PLANNING AND CONSERVATION
THE TOWN HALL HORNTON STREET LONDON W8 7NX

Executive Director M J FRENCH FRICS Dip TP MRTPI Cert TS

THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA

D'Arcy Associates,
9 Lamington Street,
London,
W6 0HU

Switchboard: 020-7937-5464
Direct Line: 020-7361-3190
Extension: 3190
Facsimile: 020-7361-3463

- 3 SEP 2004

My Ref: PP/04/01550/CHSE /
Your Ref: 2322

Please ask for: Central Area Team

Dear Sir/Madam,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT, 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT ORDER, 1995

REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO DEVELOP (DP2)

The Borough Council in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Act and Order, hereby REFUSE to permit the development referred to in the under-mentioned Schedule as shown in the plans submitted. Your attention is drawn to the enclosed Information Sheet.

SCHEDULE

DEVELOPMENT:	Erection of rear extension at basement, ground floor and 1st floor half landing, and new windows to the side elevation at 1st floor, ground floor and basement level.
SITE ADDRESS:	**24 Scarsdale Villas, London, W8 6PR**
RBK&C Drawing Nos:	PP/04/01550
Applicant's Drawing Nos:	2322/PP1, /PP2, /PP3, /PP4, /PP5B, /PP6B, /PP7B, /PP8B and Photographs 2322/PP9
Application Dated:	08/07/2004
Application Completed:	09/07/2004

REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL OF PERMISSION ATTACHED OVERLEAF

REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL:

1. **The proposal to construct a full-width extension at lower and upper ground floor levels as well as a half-width extension at first floor level on a largely unaltered property within a conservation area is considered excessive in terms of bulk and scale and will lead to the further erosion of the character and appearance of the property. The proposal is also considered to result in considerable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area, which it fails to either preserve or enhance. The proposal is, therefore, considered not to comply with the Council's Unitary Development Plan policies, in particular, Policies CD27, CD33, CD36, CD47, CD48, CD57, CD61 and CD62.**

2. **The proposed extensions at no.24, if constructed in isolation of the same scheme proposed at the adjoining property of no.22, would result in a sense of enclosure and loss of light to that property in particular. The proposal is, therefore, considered not to comply with the Council's Unitary Development Plan policies, in particular, Policies CD33 and CD36.**

INFORMATIVE(S)

1. You are advised that a number of relevant policies of the Unitary Development Plan were used in the determination of this case, in particular, Policies CD27, CD33, CD36, CD47, CD48, CD57, CD61 and CD62. (I51)

Yours faithfully,

Michael J. French
Executive Director, Planning and Conservation

ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON & CHELSEA
REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLANNING & CONSERVATION

Date: 02/09/2004

DELEGATED

APP NO. PP/04/01550/CHSE

This application is for a class of development to be determined under powers delegated to me by the Council on 18th July, 2001 and is not a major, controversial or sensitive application nor one which a Ward Councillor has asked to be considered by Planning Services Committee.

Class - minor development

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Refuse planning permission

I hereby determine and refuse this application under the powers delegated to me by the Council, subject to the condition(s) indicated below imposed for the reason(s) appearing thereunder, or for the reasons stated.

Exec. Director, Planning and Conservation 03/9/04 | Head of Development Control 3/9/04 | Area Planning Officer 2/9/04.

ADDRESS OF SITE:
24 Scarsdale Villas, London, W8 6PR

APPLICATION DATED 08/07/2004

APPLICATION COMPLETE 09/07/2004

APPLICANT/AGENT ADDRESS:
D'Arcy Associates,
9 Lamington Street,
London,
W6 0HU

DELEGATED
- 3 SEP 2004
REFUSAL

APPLICANT: Mr. & Mrs. Lajam,

CONS AREA Edwardes Square/Scarsdale/Abi

CAPS Yes

ART '4' No

WARD Abingdon

LISTED BUILDING No

ENG. HERITAGE N/A

CONSULTED 22

OBJ. 7

SUP. 0

PET. 0

PROPOSAL: Erection of rear extension at basement, ground floor and 1st floor half landing, and new windows to the side elevation at 1st floor, ground floor and basement level.

