

CITY OF WESTMINSTER			
PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE	Date 19 June 2018	Classification For General Release	
Report of Director of Planning		Ward(s) involved Bayswater	
Subject of Report	Application 1: 70 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AL. Application 2: 85 Hereford Road, London, W2 5BB. Application 3: 82 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AL. Application 4: 86 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AL. Application 5: 80 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AL. Application 6: 48-50 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AJ. Application 7: 54 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AJ. Application 8: 49 Hereford Road, London, W2 5BB.		
Proposal	Installation of an alarm box on the front elevation (Retrospective).		
Agent	No Agent		
On behalf of	On behalf of homeowners		
Registered Number	Application 1: 18/02778/LBC Application 2: 18/02859/LBC Application 3: 18/03077/LBC Application 4: 18/02865/LBC Application 5: 18/03228/LBC Application 6: 18/03305/LBC Application 7: 18/03335/LBC Application 8: 18/03293/LBC	Date amended/ completed	8 April 2018
Date Application Received	8 April 2018		
Historic Building Grade	II		
Conservation Area	Westbourne		

## 1. RECOMMENDATION

**Application 1:** Refuse listed building consent – location and appearance.  
**Application 2:** Refuse listed building consent – location and appearance.  
**Application 3:** Refuse listed building consent – location and appearance.  
**Application 4:** Refuse listed building consent – location and appearance.  
**Application 5:** Refuse listed building consent – location and appearance.  
**Application 6:** Refuse listed building consent – location and appearance.  
**Application 7:** Refuse listed building consent – location and appearance.

**Application 8:** Refuse listed building consent – location and appearance.**2. SUMMARY**

The application sites are attractive c1850's terraced houses located on the east and west sides of Hereford Road, north of the junction with Westbourne Grove. The buildings are all Grade II and located within the Westbourne Conservation Area.

A member of the public reported an unauthorised alarm box on Hereford Road to the Planning Enforcement Team in 2013. It was noted during the most recent site inspection that there were a number of alarm boxes on the listed buildings on both sides of the street and currently there are 25 unauthorised alarm boxes on Hereford Road. The 8 applications currently being presented to Planning Committee seek consent retrospectively for the installation of an alarm box on the front elevation of the building.

The Notting Hill East Neighbourhood Forum initially raised an objection against all the applications on the grounds that they are visual clutter within the streetscene. They also stated research has found that there is no evidence of alarm boxes acting as a deterrent and there are modern ways of achieving security. The forum has since clarified their position on the applications, and whilst they still maintain in the objections in general to the many and varied unacceptable designs of the boxes and their locations; they note that alarm boxes have been allowed to proliferate throughout Westminster without the relevant consents. They further note that the official UK Police recommendations include the installation of a visual burglar alarms, as a deterrent to potential offenders and that this is often a requirement of insurance providers. Those boxes connected to a fire alarm, also allow the Fire Brigade to identify properties quicker. The forum conclude that if a consistent location and style could be established for these listed buildings and become a London wide policy then there would be no objections to the proposals.

The key issue in this case is:

- The impact of the alarm box on the special interest of the listed building
- The impact of the alarm box on the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area.

The proposed alarm boxes harms the special interest of the listed building and the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area and would be contrary to policies DES1, DES5, DES9 and DES10 in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and Policies S25 and S28 of Westminster's City Plan: Strategic Policies (the City Plan).

## 3. LOCATION PLAN



This production includes mapping data licensed from Ordnance Survey with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office (C) Crown Copyright and/or database rights 2013.  
All rights reserved License Number LA 100019597



#### 4. PHOTOGRAPHS

**Application 1: 18/02778/LBC**



**Application 2: 18/02859/LBC**



**Application 4: 18/02865/LBC**



**Application 3: 18/03077/LBC**



**Application 5: 18/03228/LBC****Application 6: 18/03305/LBC****Application 7: 18/03335/LBC****Application 8: 18/03293/LBC**

## 5. CONSULTATIONS

### Application 1: 18/02778/LBC

#### NOTTING HILL EAST NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM:

1<sup>st</sup> Response - Objection: Research reports that there is no evidence of alarm boxes as acting as a deterrent. They are visual clutter within the streetscene.

2nd Response - The forum has since clarified their position on the applications, and whilst they still maintain in the objections in general to the many and varied unacceptable designs of the boxes and their locations; they note that alarm boxes have been allowed to proliferate throughout Westminster without the relevant consents. They further note that the official UK Police recommendations include the installation of a visual burglar alarms, as a deterrent to potential offenders and that this is often a requirement of insurance providers. Those boxes connected to a fire alarm, also allow the Fire Brigade to identify properties quicker. The forum conclude that if a consistent location and style could be established for these listed buildings and become a London wide policy then there would be no objections to the proposals.

#### SOUTH EAST BAYSWATER RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:

Any response to be reported verbally

#### PLANNING ENFORCEMENT TEAM:

Any response to be reported verbally

PRESS ADVERTISEMENT / SITE NOTICE: Yes

### Application 2: 18/02859/LBC

#### NOTTING HILL EAST NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM:

1<sup>st</sup> Response - Objection: Research reports that there is no evidence of alarm boxes as acting as a deterrent. They are visual clutter within the streetscene.

