

PLEASE INDEX AS

OTHER DOCUMENTS UPDATES

FILE No. TP/99/0733

JAN. FEB. MCH. APL. MAY. JUNE JUL. AUG. SEPT. OCT. NOV. DEC

PART 1

PART 9

PART 2

PART 10

PART 3

PART 11

PART 4

PART 12

PART 5

PART 13

PART 6

PART 14

PART 7

PART 15

PART 8

PART 16



9 Harley Street, London W1N 2AJ. Telephone: 0171-637 8471 Facsimile: 0171-631 0536
E-mail: surveyor@wilks-head.co.uk

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Planning Department
Town Hall
Hornton Street
LONDON W8 7NX

For the attention of Mr D Taylor

Our reference SBL/SM/5230
Your reference
Date 28th May 1999

Dear Sirs

Re: AUBREY WALK and CAMPDEN HILL RESERVOIR

Thank you for your instructions to undertake an assessment of the daylight and sunlight implications arising out of the development proposed at Campden Hill Reservoir with specific reference to the properties on the north side of Aubrey Walk and Kensington Heights on Campden Hill Road.

I have now had an opportunity of inspecting site and have completed my study.

The context for my instruction is Unitary Development Plan Policy CD28 and the Building Research Establishment report dated 1991 entitled "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight". I have therefore based my study on the criteria set out in the Guide. You have provided me with a set of the planning application drawings which comprise survey drawings prepared by Aworth Land Surveys Ltd, drawings Nos.8809(3of6), 8809(4of6), 8809(5of6), 9029(3of4), 9029(4of4), 9132/3, 9132/4, 9132/5, 9132/6, 9029/9132/1 and Broadway Malyon Architects drawings Nos.P009, P100, P101, P102, P103, P104, P105, P106, P107, P108, P109, P110, P111, P112, P113, 100 and 101.

Daylight

The Guide to Good Practice suggests that "daylighting of an existing building may be adversely affected" if the vertical sky component at the centre point of the main window is less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value. The Guide states that living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens are important and that, although they are less important, bedrooms should also be analysed.

Properties onto Aubrey Walk

I have made an assessment of the vertical sky components to ground and first floor windows to the properties at 2-24 Aubrey Walk. These results are appended to the rear of this report.

/Continued...

Partners: A G Leech (RICS LR) | Dewar FRICS (RVA) | R G Messenger BSc FRICS (RVA) | H J Schöpp BSc (Hons) ARICS | S B Laing Dip (S) ARICS
Associates: S A Hayfield (SVA) | C K Morton Dip (S) ARICS | L Peacock FSA (RVA) | A M Williams Dip (S) ARICS (RVA) | Consultant: E Roe (RICS)
Registered to BS EN ISO 9001

IN ASSOCIATION WITH DIXON WEBB CHARTERED SURVEYORS

Liverpool Chester Kendal Warrington Whitehaven

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Planning Department

- 2 -

28th May 1999

You will see that, in the majority of cases, the windows to these properties currently enjoy a vertical sky component in excess of 27% as recommended by the Guide. There will be a small reduction in the vertical sky component to a number of the windows serving these premises, however in all but three windows the vertical sky components retain in excess of 27% and where the vertical sky component drops below 27% the windows retain between 86.91% and 98.57% of their previous values. Although these windows will experience a small reduction in vertical sky component I do not consider these reductions to be significant.

Kensington Heights

A number of windows at ground floor level within the property known as Kensington Heights serve office accommodation and secondary accommodation. Some of the windows serve flats, however these are well set back from the boundary and I do not consider that the daylight to these rooms will be materially affected by the current proposals.

I have made a detailed analysis of the windows at first floor level within Kensington Heights which I consider are most likely to be affected by the proposed redevelopment. There will be reductions in the access of daylight to a number of the windows at first floor level, the most significant of these reductions are to the first floor windows at the northmost elevation which face directly the proposed flats referred to on the drawings as Campden Hill Flats. My analysis of the windows along this elevation demonstrate that the vertical sky component to ten windows would be reduced to less than 0.8 times their former values. In addition, two windows along the west facing elevation will also be reduced to below 0.8 times their previous value.

I have not had an opportunity to inspect the interior parts of this building, however I have obtained, from records held at the Planning Department copies of the floor plans and have used these to make an assessment of the internal layout to allow me to consider the daylight distribution within these rooms. The ten windows referred to above serve a total of seven rooms, and I attach a summary sheet indicating my assessment of the reduction in access of daylight to the rooms which are served by the windows which failed the initial criteria set by the Guide in relation to vertical sky components. These assessments have been taken at table height.

Room R1/71 is the eastmost room to the north elevation which is served by light from no other source. This room is identified on the plans as being a bedroom and you will see from the attached summary that it is the room most significantly affected by the proposals retaining 0.58 times its previously available daylight at table plane.

Room R2/71 may be considered a more important room as this is identified on the plans as serving a living room/bedroom, part of a studio flat. This room will retain daylight distribution amounting to 0.62 times its former value.

/Continued...

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Planning Department

- 3 -

28th May 1999

As you will see from the attached summary, the effect of the reduction in vertical sky components to the remainder of the rooms affected are small. I do not consider them to be of a material nature.

I should confirm that I have made my assessment, taking account of the existence of the oversailing balconies and indeed an oversailing balcony does exist over Room R2/71, although not over Room R1/71. Balconies, as Mr Fleming notes in his report, do have the effect of reducing sky availability to a room and can indeed play what may amount to inequitable burdens on the redevelopment of adjoining sites.

Paragraph 3.11 in Chapter 3 "Control of Development" of the Borough's Unitary Development Plan advises that "the good neighbourliness of an existing property will also be relevant, for example some buildings are situated very close to the property boundary and would impose significant and unreasonable constraints on adjoining properties if standards were rigidly applied." Room R1/71 however has no balcony restricting its access of daylight and the elevation itself is not constructed hard up against the boundary line.

Sunlight

The Guide advises that the effect of a development on sunlight availability to adjoining buildings should be considered if part of a development falls within 90° of due south of a "main window wall of an adjoining building". It advises that all main living rooms of dwellings and conservatories should be checked if they have a window facing within 90° of due south. Kitchens and bedrooms are stated to be less important, although care should be taken not to block too much sun.

The Guide advises that, if a window can receive one quarter of annual probable sunlight hours including at least 25% of annual probable sunlight hours during the winter months, then the room should still receive enough sunlight. If the available sunlight hours are both less than the amount given and less than 0.8 times their former value, either over the whole year or during the winter months, then the occupants of the existing building will notice the loss of sunlight.

2-24 Aubrey Walk

On completion of the development each of the properties along the north side of Aubrey Walk will retain in excess of the recommended level for sunlight availability and therefore the criteria for sunlight set by the Guide are met in respect of these properties. Although there will be a reduction in the access of sunlight to these properties, I do not consider these to be of a serious nature.

/Continued...

(3)

Wilks Head and Eve

CHARTERED SURVEYORS

9 Harley Street, London W1N 2AL Telephone (0171) 637 8471 Facsimile (0171) 631 0536

Analysis of Vertical Sky Components arising out of the proposed redevelopment of Campden Hill Reservoir

Room	Window	EXISTING VSC	PROPOSED VSC	LOSS VSC	Proportion of Existing
<u>2-6 Aubrey Walk</u>					
<u>Ground Floor</u>					
R1/10	W1/10	35.01	27.23	7.78	77.78
R2/10	W2/10	35.66	27.46	8.2	77.01
R3/10	W3/10	36.17	27.77	8.4	76.78
R3/10	W5/10	24.63	24.63	0	100.00
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/11	W1/11	36.56	30.53	6.03	83.51
R1/11	W2/11	36.8	30.6	6.2	83.15
R2/11	W4/10	36.39	28.01	8.38	76.97
R2/11	W3/11	37.05	30.72	6.33	82.91
R3/11	W5/11	37.34	31.04	6.3	83.13
R3/11	W6/11	37.43	31.23	6.2	83.44
<u>8-16 Aubrey Walk</u>					
<u>Ground Floor</u>					
R1/20	W1/20	32.8	27.73	5.07	84.54
R1/20	W2/20	36.92	30.87	6.05	83.61
R1/20	W3/20	33.93	29.52	4.41	87.00
R2/20	W4/20	33.21	28.87	4.34	86.93
R2/20	W5/20	36.6	31.88	4.72	87.10
R2/20	W8/20	32.1	29.04	3.06	90.47
R3/20	W7/20	32.46	28.41	4.05	87.52
R3/20	W8/20	36.21	32.08	4.13	88.59
R3/20	W9/20	32.18	29.68	2.5	92.23
R4/20	W10/20	32.72	29.88	2.84	91.32
R4/20	W11/20	34.29	32.03	2.26	93.41
R4/20	W12/20	28.87	28	0.87	96.99
R5/20	W13/20	31.05	28.95	2.1	93.24
R5/20	W14/20	32.89	31.5	1.39	95.77
R5/20	W15/20	25.9	25.53	0.37	98.57
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/21	W1/21	37.84	33.9	3.94	89.59
R2/21	W2/21	37.79	34.4	3.39	91.03
R2/21	W3/21	37.69	34.55	3.14	91.67
R3/21	W4/21	37.47	34.68	2.79	92.55
R3/21	W8/21	37.33	34.9	2.43	93.49
R4/21	W5/21	36.85	34.77	2.08	94.36
R4/21	W8/21	36.47	34.79	1.68	95.39
R5/21	W7/21	35.88	34.74	1.14	96.82
R5/21	W9/21	35.55	34.85	0.7	98.03

4

Room	Window	EXISTING VSC	PROPOSED VSC	LOSS VSC	Proportion of Existing
18 Aubrey Walk					
<u>Ground Floor</u>					
R1/30	W1/30	29.98	30.41	-0.43	101.43
R2/30	W2/30	29.52	28.95	0.57	98.07
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/31	W1/31	32.27	33.25	-0.98	103.04
R2/31	W2/31	32.53	32.45	0.08	99.75
20 Aubrey Walk					
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/41	W1/41	33.07	31.7	1.37	95.86
R2/41	W2/41	34.48	32.84	1.64	95.24
R2/41	W3/41	34.86	32.88	1.98	94.32
R2/41	W4/41	35.16	32.96	2.2	93.74
22 Aubrey Walk					
<u>Ground Floor</u>					
R1/50	W1/50	32.25	27.79	4.46	86.17
R1/50	W2/50	32.55	27.9	4.65	85.71
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/51	W1/51	35.56	33.07	2.49	93.00
R1/51	W2/51	36.02	33.35	2.67	92.59
24 Aubrey Walk					
<u>Ground Floor</u>					
R1/60	W1/60	30.48	26.49	3.99	86.91
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/61	W1/61	33.07	29.98	3.09	90.66
Kensington Heights					
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/71	W1/71	33.16	25.05	8.11	75.54
R1/71	W2/71	31.46	23.03	8.43	73.20
R2/71	W3/71	12.81	6.24	6.57	48.71
R2/71	W4/71	12.03	3.72	8.31	30.92
R3/71	W5/71	9.79	7.36	2.43	75.18
R3/71	W6/71	32.28	22.91	9.37	70.97
R4/71	W7/71	33.47	25.83	7.84	76.58
R4/71	W8/71	10.29	9.3	0.99	90.38
R5/71	W9/71	13.96	9.97	3.99	71.42
R5/71	W10/71	14.29	10.09	4.2	70.61
R6/71	W11/71	27.65	23.65	4	85.53
R6/71	W12/71	32.68	28.4	4.26	86.96
R7/71	W13/71	34.11	30.28	3.83	88.77
R7/71	W14/71	20.96	17.24	3.72	82.25
R7/71	W15/71	11.34	8.97	2.37	79.10
R8/71	W16/71	10.36	9.83	0.53	94.88
R8/71	W17/71	35.87	31.97	3.9	89.13
R10/71	W18/71	27.07	24.02	3.05	88.73
R11/71	W19/71	25.35	22.61	2.74	89.19
R12/71	W20/71	31.15	29.32	1.83	94.13
R12/71	W22/71	19.8	13.71	6.09	69.24
R12/71	W23/71	20.78	14.48	6.3	69.68
R13/71	W21/71	39.45	32.35	7.1	82.00
R14/71	W24/71	34.04	27.71	6.33	81.40
R15/71	W25/71	36.16	29.91	6.25	82.72
R16/71	W26/71	39.5	32.72	6.78	82.84