RBK&C Drawing No(s): PP/04/01550
Applicant's Drawing No(s) 2322/PP1, /PP2, /PP3, /PP4, /PP5B, /PP6B, /PP7B, /PP8B and Photographs 2322/PP9

1. **The proposal to construct a full-width extension at lower and upper ground floor levels as well as a half-width extension at first floor level on a largely unaltered property within a conservation area is considered excessive in terms of bulk and scale and will lead to the further erosion of the character and appearance of the property. The proposal is also considered to result in considerable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area, which it fails to either preserve or enhance. The proposal is, therefore, considered not to comply with the Council's Unitary Development Plan policies, in particular, Policies CD27, CD47, CD48, CD57, CD61 and CD62.**

2. **The proposed extensions at no.24, if constructed in isolation of the same scheme proposed at the adjoining property of no.22, would result in a sense of enclosure and loss of light to that property in particular. The proposal is, therefore, considered not to comply with the Council's Unitary Development Plan policies, in particular, Policies CD33 and CD36.**

INFORMATIVE(S)

1. You are advised that a number of relevant policies of the Unitary Development Plan were used in the determination of this case, in particular, Policies CD27, CD33, CD36, CD47, CD48, CD57, CD61 and CD62. (I51)

1.0 THE SITE

1.1 No.24 is one of a pair of semi-detached houses located midway along the north side of Scarsdale Villas. Marloes Road runs north to south on the east side whilst Allen Street runs north to south on the west side. The property is comprised of basement, ground and three upper storeys and is one of only a few of houses along Scarsdale Villas that remains largely unaltered.

1.2 The property, which is in use as a single family dwelling, is not listed but does lie within the Edwards Square, Scarsdale and Abingdon Conservation Area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 Planning permission is being sought for the erection of a three storey rear extension at basement, ground and first floor levels and the provision of a conservatory at rear ground floor level.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 Planning permission was sought in August 2003 for the provision of a rear extension at basement, ground, first and second floor levels with a conservatory extension at rear ground floor level as well as a basement level extension at the front of the building and the provision of a hardstanding. That application was withdrawn by the applicant in September 2003.

3.2 A further application was submitted in January 2004, again, seeking planning permission for the erection of an extension at basement, ground, first and second floor levels together with other elevational alterations. That application was also withdrawn by the applicant in March 2004.

3.3 This current application is a further revision of the two applications previously submitted for this authority's consideration.

4.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 The main considerations in this case relate to the impact which the proposed development will have upon the character and appearance of the building itself and of the surrounding conservation area. Any implications that the proposal will have upon the existing amenities of the neighbouring properties is also a material consideration. The following Unitary Development Plan policies are considered of particular relevance in the determination of this application:

CD27 - standards of design
CD33 - development affecting sunlight or daylight
CD36 - sense of enclosure
CD47 - rear extensions
CD48 - conservatory development
CD57 - preserve or enhance the conservation area
CD61 - preserve and enhance the conservation area
CD62 - standards of design in conservation areas

4.2 It is proposed to construct a full-width extension at basement level to provide a play room, with an opening leading out to the rear garden. At ground floor level, it is also proposed to construct a full-width extension albeit in two parts: one half would be a solid construction following up from the proposed extension at basement level whilst the other half would take the form of a lightweight conservatory-like structure. It is also proposed to construct an additional storey at first floor level above the proposed ground floor level extension in order to provide a study.

4.3 Nos. 22 and 24 are the only pair of semi-detached villas along the north side of Scarsdale Villas that remain unaltered. The rear facade of this pair survives in its original un-extended scale and ~~will~~ all original window openings. A number of the other pairs of houses along the north side have been substantially and, often insensitively extended and altered over the years, many of which there is no record of planning permission having either been sought or granted. In many cases, over half of the original main rear facades have been covered up by bulky extensions that have insensitive design detail which has eroded the ~~character~~ of the villa properties over time. These extensions represent the unwelcome, overdevelopment of properties which the current UDP policies relating to conservation are aiming to prevent.

4.4 The proposal forming the basis of this application includes a full-width solid extension at lower ground floor and a virtually full-width extension at upper ground floor level. Whilst the half-width extensions at all three floor levels may be acceptable, full-width extensions are not welcome, not only at this site but in the majority of cases within the Borough and would be contrary to the Council's UDP policies relating to rear extensions. It is considered, therefore, that the proposal to extend the property, which will involve covering up more than half of the main rear facade of the building ~~and~~ which would not be visually subordinate to the parent building, would seriously erode the surviving original scale and elevational appearance of this pair of houses.

