Unitary Development Plan and Conservation Area Proposals Statement policies. In particular, the proposal is considered to conflict with the following elements of Unitary Development Plan Policy CD41 i.e. CD41 (a), (b), (c), (d), (f) and (i).

4.8 A further consideration is whether the proposal would enable expansion of the school to the detriment of local amenity.

274
265

- 4.9 The applicants state that expansion of the school is not proposed. However, it is noted that the situation could change (e.g. under a different Head Teacher). If this were to happen, there is probably only limited scope for further classroom accommodation because of the need for ancillary space e.g. staff rooms and storage. Such increase might be limited to one additional classroom.

- 4.10 The school is long established at this address. The Council is not aware that local residential amenity has been adversely affected, in terms of playground noise. The school has been observed to generate traffic congestion at collection time. However, a minor increase of the scale referred to above is unlikely to have significant effect upon local amenity.

- 4.11 With reference to Policies SC1, SC5 and SC10, it is not known the extent to which the Bassett House School meets a local need. However, whatever the case, there is no overriding presumption in favour of expanding educational facilities. For example Unitary Development Plan Chapter 9 "Social and Community Facilities" paragraph 6.3 states:

"All proposals for education and training facilities will be subject to the other policies of the plan ..."

It is not considered that the benefits that the additional use of the top floor for group teaching would provide to the school outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

5.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 5.1 123 addresses in Bassett Road, St. Mark's Road and Kelfield Gardens were notified of the proposal.

- 5.2 One objection has been received from a nearby resident who refers to "horrendous" traffic, double parking and parking on yellow lines around the corner of Bassett Road and St. Helen's Gardens up to four times a day. She considers that if further internal space is provided for pupils, then the traffic situation could worsen.

As stated in paragraph 4.10 above, it is considered unlikely that the development would allow for significant increase.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 Refuse Planning Permission.

M.J. FRENCH
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND CONSERVATION

266
~~275~~

List of Background Papers:

The contents of file PP/99/00996 save for exempt or confidential information in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.

Report Prepared By: SW
Report Approved By: RT/LAWJ
Date Report Approved: 26/07/1999

PSC.99.08.SW.Rep

(276)
(267)

ADDENDUM REPORT BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLANNING &
CONSERVATION

PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE 12 AUGUST 1999

The Planning Services Committee is asked to note and agree the following amendments to the Committee reports for the NORTH area.

AGENDA ITEM 113
PP/99/0936

28 POWIS TERRACE, W11
Additional RBKC Drawing No: PP/99/00936/B
Amended Applicants Drawing No: 724/PP/101/B

AGENDA ITEM 115
PP/99/0996

60 BASSETT ROAD, W10
Councillor Cunningham has written to express his support for the recommendation to refuse planning permission.

AGENDA ITEM 116
PP/99/0369

FLAT 5, 79 LINDEN GARDEN, W2
One late letter of objection from a neighbouring occupier which whilst acknowledging the "hotch-potch" of alterations with gates and fences which have damaged the roof line, considers the structure to look like an igloo, adding virtually another floor to the building, and is out of character.

Response: This matter is addressed in the report.

Councillor Miss Weatherhead wishes to clarify that reference to her support of the objection made by the occupier of no.77 Linden Gardens in paragraph 5.2 of the report is erroneous. She has taken no view on the matter and has merely reported that she had received an objection from one of her electors.

AGENDA ITEM 117
PP/99/0493

201-209 KENSINGTON CHURCH STREET, W8
Twenty six late letters of support from local businesses, stating that Kensington Place is an asset to the local community and that the proposed extension will be beneficial to the area both to local trades people and to residents.

AGENDA ITEM 119
PP/99/0988

13 ELGIN CRESCENT, W11
WITHDRAWN FROM AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM 120
CA/99/0989

13 ELGIN CRESCENT, W11
WITHDRAWN FROM AGENDA