① 53589
an error

② 48.71

⑤

Room	Window	EXISTING VSC	PROPOSED VSC	LOSS VSC	Proportion of Existing
<u>Kensington Heights</u>					
<u>First Floor</u>					
R16/71	W27/71	18.8	17.94	0.86	95.43
R17/71	W28/71	28.14	22.76	5.38	80.88
R18/71	W29/71	38.81	32.86	5.95	84.67
R19/71	W30/71	35.78	30.34	5.44	84.80
R20/71	W31/71	19.52	17.98	1.54	92.11
R22/71	W33/71	26.73	25.59	1.14	95.74
R24/71	W34/71	31.53	29.81	1.72	94.54
R24/71	W35/71	16.74	14.93	1.81	89.19
R25/71	W36/71	19.84	17.95	1.89	90.47
R26/71	W37/71	7.05	5.99	1.06	84.96
R26/71	W38/71	38.29	36.43	1.86	95.14
R27/71	W39/71	38.82	37.09	1.73	95.54
R27/71	W40/71	12	12	0	100.00
R28/71	W41/71	13.34	12.97	0.37	97.23
R28/71	W42/71	23.15	21.65	1.5	93.52

Wilks Head and Eve

CHARTERED SURVEYORS

9 Harley Street, London W1N 2AL Telephone (0171) 637 8471 Facsimile (0171) 631 0536

Analysis of daylight distribution within rooms served by windows in Kensington Heights which do not meet the recommendations of Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice in relation to Vertical Sky Components following construction of the proposed buildings at Campden Reservoir

Table of Areas (sq. ft.) and Analysis of Loss

Room/	Use of	Whole	Prev	New	Loss	% of original daylight available following redevelopment
Floor	Room	Room	>0.2%	>0.2%		
R1/71	Bedroom	128.1	119.3	95.1	24.2	79.72
R2/71	Living/Bed	279.1	228.8	142.8	86	62.41
R3/71	Kitchen	86.7	85.4	78.4	7	91.80
R4/71	Kitchen	86.5	85.2	81	4.2	95.07
R5/71	Living/Bed	276	222	218.9	3.1	98.60
R7/71	Living Room	288.2	225.8	218.4	7.5	96.72
R12/71	Living Room	293.3	276.6	274.2	2.5	99.13

7

Wilks Head and Eve

CHARTERED SURVEYORS

9 Harley Street, London W1N 2AL Telephone (0171) 637 8471 Facsimile (0171) 631 0536

Available sunlight as a percentage of
annual unobstructed total (1486.0 Hrs)

Position	EXISTING			PROPOSED			LOSS Total
	Summer	Winter	Total	Summer	Winter	Total	
<u>2-6 Aubrey Walk</u>							
<u>Ground Floor</u>							
W1/10	45	23	68	44	14	58	10
W2/10	45	24	69	44	13	57	12
W3/10	42	23	65	41	14	55	10
W4/10	42	23	65	41	14	55	10
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/11	42	24	66	42	17	59	7
W2/11	42	24	66	42	17	59	7
W3/11	42	24	66	42	18	60	6
W5/11	42	24	66	42	18	60	6
W6/11	42	23	65	42	18	60	5
<u>8-16 Aubrey Walk</u>							
<u>Ground Floor</u>							
W1/20	32	10	42	32	5	37	5
W2/20	39	21	60	39	16	55	5
W3/20	29	22	51	29	20	49	2
W4/20	32	10	42	31	8	39	3
W5/20	52	24	76	51	22	73	3
W6/20	27	21	48	27	21	48	0
W7/20	32	10	42	31	9	40	2
W8/20	46	21	67	45	22	67	0
W9/20	29	21	50	29	21	50	0
W10/20	32	11	43	32	10	42	1
W11/20	46	21	67	46	22	68	-1
W12/20	27	17	44	27	20	47	-3
W13/20	32	9	41	32	9	41	0
W14/20	46	18	64	46	18	64	0
W15/20	27	12	39	27	14	41	-2
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/21	47	26	73	47	25	72	1
W2/21	45	24	69	45	23	68	1
W3/21	47	27	74	47	26	73	1
W4/21	47	27	74	47	26	73	1
W5/21	45	24	69	45	24	69	0
W6/21	47	27	74	47	27	74	0
W7/21	47	26	73	47	27	74	-1
W8/21	34	23	57	34	22	56	1
W9/21	34	21	55	34	22	56	-1

Position	EXISTING			PROPOSED			LOSS Total
	Summer	Winter	Total	Summer	Winter	Total	
18 Aubrey Walk							
<u>Ground Floor</u>							
W1/30	46	14	60	46	17	63	-3
W2/30	47	18	65	47	17	64	1
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/31	43	19	62	43	22	65	-3
W2/31	44	22	66	44	22	66	0
20 Aubrey Walk							
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/41	41	19	60	41	20	61	-1
W2/41	41	18	59	41	21	62	-3
W3/41	40	19	59	40	22	62	-3
W4/41	41	19	60	41	21	62	-2
22 Aubrey Walk							
<u>Ground Floor</u>							
W1/50	43	17	60	45	12	57	3
W2/50	43	17	60	44	12	56	4
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/51	46	22	68	46	22	68	0
W2/51	46	22	68	46	23	69	-1
24 Aubrey Walk							
<u>Ground Floor</u>							
W1/60	46	17	63	47	14	61	2
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/61	49	24	73	50	22	72	1
Kensington Heights							
<u>First Floor</u>							
W14/71	16	8	24	16	6	22	2
W15/71	11	2	13	10	1	11	2
W17/71	33	8	41	32	6	38	3
W18/71	28	5	33	27	3	30	3
W19/71	17	2	19	16	1	17	2
W21/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W22/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W23/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W24/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W25/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W26/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W27/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W28/71	26	11	37	23	8	31	6
W29/71	31	15	46	29	13	42	4
W30/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W31/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W32/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W33/71	26	16	42	26	16	42	0
W34/71	27	11	38	25	11	36	2
W35/71	12	9	21	11	9	20	1
W36/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W38/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W39/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W40/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W41/71	6	10	16	6	10	16	0
W42/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

9

PC → DT

9 Harley Street, London W1N 2AL Telephone: 0171-637 8471 Facsimile: 0171-631 0536
E-mail: surveyor@wilks-head.co.uk

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Planning Department
Town Hall
Hornton Street
LONDON W8 7NX

For the attention of Mr D Taylor

Our reference **SBL/SM/5230**
Your reference
Date **28th May 1999**

✓
2-6

RECEIVED BY PLANNING SERVICES									
EX DIR	HDC	N			SE	ENF	AO	ACK	
02 JUN 1999									
APPEALS	IO	REC	ARE	FWD	CON	FEES			

(16)

Dear Sirs

Re: **AUBREY WALK and CAMPDEN HILL RESERVOIR**

Thank you for your instructions to undertake an assessment of the daylight and sunlight implications arising out of the development proposed at Campden Hill Reservoir with specific reference to the properties on the north side of Aubrey Walk and Kensington Heights on Campden Hill Road.

I have now had an opportunity of inspecting site and have completed my study.

The context for my instruction is Unitary Development Plan Policy CD28 and the Building Research Establishment report dated 1991 entitled "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight". I have therefore based my study on the criteria set out in the Guide. You have provided me with a set of the planning application drawings which comprise survey drawings prepared by Aworth Land Surveys Ltd, drawings Nos.8809(3of6), 8809(4of6), 8809(5of6), 9029(3of4), 9029(4of4), 9132/3, 9132/4, 9132/5, 9132/6, 9029/9132/1 and Broadway Malyon Architects drawings Nos.P009, P100, P101, P102, P103; P104, P105, P106, P107, P108, P109, P110, P111, P112, P113, 100 and 101.

Daylight

The Guide to Good Practice suggests that "daylighting of an existing building may be adversely affected" if the vertical sky component at the centre point of the main window is less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value. The Guide states that living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens are important and that, although they are less important, bedrooms should also be analysed.

Properties onto Aubrey Walk

I have made an assessment of the vertical sky components to ground and first floor windows to the properties at 2-24 Aubrey Walk. These results are appended to the rear of this report.

/Continued...

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Planning Department

- 2 -

28th May 1999

You will see that, in the majority of cases, the windows to these properties currently enjoy a vertical sky component in excess of 27% as recommended by the Guide. There will be a small reduction in the vertical sky component to a number of the windows serving these premises, however in all but three windows the vertical sky components retain in excess of 27% and where the vertical sky component drops below 27% the windows retain between 86.91% and 98.57% of their previous values. Although these windows will experience a small reduction in vertical sky component I do not consider these reductions to be significant.

Kensington Heights

A number of windows at ground floor level within the property known as Kensington Heights serve office accommodation and secondary accommodation. Some of the windows serve flats, however these are well set back from the boundary and I do not consider that the daylight to these rooms will be materially affected by the current proposals.

I have made a detailed analysis of the windows at first floor level within Kensington Heights which I consider are most likely to be affected by the proposed redevelopment. There will be reductions in the access of daylight to a number of the windows at first floor level, the most significant of these reductions are to the first floor windows at the northmost elevation which face directly the proposed flats referred to on the drawings as Campden Hill Flats. My analysis of the windows along this elevation demonstrate that the vertical sky component to ten windows would be reduced to less than 0.8 times their former values. In addition, two windows along the west facing elevation will also be reduced to below 0.8 times their previous value.

I have not had an opportunity to inspect the interior parts of this building, however I have obtained, from records held at the Planning Department copies of the floor plans and have used these to make an assessment of the internal layout to allow me to consider the daylight distribution within these rooms. The ten windows referred to above serve a total of seven rooms, and I attach a summary sheet indicating my assessment of the reduction in access of daylight to the rooms which are served by the windows which failed the initial criteria set by the Guide in relation to vertical sky components. These assessments have been taken at table height.

Room R1/71 is the eastmost room to the north elevation which is served by light from no other source. This room is identified on the plans as being a bedroom and you will see from the attached summary that it is the room most significantly affected by the proposals retaining 0.58 times its previously available daylight at table plane.

Room R2/71 may be considered a more important room as this is identified on the plans as serving a living room/bedroom, part of a studio flat. This room will retain daylight distribution amounting to 0.62 times its former value.

/Continued...

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Planning Department

- 3 -

28th May 1999

As you will see from the attached summary, the effect of the reduction in vertical sky components to the remainder of the rooms affected are small. I do not consider them to be of a material nature.

I should confirm that I have made my assessment, taking account of the existence of the oversailing balconies and indeed an oversailing balcony does exist over Room R2/71, although not over Room R1/71. Balconies, as Mr Fleming notes in his report, do have the effect of reducing sky availability to a room and can indeed play what may amount to inequitable burdens on the redevelopment of adjoining sites.

Paragraph 3.11 in Chapter 3 "Control of Development" of the Borough's Unitary Development Plan advises that "the good neighbourliness of an existing property will also be relevant, for example some buildings are situated very close to the property boundary and would impose significant and unreasonable constraints on adjoining properties if standards were rigidly applied." Room R1/71 however has no balcony restricting its access of daylight and the elevation itself is not constructed hard up against the boundary line.

Sunlight

The Guide advises that the effect of a development on sunlight availability to adjoining buildings should be considered if part of a development falls within 90° of due south of a "main window wall of an adjoining building". It advises that all main living rooms of dwellings and conservatories should be checked if they have a window facing within 90° of due south. Kitchens and bedrooms are stated to be less important, although care should be taken not to block too much sun.

The Guide advises that, if a window can receive one quarter of annual probable sunlight hours including at least 25% of annual probable sunlight hours during the winter months, then the room should still receive enough sunlight. If the available sunlight hours are both less than the amount given and less than 0.8 times their former value, either over the whole year or during the winter months, then the occupants of the existing building will notice the loss of sunlight.