4.5 An application for planning permission has also been submitted in

respect of no.22 for a scheme the same as that which is under consideration as part of this application. The proposed extensions will project rearward by up to 3.5m which is a depth similar to other existing extensions along the terrace. However, given that no extensions currently exist at either address, the proposed extensions will result in an increased sense of enclosure for the adjoining properties. Although it could be argued that extending both properties in a similar manner would balance the appearance of the buildings, unless both schemes were implemented simultaneously, the impact of the proposed extensions would be particularly damaging for either property as it would result in a sense of enclosure and loss of light. Although there would be some effect on the other neighbouring property, no. 26, it is not considered that this would be such as to warrent refusal of the application on this grounds alone.

4.6 In any event, the proposal is considered unacceptable in principal and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the building itself or of the surrounding conservation area. The proposal is considered not to comply with the Council's UDP policies, in particular, Policies CD27, CD33, CD36, CD47, CD48, CD57, CD61 and CD62. and consequently,

5.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION

5.1 Twenty-two properties along Scarsdale Villas, Abingdon Villas and Abingdon Gardens were notified of this application. To date, seven letters of objection have been received.

5.2 The objections can be summarised as follows:

- intrusive and unsightly development
- extensions are not in-keeping with the area
- overlooking of private space
- loss of light
- loss of garden space

5.3 It is considered that all issues raised by the objectors have been addressed in the main body of this report.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

6.1 Refuse planning permission.

M.J. FRENCH
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND CONSERVATION

Background Papers

The contents of file PP/04/01550 save for exempt or confidential information in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.

Report Prepared By: ER
Report Approved By: PK/LAWJ
Date Report Approved:

PLANNING AND CONSERVATION
THE TOWN HALL HORNTON STREET LONDON W8 7NX

Executive Director M J FRENCH FRICS Dip TP MRTPI Cert TS

THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA

D'Arcy Associates,
9 Lamington Street,
London,
W6 0HU

Switchboard: 020-7937-5464
Direct Line: 020-7361-3190
Extension: 3190
Facsimile: 020-7361-3463

3 SEP 2004

My Ref: PP/04/01549/CHSE
Your Ref: 2323

Please ask for: Central Area Team

Dear Sir/Madam,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT, 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT ORDER, 1995

REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO DEVELOP (DP2)

The Borough Council in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Act and Order, hereby REFUSE to permit the development referred to in the under-mentioned Schedule as shown in the plans submitted. Your attention is drawn to the enclosed Information Sheet.

SCHEDULE

DEVELOPMENT:	Erection of rear extension at basement, ground floor and 1st floor half landing.
SITE ADDRESS:	**22 Scarsdale Villas, London, W8 6PR**
RBK&C Drawing Nos:	PP/04/01549
Applicant's Drawing Nos:	2323/PP1, /PP2, /PP3, /PP4, /PP5B, /PP6B, /PP7B, /PP8B, /PP9.
Application Dated:	08/07/2004
Application Completed:	09/07/2004

REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL OF PERMISSION ATTACHED OVERLEAF

REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL:

1. **The proposal to construct a full-width extension at lower and upper ground floor levels as well as a half-width extension at first floor level on a largely unaltered property within a conservation area is considered excessive in terms of bulk and scale and will lead to the further erosion of the character and appearance of the property. The proposal is also considered to result in considerable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area, which it fails to either preserve or enhance. The proposal is, therefore, considered not to comply with the Council's Unitary Development Plan policies, in particular, Policies CD27, CD47, CD48, CD57, CD61 and CD62.**

2. **The proposed extensions at No. 22, if constructed in isolation of the same scheme proposed at the adjoining property at No. 24, would result in a sense of enclosure and loss of light to that property in particular. The proposal is, therefore, considered not to comply with the Council's Unitary Development Plan policies, in particular, Policies CD33 and CD36.**

INFORMATIVE(S)

1. You are advised that a number of relevant policies of the Unitary Development Plan were used in the determination of this case, in particular, Policies CD27, CD33, CD36, CD47, CD48, CD57, CD61 and CD62. (I51)

Yours faithfully,

M J French.

Michael J French
Executive Director, Planning and Conservation