
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**



Geoff Beardsley & Partners Ltd.,
4 Whitton Road,
Twickenham,
Middx.
TW1 1BJ

Switchboard: 020-7937-5464
Direct Line: 020-7361-2011
Extension: 2011
Facsimile: 020-7361-3463

**KENSINGTON
AND CHELSEA**

16 FEB 2001

My Ref: PP/00/02779/CHSE

Please ask for: Central Area Team

Dear Sir/Madam,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT, 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING GENERAL DEVELOPMENT ORDER, 1988

REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO DEVELOP (DP2)

The Borough Council in pursuance of their 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: Enlargement of the existing front lightwell and the formation of access steps from garden level to basement level and the erection of an extension to back addition at second floor level.

SITE ADDRESS: 23 Campden Grove, London, W8 4JQ

RBK&C Drawing Nos: PP/00/02779

Applicant's Drawing Nos: 2004/1, 2004/4, 2004/13a and 2004/14a

Application Dated: 30/11/2000

Application Completed: 04/12/2000

REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL OF PERMISSION ATTACHED OVERLEAF

REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL:

1. The proposed rear extension at second floor level is considered to be unacceptable in that it would introduce a feature that would appear incongruous to the original design of the property and would be out of character with the existing pattern of development within the terrace. If permitted, the development would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which the Council considers desirable to preserve or enhance, in compliance with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. In this respect, the proposal is contrary to Policies CD25, CD41, CD52, and CD53 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposed rear extension at second floor level is considered to be unacceptable in that it would constitute an unneighbourly form of development by virtue of its bulk, high level location and proximity to the party boundaries with No.23a Campden Grove and Nos.74 and 76 Hornton Street, and would result in an undue cliff-like effect and an increased sense of enclosure, particularly to the ground floor and basement levels of these properties. In this respect, the extension is contrary to Policy CD41 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy CD30a of the Unitary Development Plan Proposed Alterations.

INFORMATIVE

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 CD25, CD28, CD30, CD41, CD52 and CD53 and also CD30a of the Unitary Development Plan Proposed Alterations. (151)

Yours faithfully,



Michael J. French
Executive Director, Planning and Conservation