2-24 Aubrey Walk

On completion of the development each of the properties along the north side of Aubrey Walk will retain in excess of the recommended level for sunlight availability and therefore the criteria for sunlight set by the Guide are met in respect of these properties. Although there will be a reduction in the access of sunlight to these properties, I do not consider these to be of a serious nature.

/Continued...

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Planning Department

- 4 -

28th May 1999

Kensington Heights

The west elevation of Kensington Heights faces slightly south and therefore enjoys a limited amount of sun at the present time. There will be some small reduction in the access of sunlight to the first floor flats, although I do not consider these in general to be serious. Window 19/71 which serves a living room towards the north end of the west elevation at first floor level will suffer diminution in the access of sunlight from 19% of annual available sunlight hours to 17%, with the sunlight available during the winter months being reduced from 2% to 1%. Where other reductions below the recommended level occur, these are to window W15/71, which is a small window serving a living room also served by window W14/71, and to window W18/71 which serves a bedroom.

St George's Church, Aubrey Walk

You have advised me that concerns have been raised with regard to the access of sunlight to the stone porch forming the entranceway to St George's Church. I have made an assessment of the available sun on the ground to this area. The Guide recommends that this assessment is made at the Spring equinox, i.e. on 21st March, and that the analysis considers the percentage of amenity space which would receive no sun at all on that day. There will be no reduction in the availability of sun on ground to this area as a result of the current proposals as at the recommended date.

I trust that the above is sufficient for your purposes, however should you require any further advice please do not hesitate to get in touch with me.

Yours sincerely



SANDRA BLAIN
SUNLIGHT AND DAYLIGHT CONSULTANT

Enc.

Wilks Head and Eve

CHARTERED SURVEYORS

9 Harley Street, London W1N 2AL Telephone (0171) 637 8471 Facsimile (0171) 631 0536

Analysis of Vertical Sky Components arising out of the proposed redevelopment of Campden Hill Reservoir

Room	Window	EXISTING VSC	PROPOSED VSC	LOSS VSC	Proportion of Existing
<u>2-6 Aubrey Walk</u>					
<u>Ground Floor</u>					
R1/10	W1/10	35.01	27.23	7.78	77.78
R2/10	W2/10	35.66	27.46	8.2	77.01
R3/10	W3/10	36.17	27.77	8.4	76.78
R3/10	W5/10	24.63	24.63	0	100.00
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/11	W1/11	36.56	30.53	6.03	83.51
R1/11	W2/11	36.8	30.6	6.2	83.15
R2/11	W4/10	36.39	28.01	8.38	76.97
R2/11	W3/11	37.05	30.72	6.33	82.91
R3/11	W5/11	37.34	31.04	6.3	83.13
R3/11	W6/11	37.43	31.23	6.2	83.44
<u>8-16 Aubrey Walk</u>					
<u>Ground Floor</u>					
R1/20	W1/20	32.8	27.73	5.07	84.54
R1/20	W2/20	36.92	30.87	6.05	83.61
R1/20	W3/20	33.93	29.52	4.41	87.00
R2/20	W4/20	33.21	28.87	4.34	86.93
R2/20	W5/20	36.6	31.88	4.72	87.10
R2/20	W6/20	32.1	29.04	3.06	90.47
R3/20	W7/20	32.46	28.41	4.05	87.52
R3/20	W8/20	36.21	32.08	4.13	88.59
R3/20	W9/20	32.18	29.68	2.5	92.23
R4/20	W10/20	32.72	29.88	2.84	91.32
R4/20	W11/20	34.29	32.03	2.26	93.41
R4/20	W12/20	28.87	28	0.87	96.99
R5/20	W13/20	31.05	28.95	2.1	93.24
R5/20	W14/20	32.89	31.5	1.39	95.77
R5/20	W15/20	25.9	25.53	0.37	98.57
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/21	W1/21	37.84	33.9	3.94	89.59
R2/21	W2/21	37.79	34.4	3.39	91.03
R2/21	W3/21	37.69	34.55	3.14	91.67
R3/21	W4/21	37.47	34.68	2.79	92.55
R3/21	W8/21	37.33	34.9	2.43	93.49
R4/21	W5/21	36.85	34.77	2.08	94.36
R4/21	W6/21	36.47	34.79	1.68	95.39
R5/21	W7/21	35.88	34.74	1.14	96.82
R5/21	W9/21	35.55	34.85	0.7	98.03

Room	Window	EXISTING VSC	PROPOSED VSC	LOSS VSC	Proportion of Existing
18 Aubrey Walk					
<u>Ground Floor</u>					
R1/30	W1/30	29.98	30.41	-0.43	101.43
R2/30	W2/30	29.52	28.95	0.57	98.07
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/31	W1/31	32.27	33.25	-0.98	103.04
R2/31	W2/31	32.53	32.45	0.08	99.75
20 Aubrey Walk					
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/41	W1/41	33.07	31.7	1.37	95.86
R2/41	W2/41	34.48	32.84	1.64	95.24
R2/41	W3/41	34.86	32.88	1.98	94.32
R2/41	W4/41	35.16	32.96	2.2	93.74
22 Aubrey Walk					
<u>Ground Floor</u>					
R1/50	W1/50	32.25	27.79	4.46	86.17
R1/50	W2/50	32.55	27.9	4.65	85.71
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/51	W1/51	35.56	33.07	2.49	93.00
R1/51	W2/51	36.02	33.35	2.67	92.59
24 Aubrey Walk					
<u>Ground Floor</u>					
R1/60	W1/60	30.48	26.49	3.99	86.91
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/61	W1/61	33.07	29.98	3.09	90.66
Kensington Heights					
<u>First Floor</u>					
R1/71	W1/71	33.16	25.05	8.11	75.54
R1/71	W2/71	31.46	23.03	8.43	73.20
R2/71	W3/71	12.81	6.24	6.57	48.71
R2/71	W4/71	12.03	3.72	8.31	30.92
R3/71	W5/71	9.79	7.36	2.43	75.18
R3/71	W6/71	32.28	22.91	9.37	70.97
R4/71	W7/71	33.47	25.63	7.84	76.58
R4/71	W8/71	10.29	9.3	0.99	90.38
R5/71	W9/71	13.96	9.97	3.99	71.42
R5/71	W10/71	14.29	10.09	4.2	70.61
R6/71	W11/71	27.65	23.65	4	85.53
R6/71	W12/71	32.66	28.4	4.26	86.96
R7/71	W13/71	34.11	30.28	3.83	88.77
R7/71	W14/71	20.96	17.24	3.72	82.25
R7/71	W15/71	11.34	8.97	2.37	79.10
R8/71	W16/71	10.36	9.83	0.53	94.88
R8/71	W17/71	35.87	31.97	3.9	89.13
R10/71	W18/71	27.07	24.02	3.05	88.73
R11/71	W19/71	25.35	22.61	2.74	89.19
R12/71	W20/71	31.15	29.32	1.83	94.13
R12/71	W22/71	19.8	13.71	6.09	69.24
R12/71	W23/71	20.78	14.48	6.3	69.68
R13/71	W21/71	39.45	32.35	7.1	82.00
R14/71	W24/71	34.04	27.71	6.33	81.40
R15/71	W25/71	36.16	29.91	6.25	82.72
R16/71	W26/71	39.5	32.72	6.78	82.84

Room	Window	EXISTING VSC	PROPOSED VSC	LOSS VSC	Proportion of Existing
<u>Kensington Heights</u>					
<u>First Floor</u>					
R16/71	W27/71	18.8	17.94	0.86	95.43
R17/71	W28/71	28.14	22.76	5.38	80.88
R18/71	W29/71	38.81	32.86	5.95	84.67
R19/71	W30/71	35.78	30.34	5.44	84.80
R20/71	W31/71	19.52	17.98	1.54	92.11
R22/71	W33/71	26.73	25.59	1.14	95.74
R24/71	W34/71	31.53	29.81	1.72	94.54
R24/71	W35/71	16.74	14.93	1.81	89.19
R25/71	W36/71	19.84	17.95	1.89	90.47
R26/71	W37/71	7.05	5.99	1.06	84.96
R26/71	W38/71	38.29	36.43	1.86	95.14
R27/71	W39/71	38.82	37.09	1.73	95.54
R27/71	W40/71	12	12	0	100.00
R28/71	W41/71	13.34	12.97	0.37	97.23
R28/71	W42/71	23.15	21.65	1.5	93.52

Wilks Head and Eve

CHARTERED SURVEYORS

9 Harley Street, London W1N 2AL Telephone (0171) 637 8471 Facsimile (0171) 631 0536

Analysis of daylight distribution within rooms served by windows in Kensington Heights which do not meet the recommendations of Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice in relation to Vertical Sky Components following construction of the proposed buildings at Campden Reservoir

Table of Areas (sq. ft.) and Analysis of Loss

Room/ Floor	Use of Room	Whole Room	Prev >0.2%	New >0.2%	Loss	% of original daylight available following redevelopment
R1/71	Bedroom	128.1	119.3	95.1	24.2	79.72
R2/71	Living/Bed	279.1	228.8	142.8	86	62.41
R3/71	Kitchen	86.7	85.4	78.4	7	91.80
R4/71	Kitchen	86.5	85.2	81	4.2	95.07
R5/71	Living/Bed	276	222	218.9	3.1	98.60
R7/71	Living Room	288.2	225.8	218.4	7.5	96.72
R12/71	Living Room	293.3	276.6	274.2	2.5	99.13

Wilks Head and Eve

CHARTERED SURVEYORS

9 Harley Street, London W1N 2AL Telephone (0171) 637 8471 Facsimile (0171) 631 0536

Available sunlight as a percentage of
annual unobstructed total (1486.0 Hrs)

Position	EXISTING			PROPOSED			LOSS Total
	Summer	Winter	Total	Summer	Winter	Total	
<u>2-6 Aubrey Walk</u>							
<u>Ground Floor</u>							
W1/10	45	23	68	44	14	58	10
W2/10	45	24	69	44	13	57	12
W3/10	42	23	65	41	14	55	10
W4/10	42	23	65	41	14	55	10
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/11	42	24	66	42	17	59	7
W2/11	42	24	66	42	17	59	7
W3/11	42	24	66	42	18	60	6
W5/11	42	24	66	42	18	60	6
W6/11	42	23	65	42	18	60	5
<u>8-16 Aubrey Walk</u>							
<u>Ground Floor</u>							
W1/20	32	10	42	32	5	37	5
W2/20	39	21	60	39	16	55	5
W3/20	29	22	51	29	20	49	2
W4/20	32	10	42	31	8	39	3
W5/20	52	24	76	51	22	73	3
W6/20	27	21	48	27	21	48	0
W7/20	32	10	42	31	9	40	2
W8/20	46	21	67	45	22	67	0
W9/20	29	21	50	29	21	50	0
W10/20	32	11	43	32	10	42	1
W11/20	46	21	67	46	22	68	-1
W12/20	27	17	44	27	20	47	-3
W13/20	32	9	41	32	9	41	0
W14/20	46	18	64	46	18	64	0
W15/20	27	12	39	27	14	41	-2
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/21	47	26	73	47	25	72	1
W2/21	45	24	69	45	23	68	1
W3/21	47	27	74	47	26	73	1
W4/21	47	27	74	47	26	73	1
W5/21	45	24	69	45	24	69	0
W6/21	47	27	74	47	27	74	0
W7/21	47	26	73	47	27	74	-1
W8/21	34	23	57	34	22	56	1
W9/21	34	21	55	34	22	56	-1