2nd Response - The forum has since clarified their position on the applications, and whilst they still maintain in the objections in general to the many and varied unacceptable designs of the boxes and their locations; they note that alarm boxes have been allowed to proliferate throughout Westminster without the relevant consents. They further note that the official UK Police recommendations include the installation of a visual burglar alarms, as a deterrent to potential offenders and that this is often a requirement of insurance providers. Those boxes connected to a fire alarm, also allow the Fire Brigade to identify properties quicker. The forum conclude that if a consistent location and style could be established for these listed buildings and become a London wide policy then there would be no objections to the proposals.

#### SOUTH EAST BAYSWATER RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:

Any response to be reported verbally

#### PLANNING ENFORCEMENT TEAM:

Any response to be reported verbally

PRESS ADVERTISEMENT / SITE NOTICE: Yes

**Application 3: 18/03077/LBC****NOTTING HILL EAST NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM:**

1<sup>st</sup> Response - Objection: Research reports that there is no evidence of alarm boxes as acting as a deterrent. They are visual clutter within the streetscene.

2nd Response - The forum has since clarified their position on the applications, and whilst they still maintain in the objections in general to the many and varied unacceptable designs of the boxes and their locations; they note that alarm boxes have been allowed to proliferate throughout Westminster without the relevant consents. They further note that the official UK Police recommendations include the installation of a visual burglar alarms, as a deterrent to potential offenders and that this is often a requirement of insurance providers. Those boxes connected to a fire alarm, also allow the Fire Brigade to identify properties quicker. The forum conclude that if a consistent location and style could be established for these listed buildings and become a London wide policy then there would be no objections to the proposals.

**SOUTH EAST BAYSWATER RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:**

Any response to be reported verbally

**PLANNING ENFORCEMENT TEAM:**

Any response to be reported verbally

PRESS ADVERTISEMENT / SITE NOTICE: Yes

**Application 4: 18/02865/LBC****NOTTING HILL EAST NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM:**

1<sup>st</sup> Response - Objection: Research reports that there is no evidence of alarm boxes as acting as a deterrent. They are visual clutter within the streetscene.

2nd Response - The forum has since clarified their position on the applications, and whilst they still maintain in the objections in general to the many and varied unacceptable designs of the boxes and their locations; they note that alarm boxes have been allowed to proliferate throughout Westminster without the relevant consents. They further note that the official UK Police recommendations include the installation of a visual burglar alarms, as a deterrent to potential offenders and that this is often a requirement of insurance providers. Those boxes connected to a fire alarm, also allow the Fire Brigade to identify properties quicker. The forum conclude that if a consistent location and style could be established for these listed buildings and become a London wide policy then there would be no objections to the proposals.

**SOUTH EAST BAYSWATER RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:**

Any response to be reported verbally

**PLANNING ENFORCEMENT TEAM:**

Any response to be reported verbally

PRESS ADVERTISEMENT / SITE NOTICE: Yes

**Application 5: 18/03228/LBC****NOTTING HILL EAST NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM:**



1<sup>st</sup> Response - Objection: Research reports that there is no evidence of alarm boxes as acting as a deterrent. They are visual clutter within the streetscene.

2<sup>nd</sup> Response - The forum has since clarified their position on the applications, and whilst they still maintain in the objections in general to the many and varied unacceptable designs of the boxes and their locations; they note that alarm boxes have been allowed to proliferate throughout Westminster without the relevant consents. They further note that the official UK Police recommendations include the installation of a visual burglar alarms, as a deterrent to potential offenders and that this is often a requirement of insurance providers. Those boxes connected to a fire alarm, also allow the Fire Brigade to identify properties quicker. The forum conclude that if a consistent location and style could be established for these listed buildings and become a London wide policy then there would be no objections to the proposals.

**SOUTH EAST BAYSWATER RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:**

Any response to be reported verbally

**PLANNING ENFORCEMENT TEAM:**

Any response to be reported verbally

**PRESS ADVERTISEMENT / SITE NOTICE:** Yes

**Application 6: 18/03305/LBC**

**NOTTING HILL EAST NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM:**

1<sup>st</sup> Response - Objection: Research reports that there is no evidence of alarm boxes as acting as a deterrent. They are visual clutter within the streetscene.

2<sup>nd</sup> Response - The forum has since clarified their position on the applications, and whilst they still maintain in the objections in general to the many and varied unacceptable designs of the boxes and their locations; they note that alarm boxes have been allowed to proliferate throughout Westminster without the relevant consents. They further note that the official UK Police recommendations include the installation of a visual burglar alarms, as a deterrent to potential offenders and that this is often a requirement of insurance providers. Those boxes connected to a fire alarm, also allow the Fire Brigade to identify properties quicker. The forum conclude that if a consistent location and style could be established for these listed buildings and become a London wide policy then there would be no objections to the proposals.