Position	EXISTING			PROPOSED			LOSS Total
	Summer	Winter	Total	Summer	Winter	Total	
<u>18 Aubrey Walk</u>							
<u>Ground Floor</u>							
W1/30	46	14	60	46	17	63	-3
W2/30	47	18	65	47	17	64	1
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/31	43	19	62	43	22	65	-3
W2/31	44	22	66	44	22	66	0
<u>20 Aubrey Walk</u>							
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/41	41	19	60	41	20	61	-1
W2/41	41	18	59	41	21	62	-3
W3/41	40	19	59	40	22	62	-3
W4/41	41	19	60	41	21	62	-2
<u>22 Aubrey Walk</u>							
<u>Ground Floor</u>							
W1/50	43	17	60	45	12	57	3
W2/50	43	17	60	44	12	56	4
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/51	46	22	68	46	22	68	0
W2/51	46	22	68	46	23	69	-1
<u>24 Aubrey Walk</u>							
<u>Ground Floor</u>							
W1/60	46	17	63	47	14	61	2
<u>First Floor</u>							
W1/61	49	24	73	50	22	72	1
<u>Kensington Heights</u>							
<u>First Floor</u>							
W14/71	16	8	24	16	6	22	2
W15/71	11	2	13	10	1	11	2
W17/71	33	8	41	32	6	38	3
W18/71	28	5	33	27	3	30	3
W19/71	17	2	19	16	1	17	2
W21/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W22/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W23/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W24/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W25/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W26/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W27/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W28/71	26	11	37	23	8	31	6
W29/71	31	15	46	29	13	42	4
W30/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W31/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W32/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W33/71	26	16	42	26	16	42	0
W34/71	27	11	38	25	11	36	2
W35/71	12	9	21	11	9	20	1
W36/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W38/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W39/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W40/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W41/71	6	10	16	6	10	16	0
W42/71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PLANNING AND CONSERVATION

THE TOWN HALL HORNTON STREET LONDON W8 7NX

Executive Director M J FRENCH FRICS Dip TP MRTPI Cert TS

Heath and Buckeridge
Solicitors
23 Queen Street
Maidenhead
Berks SL6 1NB

Switchboard: 020 7937 5464
Extension: 2084
Direct Line: 020 7361 2084
Facsimile: 020 7361 3463
Email: Paul.kelsey@rbkc.gov.uk
Web: www.rbkc.gov.uk

22 March 2004

THE ROYAL
BOROUGH OF



KENSINGTON
AND CHELSEA

My reference: DPS/DCC/PK/TP Your reference: HD/JF/Rixon Please ask for: Paul Kelsey
/99/0733

Dear Sir/Madam,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Plot 21 Wycombe Square, Aubrey Walk, W8

I refer to your letter dated 19 March 2004 regarding the above property, which is within the former Campden Hill Reservoirs Site.

The issue of land contamination did not arise during the consideration of the original planning application. I am of the opinion that as this was the site of a reservoir it is extremely unlikely that the land would be contaminated.

The issue of subsidence and special building methods is dealt with by my Building Control Department. I have asked them to reply to you separately on this point.

I hope this is the information you require.

Yours Sincerely


Michael J French
Executive Director, Planning and Conservation

cc Amir Fardouee – Building Control



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Edwin J. Heath
Richard H. Buckeridge, B.A.
Tilly Verik, B.A.
Sam Buchanan, B.A.



HEATH & BUCKERIDGE

SOLICITORS

23 Queen Street, Maidenhead
Berks. SL6 1NB
Telephone: (01628) 671636
Fax: (01628) 671922
D.X. 6406 Maidenhead

Our ref.

Mr. Kelsey
Planning Department
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Town Hall
Hornton Street
London
W8 7NX

HD/JF/RK/on

19 March, 2004

Via Fax No. 020 7361 3463 & Post

Dear Mr. Kelsey

Re: Plot 21 Wycombe Square, Campden Hill

Further to our telephone conversation this morning, we would be obliged if you would kindly confirm whether a specific environmental audit/site investigation was carried out on the above site with respect to contaminated land as our Environmental Report has highlighted contaminated land concerns as there was past industrial land use within 25 metres of the property.

We have referred this matter to the developer's solicitors who have informed us that no specific environmental audit was carried out as it was not deemed necessary by the Local Planning Authority. If this is the case, please provide us with written confirmation of the same so that we can report to our Mortgage Lender.

We also understand that the risk to the property from natural subsidence hazards is above moderate and we would be obliged if you would confirm whether any special building methods were recommended to counteract the vulnerability of subsidence such as underpinning etc.

We look forward to your urgent response and thank you very much for your kind assistance in this regard.

Yours sincerely

Harjit Dlay

Email : harjit.dlay@heathbuckeridge.com

EX DIR	HDC	TP	CAC	AD	CLU	AC	AK
R.B.	22 MAR 2004				PLANNING		
N.	SW	SE	APP	IO	REC		
	ARB	FPLN	DES	FEE			

92

21

23 KENSINGTON PLACE

LONDON W8 7PT

Tel 0171 229 7508

Fax 0171 727 2683

6.7.1999

Don Earley Esq
NPFA
Midlands Sports Centre
Cromwell Lane
Coventry CV4 8AS

Fax 02476 694614

Dear Mr Earley

Thames Water Development Kensington W8

We spoke on the phone a short while ago and I promised to send you a copy of the K & C recommendation of officers to our Planning Committee regarding the above proposed development. On second thoughts I am trying to fax it to you. This will not only save time but will also enable me to retain my copy of the document. It would take me two or three days to obtain another copy from the Town Hall without personally going down to collect it.

The Planning Inquiry will be held at Kensington Town Hall starting on July 20. The developers appealed against non determination by the Council immediately the eight week period expired.

Any help which you could give would be very much appreciated. If you have figures for the availability of open space sports facilities for this borough, compared to the national average that would be very much appreciated. The Town Hall here does not have these figures.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Christopher Buckmaster



EVERY CHILD DESERVES A PLACE TO PLAY

Mr Christopher Buckmaster
23 Kensington Place
LONDON
W8 7PT

Our ref: ST/HR/LPF/London

21 July 1999

Dear Mr Buckmaster

Thames Water W8

Thank you for your letter dated 6 July 1999. Don Earley has asked me to respond to it. Thank you very much for the information supplied. The site will be added to our list of Playing Fields at Risk, which is circulated widely.

Please find attached a summary of the register of recreational land that was carried out in 1992. It gives a figure for Kensington and Chelsea of 10 acres. There are only 2 outdoor recreational spaces for pitches. This provision provides for only 2% of the needs of the resident population.

The Three-Acre Standard is a minimum requirement for sports pitches per thousand population. As you will see this means there is an extreme shortage of outdoor recreation space in Kensington and Chelsea. The tennis courts at Thames Water are not included in these figures because they are probably a private sports facility. Another reason why they may not have been included in this survey is because they may have been overlooked at the time the survey was carried out. In any event it would not make much impression on the overall shortage in the area and the figures are unlikely to have changed substantially since then.

Please note also the figures for the Authorities in the adjoining areas. There is also likely to be a shortfall in the surrounding area too. This is important because it shows that the residents of Kensington and Chelsea could not be catered for within the surroundings boroughs either.

I trust this information is of use. If you require further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Sarah Thornton
Planning Officer
e-mail address: planning@npfa.co.uk

Enc

23

NATIONAL PLAYING FIELDS ASSOCIATION

Patron HM THE QUEEN President HRH THE DUKE OF EDINBURGH KG KT
Chairman CHRISTOPHER LAING Vice-Chairman ALISON MOORE-GWYN Director ELSA DAVIES
NPFA Field Office, Midlands Sports Centre for the Disabled Cromwell Lane, Tile Hill, Coventry CV4 8AS

REGISTER OF RECREATIONAL LAND: Site and Pitch Nos. and Areas

District	Code	ALL SITES			Public Pitch Area	1991 Population	Pitch Area per 1000	% of 31
		No. of sites	No. of pitches	Area of pitches				
City of London	D01AA					4,142	0.0	0%
Camden	D01AB	10	48	121.00	108	170,444	0.6	21%
Hackney	D01AC	12	38	481.25	478.25	181,248	2.5	38%
Hammersmith and Fulham	D01AD	3	26	45.00	45	148,502	0.3	10%
Haringey	D01AE	24	31	174.00	161	202,204	0.8	27%
Islington	D01AF	7	10	35.00	35	164,686	0.2	7%
Kensington and Chelsea	D01AG	2	4	10.00	10	138,394	0.1	2%
Lambeth	D01AH	10	65	38.50	38.5	244,834	0.2	5%
Lewisham	D01AJ	34	140	237.50	233.5	230,983	1.0	34%
Newham	D01AK	31	134	200.00	176	212,170	0.8	28%
Southwark	D01AL	25	52	171.00	165.5	218,541	0.8	25%
Tower Hamlets	D01AM	7	22	47.00	44	181,064	0.3	9%
Wandsworth	D01AN	28	102	123.50	104	252,425	0.4	14%
Westminster	D01AP	2	18	10.00	10	174,814	0.1	2%
Barking and Dagenham	D01AQ	18	118	83.00	83	143,681	0.6	19%
Barnet	D01AR	53	173	294.50	252.5	293,564	0.9	29%
Bexley	D01AS	24	71	159.50	154.5	215,615	0.7	24%
Brent	D01AT	60	171	273.50	200.5	243,025	0.8	28%
nlev	D01AU	123	374	728.50	689.5	290,609	2.4	79%
ydon	D01AW	123	573	1011.00	785.5	313,510	2.5	84%
g	D01AX	33	345	1041.00	852	275,257	3.1	103%
Enfield	D01AY	65	289	590.00	668.5	257,417	2.6	87%
Greenwich	D01AZ	64	178	216.50	206.5	207,650	1.0	33%
Harrow	D01BA	51	110	539.25	518.25	200,100	2.6	86%
Havering	D01BB	55	267	215.00	205	229,492	0.9	30%
Hillingdon	D01BC	31	239	359.00	294.5	231,602	1.3	42%
Hounslow	D01BD	24	143	133.00	133	204,397	0.7	22%
Kingston upon Thames	D01BE	38	151	242.50	207.5	132,996	1.6	52%
Merton	D01BF	44	213	250.50	189	168,470	1.1	37%
Redbridge	D01BG	45	325	597.00	597	226,218	2.6	88%
Richmond upon Thames	D01BH	54	65	221.00	214	160,732	1.3	44%
Sutton	D01BJ	38	155	346.25	336.25	168,880	2.0	66%
Waltham Forest	D01BK	44	205	488.75	338.75	212,033	1.6	53%
LONDON		1288	5005	9583.50	8534.50	6,679,699	1.3	43%
LONDON REGION		1288	5005	9583.50	8534.50	6,679,699	1.3	43%

1/ CM - please copy to Levene
2/ DT - please acknowledge & explain procedure

LWS/DT

23 KENSINGTON PLACE
LONDON W8 7PT
Tel 0171 229 7508
22.6.1999

RECEIVED BY PLANNING SERVICES							
1	HDC	N	C	SW	SE	ENF	AO ACK
104 23 JUN 1999							
1	IC	HEI	ARL	FWD PLN	CON DES	FEEs	

Copy

Mr C A Thompson
c/o Mr D Shorland
The Planning Inspectorate
Room 1003
Tollgate House
Houlton Street
Bristol BS2 9DJ

ref APP/K5600/E/99/1016054
APP/K5600/A/99/1022704

Dear Mr Thompson

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Appeals by St James's Homes Ltd on site at Former Thames Water Reservoir,
Campden Hill Road, London W8

I would like to confirm that I wish to speak at the above Appeals.

The points that I wish to raise include:-

- The effect on Holland Park School, of which I am a Governor, of the dominant and overbearing form of the proposed development, in particular to the listed building, Thorpe Lodge.
- The impact increased vehicular traffic will have on the two schools in the area. Holland Park School has just under 1500 pupils and adjoins the proposed development, while Fox School, which is a primary school with just under 300 children, is about 200 metres away.
- The further breach of the recommended guidelines of the National Playing Fields Association on the amount of open space dedicated to sport, related to the local population. The NPFA guidelines were referred to in the Royal Borough's Draft Sports strategy, approved by Youth and Continuing Education Committee earlier this month, which inter alia seeks no diminution of the already few open sports areas in the Borough.

My formal statement of case will be forwarded shortly.

Yours sincerely



Cllr Christopher Buckmaster

cc RBKC and Trevor Blaney

24

McCoy Associates Chartered Town Planners

31 Station Road · Henley-on-Thames · Oxon RG9 1AT · Tel: 01491 579113
Fax: 01491 410852 · VAT No. 363 3525 59

① PC
② DT
③ Copy
DMcD
④ Copy Phil

Your ref:
Our ref: **DMcC/eaw/CHR**
Please ask for: **Denis McCoy**

✓ CM 1/17

30 June 1999

Mr Derek Taylor
Directorate of Planning Services
The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
The Town Hall
Hornton Street
LONDON W8 7NX

Dear Derek

CAMPDEN HILL RESERVOIR

While commenting on my Proof by telephone David Holgate indicated a number of things which he considers should be done in further preparation for the Inquiry.

As I said on the 'phone he believes he asked for some work to be done to provide a basis for resisting any suggestion that if the appeal fails the structures could be put to some B1/B8 Use without the need for planning permission. The "fall back" argument, as he put it.

He also considers that the several Committee Reports leading to the designation of the parts of the Conservation Area should be examined in case there are any surprises hidden away there. That may be a counsel of perfection, but as a minimum I do think it would be desirable to look at the 1971 report designating the Campden Hill Square area (which included the tennis courts) and the 1976 report which incorporated Holland Park School, the rest of the site and the big 20th century buildings. Is it easy for David McDonald to have these looked out?

He also thought I could do better than rely on quoting from the draft PPG3 about open space created by regenerated "brownfield" sites. After two years of the present Government he is surprised there is nothing more substantial - perhaps in Prescott's White Paper of last year? You won't need to be told I've not been able to do anything about this! Perhaps some of your policy colleagues have a bright idea if you think something should be done on the point.

If you think I should be doing something about any of these matters would you please let me know.

Finally sorry that I didn't get the right end of the stick about the overlays for the appendices.

Yours sincerely

Denis

McCoy Associates

RECEIVED BY PLANNING SERVICES									
EX DIR	HDC	N	SW	SE	ENF	AO ACK			
- 1 JUL 1999							49		
APPEALS	IC	REG	ARE	FWD PLN	CON DES	FEES			

25

Kensington Heights

Site Area: Scaling from James Thomas' Appendix 8
(Scale 1:1250) the boundaries are;

North 70 m
West 88 m
East 92 m
South 49 m

Since the site tapers from north to south the reasonable 'average' to take is $90 \times 60 = 0.54 \text{ ha}$.

From the floor plans in my possession the number of habitable rooms appear to be;

Podium	254
Floors x 4	524
	524
	524
	524
Ref house	284
	<hr/>
	264

Density $264 \div 0.54 \text{ ha} = 483 \text{ h/ha}$.

- what about Airie Gardens ?
Melbourne House ?
Northern side of Peel St ?

Site Area

$$\begin{array}{r} 9.4 \quad 94 \text{ m} \\ \quad 65 \text{ m} \\ \hline 6,110 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{r} (90) \\ (60) \\ \hline 5,400 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{r} 89 \\ 14 \\ \hline 1,246 \end{array} \div 2$$

$$1.485$$

MCA

McCoy Associates Chartered Town Planners

31 Station Road · Henley-on-Thames · Oxon RG9 1AT · Tel 01491 579113

Fax: 01491 410852 · VAT No. 363 3525 59

R.B.K. & C.
TOWN PLANNING

26 JUL 1999

RECEIVED

26 July 1999

Your ref

Our ref

Please ask for:

DMcC/pw/CHR

Denis McCoy

BY FAX: 0171-361 3463 - This page + 1
and 0171-361 3488

Derek Taylor Esq
 Planning and Conservation
 Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
 The Town Hall, Hornton Street
 LONDON W8 7NX

Dear Derek

Campden Hill Reservoir Inquiry

Having re-examined the model my comments on possible viewpoints for "periscope" photographs are:

- (a) A view from Kensington Place would be less helpful than I thought. One looking south up Campden Hill Gardens would also be unhelpful due to the very limited lengths of existing terraces which have been modelled.
- (b) Of the viewpoints chosen for the computer montages, that outside Kips Flowers/110 Campden Hill Road is the most important for a photo.
- (c) Two looking east along Aubrey Walk would be desirable - I suggest from the centre line of the road in front of 18 Aubrey Walk and at the junction with Hillsleigh Road.
- (d) The front door of Thorpe Lodge faces a large tree on the model (and no doubt, in fact!). A photo looking slightly east so as to include Kensington Heights would be the most useful from here.
- (e) From the top of the car park ramp looking back towards the Church tower would be interesting. The absence of any detail on the model of the tower however may be said to result in a misleading impression.
- (f) For glimpses of the proposed development as a whole I suggest a view between old and new buildings from in front of West Hill House/118 Campden Hill Road - and from the top of Campden Hill Gardens towards the car park ramp, between the big flats block on the left and the end of the Aubrey Walk block on the right.
- (g) I don't think a view from in front of 24 Aubrey Walk is going to help us much.

Yours sincerely

Palarkis
 PP. Denis F. McCoy

McCOY ASSOCIATES

cc: John Zukowski Esq, Legal Services

BY FAX (0171-361-3463) - This page only

NOTE FOR MR HOLGATE

TOR GARDENS

Comparisons were drawn between the proposed central space and this communal garden area.

As the Inquiry was told, it serves a three-storey block of post-war flats (which has a flat roof).

The Victorian buildings to the north of that block and south of the space are of three storeys over basements, in the "villa" style. Their slated roofs have quite a low pitch and are partially hidden behind parapets.

The communal garden extends for the full length of the block (about 95 metres) and is some 25 metres wide. The road and footways along its south boundary have an overall width of just over 10 metres.

On the north side of the block there is a much more modest garden forecourt, just over 6 metres deep with triangular bay features projecting into it. This is about the same depth as the back gardens of the proposed east terrace.

Page 15 of Mr Thomas' Appendices shows the pattern of development at Tor Gardens in 1916. The flats are a reminder of post-war realisation that London densities needed to be reduced.

DMcC:26.7.99

29

Mr. Buchmester — Present

Mr. Cumpson — Present

Mr. Freeman — ? attempts being made to contact

Anthony Land — on 45 mins notice to travel; today pm preferable

Kensington Society — cannot do Thurs.; pm today preferable
(Sir Ronald Arculus)

Ms Caselles — will arrive here by 2pm today to say 'a few words' this aft.

Mr. Freeman will be coming
at 3pm today - he
cannot attend tomorrow.

Mr. Caselles

20

MCA

McCoy Associates Chartered Town Planners

31 Station Road · Henley-on-Thames · Oxon RG9 1AT · Tel: 01491 579113

Fax: 01491 410852 · VAT No. 363 3525 59

URGENT

With Compliments by fax ● This page plus others

TO: Mr Derek Taylor (for Mr Denis McCoy please)

Denis, just to let you know that I have been unable to trace a reply from Mr French to your fee proposals letter of 13 May.

for information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	for comments
for action	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	as requested

Wood
28.7.99

Confidential to addressee only — use of contents by others prohibited
If received in error please let us know by telephone at our expense.

28 JUL 1999 10:01

01491 410852

PAGE.01

RECEIVED
 28 JUL 1999
 TOWN PLANNING
 R.B.K.&C.

32



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA ¹³

KENSINGTON

Conservation Area
Proposals Statement




KENSINGTON
**Conservation Area
Proposals Statement**



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF
KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA

34



**KENSINGTON CONSERVATION AREA
PROPOSALS STATEMENT**

***Foreword by the Chairman,
Planning and Conservation
Committee***

Kensington Conservation Area is the largest of the Borough's many conservation areas and covers a wide range of locations from busy shopping streets to quiet residential culs-de-sac. It contains all styles and ages of building from its early Georgian speculative developments through to the present day. It is especially relevant for me to be writing this foreword as this Area contains the Town Hall and my home. My twin interests as Chairman of the Planning and Conservation Committee and as resident mirror the aim of each and every Conservation Area Proposals Statement to relate the conservation aspects of the policies of the Council's development plan (currently the "UDP") to the level of individual streets and houses so as to set out the Council's likely response to proposals for development and enhancement. As with previous Statements, there is also plenty of advice on the most appropriate approach to the repair and improvement of buildings in the Area, whether or not planning permission or listed building consent is required from the Council.

I hope that all residents of Kensington Conservation Area and others using this document will find it of interest and value as we make its preservation or enhancement our common aim.

Councillor Desmond Harney OBE

65



1

Introduction

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 obliges local authorities to determine which parts of their areas are of special architectural or historic interest and to designate them as conservation areas. Once designated, councils are further obliged (Section 71) to formulate and publish proposals for their preservation and enhancement, to present such proposals for consideration at a public meeting in the Area and to have regard to any views expressed at the meeting concerning such proposals. The Public Meeting to consider this Statement was held in the Small Hall, Kensington Town Hall on 7 November 1994.

It is the general duty of the Council, in the exercise of its planning functions, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of its conservation areas (Section 72).

PLANNING BACKGROUND

The Council is committed by its Unitary Development Plan to the preparation of Proposals Statements for conservation areas. The Plan contains general policies governing the control of development and, in particular, policies and standards regarding conservation, design and related matters. The overall aim of the Plan is "to maintain and enhance the character and function of the Royal Borough as a residential area and to ensure its continuing role within the metropolitan area as an attractive place in which to live and work". Its policies resist the loss of permanent residential accommodation, the encroachment of inappropriate business activities and the loss of local services which support residential character. Therefore underlying this Conservation Area Proposals Statement is a continued resistance to any change of use from residential use in the Area and also to any change which damages residential amenity, for example, extra traffic generation. In some cases the character or appearance of an area is so significant or fragile that preservation only is appropriate. Elsewhere, working within the existing environ-

mental context to produce new and appropriate solutions may enhance a conservation area.

The Plan provides that "each Statement identifies the characteristics which contribute to the special nature of the conservation area and includes guidance which ensures its preservation and enhancement. Guidelines for the design of new building work (including extensions and alterations to existing properties), as well as proposals for enhancement work to be carried out by the Council, are also included."

The Plan also indicates that "the Statements will set out detailed guidance to interpret and elaborate on development control policies set out in this plan. Such detailed guidance will be applied to all relevant planning applications." Comments in this Statement are therefore subsidiary to and should be read in the light of the Council's general restrictive policies as set out in the Unitary Development Plan.

THE PURPOSE AND FORMAT OF THE PROPOSALS STATEMENT

This document presents proposals for the preservation and enhancement of Kensington Conservation Area.

The purpose of this Proposals Statement is therefore threefold:

1. To identify the particular characteristics of the Area which justify its designation as a conservation area and which should be preserved or enhanced.
2. To provide guidance in respect of any proposed changes:
 - (a) to owners on appropriate action to preserve and enhance their buildings, including advice on changes for which no planning application is required;
 - (b) on the Council's likely response to applications for planning permission.
3. To identify works of improvement, enhancement or other initiatives which could be undertaken by the Council or other agencies.

The Kensington skyline and the great houses form the backdrop to Kip's view of Beaufort House

30

(Title page) A mature urban environment in Phillimore Gardens

THE EXTENT OF THE CONSERVATION AREA

The earliest conservation area designation covered much of the original village and the Pitt Estate (townscape areas 1 and 2 in this document, see map on page 11) in 1970. Four additional designations, roughly corresponding to areas 3/4, 5, 6 and 7, followed over the next three years. In 1976 these areas were joined together and given the title Kensington Conservation Area. Extensions to take in the Kensington High Street frontage followed in 1982 and 1994.

With minor exceptions, this Conservation Area is bounded by the following Conservation Areas: Holland Park to the west; Edwardes Square Scarsdale and Abingdon, and Kensington Square to the south (Kensington High Street); and Kensington Palace to the east (Kensington Church Street). The western half of its northern boundary is shared by Ladbroke Conservation Area along Holland Park Avenue.

PROCEDURE

This Proposals Statement for Kensington Conservation Area has been prepared under the direction of M J French, Executive Director of

Planning and Conservation, by the Council's Consultants, McCoy Associates, in liaison with The Kensington Society, The Phillimore Kensington Estate, local residents groups and interested parties.


The Statement was written, illustrated and designed by Geoffrey Huntingford BSc(Hons) MRTPI.

Except where credited, historical maps and illustrations were produced by the Council's photographers from originals kindly made available by Kensington Local Studies Library. The assistance of the Council's Local Studies Librarians is gratefully acknowledged.

The map on the cover is an extract from the Ordnance Survey of 1862-5.

**THIS PROPOSALS STATEMENT WAS
ADOPTED BY THE PLANNING AND
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE ON
9 JANUARY 1995**


Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Town Hall Hornton Street London W8 7NX
0171-361 2080



Contents


Chairman's Foreword	2
1. Introduction	3
<i>Statutory Background</i>	
<i>Planning Background</i>	
<i>The Purpose and Format of the Proposals Statement</i>	
<i>The Extent of the Conservation Area</i>	
<i>Procedure</i>	
2. History and Townscape	7
<i>General History</i>	
<i>Notable Residents</i>	
<i>Historical Development and Townscape Analysis area by area</i>	
1. <i>The Old Village</i>	
2. <i>The Pitt Estate</i>	
3. <i>Campden House</i>	
4. <i>Campden House to Edge Street</i>	
5. <i>Hillgate Village</i>	
6. <i>Campden Hill</i>	
7. <i>The Phillimore Estate</i>	
8. <i>The Institutions</i>	
9. <i>The Southern Corridor</i>	
10. <i>The Northern Corridor</i>	
<i>The Campden Hill Lawn Tennis Club</i>	
3. Land Use and Traffic	33
4. Building Maintenance and Minor Works	34
5. Control of Physical Change	38
6. Shopfronts and Advertising	41
<i>Kensington Church Street</i>	
7. Views and vistas	45
8. Property Enhancement: Buildings	46
9. Property Enhancement: Curtilages	49
10. Environmental Improvements	51
Proposals Map	53
11. Appendices	55
1. <i>List of Properties</i>	
2. <i>List of Listed Buildings</i>	
3. <i>List of properties covered by Article 4 directions</i>	
4. <i>Sources of Grant Aid</i>	
5. <i>Trees</i>	
6. <i>General Notes on Interiors</i>	
Index	60

38



Rocque 1746 (above)

Starling 1822 (right)



GENERAL HISTORY

Kensington Conservation Area covers some 130 acres (53 ha) on the favoured south and west slopes of Campden Hill, five miles (eight kilometres) west of the City of London. Its development began with two tiny medieval settlements astride the old Roman roads from London to the West, now known as Notting Hill Gate and Kensington High Street. The more important, Kensington, had a small church which was granted to Abingdon Abbey around 1100: nothing more is known about this building except that the eastern half of the present St Mary Abbots occupies the same site. Connecting roads running north and south were scarce in this location: one of these joined Kensington with its smaller neighbour on Notting Hill Gate and survives as Kensington Church Street.

From Elizabethan times the area had a reputation as a healthy place to live, with spas and extensive market and nursery gardens. The first house on the site of Aubrey House, and possibly forming its core, was attached to a medicinal spring called Kensington Wells which was in use until the middle of the 18th century. With its pleasant position and proximity to London, Kensington gradually became popular with those who wished to get away from the thickly-populated and occasionally plague-ridden city. Proclamations from 1580 onwards and throughout the next century prohibited all new buildings within specified distances of London but these proved hard to enforce.

At the beginning of the 17th century the major landowner was Sir Baptist Hicks. He was admitted tenant of land including the Campden House estate in 1609 and purchased more land to the south and west in 1616, owning over 100 acres in the area when created Viscount Campden in 1628. With so much land in one ownership the distinction between the three manors of Abbots Kensington, West Town and Notting Barns became blurred, so that by 1670 the whole area north of what is now Kensington High Street was

known as the manor of Abbots Kensington. The role of manor house was probably filled by Parsonage House which stood a little to the north-west of the church. Kensington Church Walk was originally its cartway, being taken over as a "constant thoroughfare" by the Kensington Vestry in 1767 and extended to the High Street in 1814. Further north again stood Campden House itself, traditionally said to have been built in 1612 but possibly the refacing and enlargement by Sir Baptist of an Elizabethan building. It was rebuilt again following almost total destruction by fire in 1862 and was eventually demolished in 1900 after the last remaining part of its grounds had been developed.

The desirability of the area received a tremendous boost when Nottingham House, enlarged and improved by Wren for the Earl of Nottingham and later to become Kensington Palace, was purchased as a country seat by William III in 1689. As well as the larger houses mentioned above, pressure for accommodation was met by a modest expansion of Kensington village. Following Thomas Young's initiative in what is now Kensington Square, the earliest speculative developments north of the High Street were by John Jones in the early 1700s. He built Jones Buildings, later Kensington Church Court; though the buildings have long since been replaced, his arched entrance was retained in a rebuild of 1872-73 and is still there today. He then turned his attention northwards, purchasing land around St Mary Abbots and constructing various houses of which 9-17 Church Street survive, nos. 15 and 17 retaining original brickwork and window openings in their upper floors. After his death in 1727, his wife and son-in-law, John Price, continued developing the land. 16-26 Holland Street date from 1728-29 while nos. 10 and 12 were erected by December 1736. It is not known when Parsonage House was demolished but six new houses were occupying its site by 1760. Adjacent land was developed as the Pitt Estate, Campden House having been sold separately with 13 acres in 1709-10 and subsequently purchased by Stephen Pitt in

2

History and Townscape

Campden House in the 18th century (below left)

After the Campden House fire in 1862 (below)



40

1751. The remainder of the Campden House estate, extending over 89 acres, was inherited by Robert Phillimore in 1741. He left the 25 acres north of Campden House to his younger son Joseph in 1774 and this area was divided and subdivided for redevelopment from 1808 onwards. The remainder still forms what is known as the Phillimore Kensington Estate today.

St Mary Abbots was largely rebuilt between 1683 and 1704. There is some evidence that medieval masonry was re-used encased in brick. Its churchyard was extended westwards in 1763 and a tower was added in 1770-72.

By the time Queen Victoria was born in Kensington Palace in 1819 the population of Kensington had reached 12,000. The four-storey terraces on the north side of High Street, started in 1788 on land leased from William Phillimore, had recently been completed but there had otherwise been few changes over the previous century except for the improvement of the network of lanes within the area. The future Campden Hill and even Airlie Gardens are discernible on Starling's map of 1822, serving the large houses of the well-to-do built for William Phillimore by John Tasker between 1808 and 1817, with a lane connecting them and continuing as a mere footpath to the corner of Kensington Place. The Grand Junction Water Works was already established on Campden Hill with the West Middlesex Works below it on the other side of this footpath, now known as Campden Hill Road.


Financial uncertainty around 1825 severely restricted the plans of various developers. Schemes by Lord Holland and J W Ladbroke elsewhere in the district were affected, while Campden Hill Square, originally laid out by

Joshua Flesher Hanson in 1826, was also premature, development being slow and uneven with the last lease, that of the original no. 28, not being granted until 1851. However, the population of Kensington doubled during Queen Victoria's childhood and at her death in 1901 there were 176,000 resident in the parish. While some of the population explosion can be credited to better living conditions, higher birth rates and increased life expectancy, the great majority of the increase, four-fifths of the 50,000 in the 1860s for example, came from migration. In Kensington's case this was generally provided by people moving "upward and outward", those with increased wealth looking for an attractive home, in contrast to the "downwards and inwards" migration of the London revealed by Mayhew and Barnardo. The area did have its share of meaner dwellings, however, and the contrast between the grand houses of Campden Hill and the virtual slums of Campden Street and St James (now Jameson) Street would have been very striking one hundred years ago. The Survey of London records Henry Mayhew's interview with several workmen who lived in the vicinity of Silver Street (now the north end of Kensington Church Street) who "extolled the virtues of living in the suburbs", where they could enjoy the luxury of two rooms (Survey of London, Vol. XXXVII, p.85).

The upturn in building rates around the City reached Kensington in the 1840s so that while completions doubled in London between 1859 and 1868, in Kensington they increased sixfold. By 1852 Campden Hill Square was complete and houses were rapidly filling-in the land between Church Street and Campden Hill. Development by Joseph Gordon Davis of much of the Phillimore Estate behind the High Street frontages was begun in 1855 and was well under way by 1860. Further houses were built on the

St Mary Abbots and Church Street in the mid 19th century (below)

St Mary Abbots after the air raid in March 1944 (below right)



remainder of the Pitt Estate northwards to Sheffield Terrace, while building continued over the Campden House estate, starting with late Georgian terraces at the eastern end of Bedford Gardens and culminating with Hillgate Village being laid out on the site of a brickfield between 1850 and 1860.

St Mary Abbots was declared unsafe in 1866. Its Building Committee decided that a new church was required, engaged (Sir) George Gilbert Scott and approved designs in June 1868. The old church was demolished in 1869 and the new one consecrated in 1872. Its 250 foot spire was completed in an elaborate ceremony on 15 November 1879. The arcaded entrance was erected between 1889-93 to designs by John Oldrid Scott who also supervised the furnishing of the church after his father's death in 1878.

St George's, Campden Hill, had been built as a daughter church in the grounds of Wycombe House, formerly a neighbour of Aubrey House, in 1864. A year later work commenced on the Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel which was designed by E W Pugin: the college buildings followed to designs by Goldie, Child and Goldie in the late French Gothic style known as "Flamboyant".

The extension of the Metropolitan Railway through the eastern half of the area in the mid-1860s had a considerable effect on the character of its streets. Large numbers of houses were demolished and rebuilt, often in a style and to a scale at odds with the original development. The quiet manners and reticence of Jeremiah Little's developments on the Pitt Estate, for example, were to some extent compromised by the rebuilding of much of Gordon Place, including no. 1, the rear of which is

shaped to accommodate a ventilation shaft. Little also rebuilt 8-14 Sheffield Terrace, houses he himself had erected 20 years earlier.

With the completion of the Phillimore Estate development and the insertion of Campden Hill Gardens, the general street pattern of the area had been established by the last quarter of the 19th century. Although the carriageway was much narrower than today, Kensington Church Street retained a more random aspect until the intensive rebuilding of the 1890s and the redevelopment of the grounds of Campden House.

Major changes this century include the recasting of some of the large houses at the upper end of the former Phillimore Estate and the replacement of others by educational institutions; the building of Kensington Library and the Town Hall; and developments on former Water Board land. The opportunity for a certain amount of rebuilding since the 1930s was created by the air raids of the Second World War, particularly round Tor Gardens. The loss of the nave roof of St Mary Abbots in March 1944 was made good in 1955 to designs by Romilly Craze, while Sir Giles Gilbert Scott's designs to replace the ruined Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel were realised in 1959. Campden Hill Court, a major development dating from 1898, was itself threatened by an application in 1962 to redevelop the site to provide 168 flats in two 23-storey towers. Both this and an alternative scheme for a 12-storey slab block generated considerable local opposition and did not gain consent.

The latest major scheme in the Area is the redevelopment of Observatory Gardens behind the existing facades, for long a problem site obvious from the deterioration of its exuberant stucco ornamentation.



The Metropolitan Railway Station, Notting Hill Gate

NOTABLE RESIDENTS OF KENSINGTON CONSERVATION AREA

AIRLIE, DAVID GRAHAM DRUMMOND, 10th EARL OF (1826-1881), probably gave his name to Airlie Gardens as he lived at nearby Holly Lodge on Campden Hill in 1863. The coach house to Holly Lodge survives in front of Queen Elizabeth College on Campden Hill.

ARGYLL, GEORGE JOHN DOUGLAS CAMPBELL, 8th DUKE OF (1823-1900), lived at Argyll Lodge, Campden Hill, from about 1853. Argyll Road was named after him in 1859. Argyll Lodge stood on the south side of Campden Hill opposite Holland Park School.

BEDFORD, DOWAGER DUCHESS OF: Duchess of Bedford Walk was named in 1932 after the wife of the 6th Duke. She was a tenant of Bedford Lodge, later Argyll Lodge, on Campden Hill.

BRIDGE, FRANK (1879-1941), composer and musician, lived at 4 Bedford Gardens. He is most famous for his chamber music and as the tutor of Benjamin Britten.

CHESTERTON, GILBERT KEITH (1874-1936), novelist, was born at 32 Sheffield Terrace and spent part of his childhood there. His novel "The Napoleon of Notting Hill" was published in 1904.

COKE, LADY MARY (1726-1811): The youngest daughter of a Duke of Argyll, Lady Mary kept a journal during her residence at Aubrey House between 1767 and 1788. Owing to her albino colouring and her penchant for gossip she was nicknamed the "White Cat".

CRANE, WALTER (1845-1915), the artist, lived at The Old House, 13 Holland Street, from 1894 to 1915.

FORD, FORD MADOX (1873-1939), novelist and critic, lived at 80 Campden Hill Road.

FOWLER, SIR HENRY (1817-1898), engineer to the world's first underground railway, the Metropolitan, opened between Bishop's Road, Paddington and Farringdon Street on 10 January 1863. He designed the famous though unsuccessful locomotive "Fowler's Ghost", and spent the last ten years of his life at Thornwood Lodge, Campden Hill.

GALSWORTHY, JOHN (1867-1933), novelist, lived at South House, Campden Hill Road between 1897 and 1903 and at 16A Aubrey Walk between 1903 and 1905.

GRAHAME, KENNETH (1859-1932), author of "The Wind in the Willows", lived at 16 Phillimore Place between 1901 and 1908.

HALL, RADCLYFFE (1880-1943), novelist and poet, lived at 37 Holland Street from 1924 to 1929.

HICKS, SIR BAPTIST (1551-1629): Created Lord Campden in 1628, from his estate at Chipping Campden in Gloucestershire. He built or recast Campden House in 1612. Though nothing of his work survives in Kensington, he was responsible for a number of the most distinctive buildings in Chipping Campden including the Market Hall, the Almshouses, the gates to his manor house and his own magnificent tomb in the church.

HOOVER, HERBERT CLARK (1874-1964), President of the United States of America between 1928 and 1932, used Red Lodge, Hornton Street, as his European home from 1907 to 1916.

JONES, DAVID (1895-1974), artist and poet, moved to 12 Sheffield Terrace in October 1941 and lived there until 1947.

JOYCE, JAMES (1882-1941), Irish novelist, lived at 28 Campden Grove in 1931.

MACAULAY, THOMAS BABINGTON, LORD (1800-1859), poet, essayist and historian; purchased Holly Lodge, Campden Hill, in 1856 and died there in 1859, having been created a peer in 1857. Two of his best-known works are "Lays of Ancient Rome" and "History of England from the Accession of James II".

MORGAN, CHARLES (1894-1958), novelist and critic, lived and died at 16 Campden Hill Square.

NEWBOLT, SIR HENRY (1862-1938), poet, lived at 29 Campden Hill Road.

NEWTON, SIR ISAAC (1642-1727), natural philosopher and mathematician. His theories of gravitation presented to the Royal Society in 1686 covered known phenomena until overtaken by Einstein's work in the early years of this century. He spent the last two years of his life in Orbell's Buildings, probably where Bullingham Mansions now stands off Kensington Church Street.

RAMBERT, DAME MARIE (1888-1982), dancer and founder of the Ballet Rambert, lived at 19 Campden Hill Gardens.

RUSSELL FLINT, SIR WILLIAM, RA FRWS (1880-1969), artist, lived at Peel Cottage, 80 Peel Street, from 1920 until his death.

SAMBOURNE, EDWARD LINLEY (1844-1910), artist and cartoonist, lived at 18 Stafford Terrace from 1874 until his death.

SASSOON, SIEGFRIED (1886-1967), writer, lived at 23 Campden Hill Square from 1925 to 1932.

SOUTH, SIR JAMES (1785-1867), astronomer: A founder of the Royal Astronomical Society and President in 1829, he built an observatory on Campden Hill in 1826, acquired Phillimore House from William Robert Phillimore and died there. The house and observatory stood on the present site of Observatory Gardens.


STANFORD, SIR CHARLES VILLIERS (1852-1924), composer and musician, teacher and conductor, lived at 56/58 Hornton Street between 1894 and 1916.

STUART, JOHN McDOWALL (1815-1866), explorer, the first to cross Australia. He lived and died at 9 Campden Hill Square.

UNDERHILL, EVELYN (1875-1941), Christian philosopher and teacher, lived at 50 Campden Hill Square from 1907 to 1939.

WALTON, GEORGE (1867-1933), designer and architect, lived at 44 Holland Street between 1901 and 1905.

WEBSTER, SIR RICHARD, VISCOUNT ALBERT-STONE (1842-1915), Lord Chief Justice. Lived at Hornton Lodge, Pitt Street, from 1888 to 1914.






Ladbroke

Pembridge

*Historical
development
and townscape
analysis area
by area*

KEY MAP

-  Townscape Areas
-  Adjacent Conservation Areas
-  Not in Conservation Area

*Kensington
Palace*

*Holland
Park*

*Kensington
Square*

*Edwardes Square,
Scarsdale &
Abingdon*

11

The Old Village

Carmel Court
Duke's Lane
Holland Street
Gregory Place
Kensington Church Court
Kensington Church Street
Kensington Church Walk
Holland Place

Historical development

The early history of this, the longest established part of this Conservation Area, has been covered above, as has the history of St Mary Abbots Church. Because of these early beginnings, this area is characterised by a small-scale, random pattern of streets and closes, in contrast to the planned development of the Pitt Estate adjacent. The east end of Holland Street with its plain, elegant brick terraces is the exception, but even here the scale is charming and intimate. In contrast to the tightly-packed dwellings of Carmel Court, Holland Place and Gregory Place, some sites around Kensington Church Walk remained undeveloped for a surprisingly long time. Land between The Old House (13 Holland Street) and Church Walk remained open until 1833, for example; the two houses built there have since been replaced by Ingelow House. Infilling continued with the erection of 6-12 Church Walk in 1875-76 by Lucas and Sons. With the establishment and enlargement of St Mary Abbots' burial ground, there has always been some open space to contrast with the dense closes and the bustle of the nearby main streets.

At the southern end of Church Walk, astride the former drive to Campden House, stands Kensington Vestry Hall. The original hall was attached to the church: the new, enlarged premises were designed by Benjamin Broadbridge and erected in 1851-52. Its Jacobean style was probably intended to reflect Holland House and Campden House. The accommodation provided was already insufficient by 1875, so a new Town Hall was built to

classical designs by Robert Walker between 1878-80. The elegant iron railings and gate piers to the Vestry Hall were removed at the same time. With St Mary Abbots Church of 1869-72, St Mary Abbots School completes the group of four important mid-Victorian public buildings in this small area. In this case, the date was around 1860 and the style a rather plain Gothic. The north elevation is more picturesque, however, enlivened by the schoolgirl and schoolboy figures reset on brackets. The recent development of flats and offices at Kensington Cloisters on the north side of St Mary Abbots has enhanced the almost "cathedral close" atmosphere of this location.

Other major developments in this part of the Area are confined to the north end, where Newton House and Bullingham House were demolished to make way for Bullingham Mansions in 1894. Newton Court dates from 1926, erected to designs by Wills and Kaula on the site of the buildings adapted in 1849 for the Kensington Dispensary for poor patients.

Townscape analysis

This area, defined rather by the edge of the Pitt Estate, consists of dense earlier development remaining relatively unchanged in plan form between two groups of larger buildings which have evolved more slowly over the years.

At the southern end, the most conspicuous contrast is between the fronts (the High Street/Church Street corner) and the backs as seen from Church Walk. St Mary Abbots Church

Mid 18th century frontages in Kensington Church Street (below)

Kensington Vestry Hall as the public library at the end of the 19th century (below right)



presides over both but at a distance, its screen of mature trees reducing its immediate impact. Where the tree screen is removed and the visual dislocation brought about by its immense size is reduced, as with the skilfully-contrived and important arcaded entrance, the effect is extremely attractive. The remainder of the HIGH STREET frontage within the Conservation Area is of considerable townscape value, buildings at the west end of the terrace having a particularly inventive skyline. Through the archway, CHURCH COURT is however a disappointment, little more than a service yard, though the link with Church Walk has potential.




Kensington Church Court; visual confusion behind commercial frontages (left)

CHURCH WALK in its meandering pattern offers many glimpses of surrounding buildings and with its mature trees is an invaluable space. Recent building and garden developments have won Environment Awards from the Council, but this route really requires the best treatment at all times.

It leads easily into the central part of this area, to the dense early developments around HOLLAND STREET which is varied and altered but still derives most of its charm from early 18th century housing and some excellent shopfronts. Of the courts, CARMEL COURT is the most attractive, with houses overlooking a pedestrian walkway which is made more intriguing by the covered passage to Duke's Lane. In strong contrast, the pretty terrace down GREGORY PLACE is rather swamped by the sea of parked cars, though the activity that this creates may even so be preferable to the empty anonymity of the garage court to Ingelow House. HOLLAND PLACE is too short to be more than a brief interruption to Church Street frontages.

DUKE'S LANE itself could also have been taken over by modern development but it retains a charming variety. One is grateful for the two pairs of attractive cottages at the west end (Gordon Cottages and Queen Anne Cottages: the planting in front of 2 Gordon Cottages being particularly important) and for the skill in which Giles Gilbert Scott has placed a large church next to the Lane yet given this facade an appropriate scale.

This part of CHURCH STREET contains some buildings, such as nos. 1-17, which relate to those in the streets behind, yet even these are made very different by their relationship to a busy road successively widened to cope with the demands of heavy traffic. The early Georgian buildings remain attractive, as do Newton Court and the Church of Our Lady of Carmel. Bullingham Mansions is immaculately detailed and beautifully maintained yet it is a little lost between Newton Court and its striking post-war neighbour which helps define the sinuous route of the road in an effective way. Only the later Victorian blocks between Holland Street and Duke's Lane fail to impress although their sheer bulk is visually appropriate in this context.



44

2

The Pitt Estate

Campden Grove
 Gloucester Walk
 Gordon Place
 Holland Street
 Hornton Street
 Pitt Street

Historical development

The area covered by this section is strictly only part of the Pitt Estate of 14½ acres as purchased by Stephen Pitt in 1751: it is the part closest to the old village centre of Kensington and was developed first as terraces of medium-sized houses with no great architectural pretensions.

The Estate was developed by William Eales, a timber merchant, and Jeremiah Little, a builder, who undertook to develop the whole of the Pitt holding except for Newton House and Bullingham House. Even Campden House itself was a serious candidate for early demolition. The southern end of the Estate was narrow and of an awkward shape, with little opportunity for spacious planning. The houses that were erected were generally of three storeys with stuccoed facades simply ornamented. The name of Thomas Allason, the surveyor responsible for the plan of the Ladbroke Estate, is commemorated in the substantial terrace on Church Street between Gloucester Walk and Campden Grove: it may be under his overall scheme that four houses on the north side of Campden Grove were provided with full-height bay windows to make an architectural statement at the top of Gordon Place. Certainly the greater variety of later building phases of the Estate after his death in 1852 argues for his controlling influence in the early stages.

The advent of the Underground Railway had an unfortunate effect on the homogenous, small-scale character of this part of the Estate. Replacements were generally of a disproportionate scale with the greater use of ornament fashionable in mid-century. Campden Grove has probably suffered most: the visual effect of its carefully contrived centrepiece is overbalanced by the redevelopment of four properties to the east with ornate cornices topping houses a whole storey higher, while its frontage line is broken on the south side by the gable of 1 Gordon Place. The gap created by the railway on the south side is accentuated by the substantial scale of this house and the relatively unspoilt terrace on the other side of the ventilation shaft.

The east side of the northern half and the west side of the southern half of Gordon Place date from the same period, 1871-73, but the disruption is minimised by the dog-leg in the middle of this street (a result, no doubt of the constraints of avoiding Bullingham House on the original development) and because each new terrace was entire in itself.

Apart from the usual attrition of time, the only significant alteration subsequent to the construction of the railway has been redevelopment as the result of bomb damage in the Second World War. Four terraced houses with garages are a disappointing replacement for three mid-Victorian houses in the northern half of Gordon Place.


Townscape analysis

The overall character of this part of Kensington Conservation Area is of a relatively secluded, intimate residential backwater of elegant terraces behind front gardens providing sufficient space for foliage to soften further any formality in the buildings. The core of this, the initial development of the Pitt Estate, is GORDON PLACE aligned roughly on the original drive to Campden House from the High Street. The dog-leg in the centre, where it is crossed by Pitt Street, produces a charming effect which suits the scale and unpretentious character of the original development. Although the later Victorian terraces are at odds with the original conception, the buildings terminating the vistas in each half of Gordon Place do so very effectively though in different ways. 20 Gordon Place has its entrance in the southern half of the street but maintains an alternative front elevation northwards, its prominence enhanced by its massive though slightly alarming studio attic and the splendid mature tree on the corner of no. 18. In the other direction, no. 17 presents its gable to views from the south, but this gable has a full complement of blind windows framed in ornamental stucco above a stucco plinth.

Enclosure is also provided at either end of Gordon Place, firstly by the feature terrace on Campden Grove already referred to, and sec-

Gordon Place (below)

Post-war houses which do not reflect the character and layout of older properties (below right)





An elegant and well-proportioned terrace on Kensington Church Street (far left)



The removal of railings for forecourt parking has a severe impact on the street scene (left)


only and particularly charmingly by the cul-de-sac of 33-39 and 40-62 Gordon Place where two attractive terraces, effectively framed by similar properties on Holland Street, preside over a cul-de-sac that dwindles from narrow carriageway to wider path to narrow path to garden in a remarkable sequence. Mature planting associated with Kensington Church Walk assists in the enclosure of the southern end of Gordon Place in a very distinctive manner.

PITT STREET is also effectively enclosed, though by properties of different character. Though Pitt Street is straight, the variety and attractiveness of the buildings at the junction with Gordon Place - not to mention the magnificent tree - give the cross-roads almost as much visual significance as it has in Gordon Place. In reality Pitt Street is extremely varied; the only terrace from the original development faces the southern frontage of Bullingham Mansions and the tall and exquisitely detailed Carmelite Priory. In the western half there is a Victorian terrace, in which the five earliest properties exhibit unusual window details. Facing these are modern houses benignly presided over by the opulent red brick and stucco of Horton Street. It must be the strong gravitational pull of the central cross-roads which brings these disparate parts together.

Holland Street and Campden Grove echo the elegance of the best of Gordon Place. HOLLAND STREET is the busier but, as befits the continuation of earlier development, the more intimate CAMPDEN GROVE remains a delightful street with some beautifully-maintained houses and some excellent front gardens. As well as the unfortunate effects of the driving-through of the railway, this street suffers in strong contrast to its neighbours from the relative inadequacy of the view eastwards to KENSINGTON CHURCH STREET. The dull concrete panels of a 1960s development, oversailed by the back of Winchester Court, provides the least satisfactory enclosure in this otherwise distinctive neighbourhood.

This area's own frontage to Church Street, on the other hand, provides one of the Conservation Area's most successful building groups, where generally excellent shopfronts combine with

attractive ironwork and substantial stucco frontages. The stucco continues round into GLOUCESTER WALK where Pitt Estate terraces line the south side in an attractive though much altered sequence. In addition to railway redevelopments there are some properties with masonry roof extensions of considerable antiquity.



B

Campden House

*Bedford Gardens
Campden House Close
Gloucester Walk
Hornton Street
Sheffield Terrace
Tor Gardens*

Historical development

This part of Kensington Conservation Area is typified by spacious developments of the mid-Victorian period between the more intimate terraces of the early Pitt Estate to the south and the less salubrious, more "crammed" schemes to the north at Campden Street and Peel Street. Most of this area was developed as a continuation of the Pitt Estate up to and including Sheffield Terrace: the variety of built forms is the result of economic difficulties towards the end of the scheme, of the building of the railway, of uncertainty over the fate of Campden House and eventually as a result of enemy action during the Second World War. Bedford Gardens, in contrast, originated in "The Racks", the 25 acre northern portion of the Campden House estate which came to Robert Phillimore in 1741 and was given to Joseph Phillimore, his younger son, in 1774.

The 14½ acres bought by Alexander Ramsay Robinson in 1808 had by 1825 become five separate entities: three and a half acres bought by the West Middlesex Water Works Company; the part of this developed as Edge Street; half of nearly six acres laid out by John Punter as Peel Street; the other half developed as Campden Street by William Ward; and five acres purchased by William Hall in 1822 which he developed as Bedford Place, now Bedford Gardens. The contrast between this part of the Conservation Area and the area immediately to the north is typified by the fact that Hall laid out only one street on his five acres while Punter and Ward put in two streets across an area only fractionally larger.

Hall began at the eastern end of Bedford Gardens with facing terraces of plain brick. Their abrupt termination may be explained by the sudden death of Hall's son in 1829 or 1830 and by his continuing financial difficulties. The take-up of houses was slow and nos. 36-46 were completed by a different builder who introduced minor changes in external finish. Undeveloped land on the north side changed hands in 1831, resulting in the completion in 1836 of seven pairs of semi-detached houses, advertised as a

"refreshing contrast" to run-of-the-mill housing, with "a consequence at which their neighbours do not aspire".

Some plots on the south side remained undeveloped for many years. The earliest surviving houses, nos. 85-91, date from shortly before 1830. The most interesting, and indeed one of the most surprising in the whole Conservation Area, is no. 77, a towering block of studios with north-lit windows stacked one above the other.

Development of the Pitt Estate was continuing while Hall was struggling to finish Bedford Gardens, but most of Gloucester Walk and Sheffield Terrace were begun around 1850, with 1-7 Tor Gardens being built by Thomas Bridges in 1851. Eames and Little were still heavily involved in developing the area but built their last houses together in 1855. Little lived in Wilton Villa (54 Sheffield Terrace) which he had built for his own occupation, and continued to build in Kensington, employing 50 men and 10 boys. He died in 1873.

The architectural reaction to Italianate squares and terraces arrived in time for the development of the grounds of Campden House itself, providing Sheffield Terrace and Gloucester Walk with typically tall, red brick houses with terracotta ornament and inventive skylines. The frontage to Kensington Church Street is taken up with a terrace of studio houses. Campden House Chambers at the top end of Hornton Street take the design idea a stage further with red brick above a robust stone ground floor with a corbelled frieze. This scheme, designed by Thackeray, Turner and Eustace Balfour, attracted critical attention on completion with its vaulted communal dining room.

Even if Campden House had not been demolished in 1900, it may not have survived the Second World War. German bombs tore a swathe through this area, resulting in the loss of Little Campden House and much of Tor Gardens and providing the opportunity for the significant level of post-war building in this locality.

The morning mail is delivered to Sheffield Terrace (below)

Varied roof alterations in Sheffield Terrace take on additional prominence in views from Hornton Street (below right)



Townscape analysis

Despite its relatively short development history, this part of the Conservation Area contains a wide range of building types and styles, bound together by the framework provided by relatively generous space standards and a wealth of mature planting.

The greatest distinction in townscape can be made between the long streets (Bedford Gardens and Sheffield Terrace) and the remaining shorter streets with their greater potential for visual enclosure.

The spaciousness and original quality of Bedford Gardens and Sheffield Terrace prevent their extreme length from dominating townscape considerations as in Peel Street. They also both have a formal eastern end and a less formal west end. In the case of BEDFORD GARDENS, the early terraces by Hall at the eastern end provide a very strong and elegant effect, altered only by the large Edwardian mansion block at no. 13, with substantial roof extensions and itself the redevelopment of three of the four later Victorian houses erected after the railway was constructed. At the western end the semi-detached houses on the north side, much altered and rather insignificant behind mature shrubs, face a terrace of considerable variety lacking the consistency and perhaps the dignity of the earlier terraces. In SHEFFIELD TERRACE the earlier terrace on the north side together with the boldly modelled but rather mechanical red-brick

terraces on the south side provide a strong "street" image, in contrast to which the individual villas at the eastern end provide a street frontage of considerable beauty and charm. The reticence and good manner of the Tor Gardens terrace with its carefully-considered frontage planting and boundary walls is an acceptable neighbour: only on the south side does this terrace and the garden fail to provide satisfying townscape in this particular context.



Tor Court in the same way pleases with its elevation to Gloucester Walk and disappoints with the blandness of its elevations to HORNTON STREET although the planting and walling is well-carried-out. Alone of the post-war developments, 45 and 47 Hornton Street attempt to pick up something of the flavour of their neighbouring Victorian villas, between which the recasting of Campden House Close from a Victorian mews shows many charming touches.

In GLOUCESTER WALK, the south side of the Campden House development is less sharply modelled than the terrace on the south side of Sheffield Terrace but contains a greater variety handled with subtlety which with the denseness of the original railings produces a powerful effect. This points up the requirement for well-maintained facades and appropriate boundary treatments together to create attractive townscape: where one or other is missing the resulting street scene is not so satisfying.

The semi-detached villas of 1836 in Bedford Gardens (top)

The Edwardian flats at 13 Bedford Gardens represent the third development of this site in about 70 years (middle)

A mature town street: Sheffield Terrace, looking east (bottom)



48

4

Campden Street to Edge Street

Campden Street
Edge Street
Peel Street

Campden Street at the turn of the century. The houses on the left have been altered but their original character can still be discerned. The street appears wider without parked cars (below)

Campden Street today. The parked cars virtually turn the street into a traffic corridor (top right)

The pre-war Campden Hill skyline behind the Fox Primary School seen from Edge Street (below right)

Historical development

As described above, the distinctive character of this part of the Conservation Area is a direct result of the consecutive subdivision of the northern portion of the former Campden House estate, so that by 1823 John Punter and William Ward owned around five and three-quarter acres and undertook to develop a street each on the east-west orientation being established by more spacious schemes to the south.

Punter's development of Peel Street proceeded more rapidly. He completed eight pairs of semis called Claremont Cottages by 1826 (on the site now occupied by Campden Houses) and auctioned lots corresponding to building plots. Hanson, the developer of Campden Hill Square, briefly owned four. Sewerage was provided from 1829, and few plots remained undeveloped by 1834. It is possible that many houses were in multiple occupation from the start: reports were made to the Vestry in 1856 about the "foul and offensive" state of privies at seven houses. Apart from the inevitable disruption caused by the building of the railway, the most extensive redevelopment concerns the erection of Campden Houses as labourers' dwellings by the National Dwellings Society Limited in 1877-78. 80 Peel Street was built at the same time for Matthew Ridley Corbett, a portrait and landscape painter.

In contrast, development in Campden Street was sporadic until a concerted attempt shortly before 1850 to complete the street. The former Campden Arms public house (now no. 34) and nos. 72-84 (consecutive) date from this period. Byam Shaw House was opened as an art school in 1910.

Edge Street was laid out in the 1820s on the lower end of the land purchased by the West Middlesex Water Works Company in 1809. Although it was generally developed along similar lines to Peel Street, there were also groups of tiny cottages arranged round courtyards, swept away when the railway was inserted. The Water Works site itself ceased to be required by



the 1920s. The site of the reservoir was let in 1923 and afterwards sold for use as a garage: the remainder was sold to the London County Council in 1924 for the relocation of the Fox School, which was threatened by road-widening proposals at what is now the north end of Kensington Church Street. In the event the new school was not required until 1935.

Townscape analysis

All three streets consist for the most part of small houses with little architectural sophistication, consistently altered over the years. The general effect is of an attractive and unpretentious residential environment on a human scale. Each street however does have its own character with its own advantages and shortcomings.

Perhaps the greatest general shortcoming lies in the length of Peel Street and Campden Street when related to the width of plots and the average size of frontages. PEEL STREET suffers most, its linearity emphasised by Campden Houses. The individuality in external treatment of the frontages militates against their being taken together as serious townscape although