**SOUTH EAST BAYSWATER RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:**

Any response to be reported verbally

**PLANNING ENFORCEMENT TEAM:**

Any response to be reported verbally

**PRESS ADVERTISEMENT / SITE NOTICE:** Yes

**Application 7: 18/03335/LBC**

**NOTTING HILL EAST NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM:**

1<sup>st</sup> Response - Objection: Research reports that there is no evidence of alarm boxes as acting as a deterrent. They are visual clutter within the streetscene.



2nd Response - The forum has since clarified their position on the applications, and whilst they still maintain in the objections in general to the many and varied unacceptable designs of the boxes and their locations; they note that alarm boxes have been allowed to proliferate throughout Westminster without the relevant consents. They further note that the official UK Police recommendations include the installation of a visual burglar alarms, as a deterrent to potential offenders and that this is often a requirement of insurance providers. Those boxes connected to a fire alarm, also allow the Fire Brigade to identify properties quicker. The forum conclude that if a consistent location and style could be established for these listed buildings and become a London wide policy then there would be no objections to the proposals.

**SOUTH EAST BAYSWATER RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:**

Any response to be reported verbally

**PLANNING ENFORCEMENT TEAM:**

Any response to be reported verbally

**PRESS ADVERTISEMENT / SITE NOTICE:** Yes

**Application 8:** 18/03293/LBC

**NOTTING HILL EAST NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM:**

1<sup>st</sup> Response - Objection: Research reports that there is no evidence of alarm boxes as acting as a deterrent. They are visual clutter within the streetscene.

2nd Response - The forum has since clarified their position on the applications, and whilst they still maintain in the objections in general to the many and varied unacceptable designs of the boxes and their locations; they note that alarm boxes have been allowed to proliferate throughout Westminster without the relevant consents. They further note that the official UK Police recommendations include the installation of a visual burglar alarms, as a deterrent to potential offenders and that this is often a requirement of insurance providers. Those boxes connected to a fire alarm, also allow the Fire Brigade to identify properties quicker. The forum conclude that if a consistent location and style could be established for these listed buildings and become a London wide policy then there would be no objections to the proposals.

**SOUTH EAST BAYSWATER RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:**

Any response to be reported verbally

**PLANNING ENFORCEMENT TEAM:**

Any response to be reported verbally

**PRESS ADVERTISEMENT / SITE NOTICE:** Yes

## **6. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### **6.1 The Application Site**

The application sites are 8 Grade II listed buildings located intermittently on the east and west sides of Hereford Road. All the buildings are located within the Westbourne Conservation Area.

## 6.2 Recent Relevant History

### Planning Enforcement History

In 2013 a member of the public reported the installation of an alarm box on the front elevation of a listed building at 54 Hereford Road to the Planning Enforcement Team. Following the initial investigation it was determined that the alarm box was causing harm to the special interest of the listed building and that formal enforcement action was warranted.

It was then noted during the most recent site inspection that there were a number of alarm boxes on properties, which were also Grade II listed, on both sides of Hereford Road. In order to provide a consistent approach it was then necessary to open investigations about the other alarm boxes also. Advice was sought from design officers on the alarm boxes and it was advised that where the alarm boxes were sited in a visually prominent location, the installation was considered to harm the special interest of the listed building and it was recommended that the Enforcement Team pursue the relocation of the alarm boxes.

The alarm box introduced at 88 Hereford Road was considered to be in an acceptable location (within the front portico screened by the column), so that case was closed. Alarm boxes located on two other properties on the road were removed following the Council's letter and two properties were able to demonstrate the alarm boxes were installed prior to the buildings being listed and therefore were beyond planning control; these enforcement cases have been closed. The remaining 25 properties were advised to relocate their alarm boxes to a position that was considered to have minimal impact on the listed building.

### Planning History

There is no relevant planning history for the application sites in relation to the installation of alarm boxes, however there are a number of appeal decisions which are worthy of note. Additionally there is no planning history for the whole of Hereford Road relating to the installation of alarm boxes.

### Relevant Appeal Decisions

#### 24 Chilworth Street (RN: 09/43652/P)

Appeal against a listed building enforcement notice requiring the removal of an alarm box, which has been installed on the front elevation of the property and to make good any damage to the fabric of the building caused by the installation.

The inspector concluded that there was harm to the heritage asset, which is less than substantial, but they did not consider that there are any appropriate public benefits, which outweigh the harm caused. They noted that the Council would not have granted consent for this particular installation and they found no justification in doing so at the appeal stage.

21 Hyde Park Square (incorporating 20 and 20A Hyde Park Square and 43 and 43A Gloucester Square) (RN:05/07454/LBC)

Appeal against the refusal to grant listed building consent for the retention of 7no CCTV cameras.

The Inspector concluded that 'the CCTV cameras which are located within the projecting porches are reasonably well screened. Consequently the amount of unobtrusive fittings do not materially detract from the appearance of the listed building'. The cameras fixed within the front lightwell and on the cornice at first floor level are obtrusive and appear as an incongruous and insensitive modern addition attached to a classical façade. The cameras harm rather than preserve the character of the historic building and the appearance of the street and the conservation area.

The Colonies, 25 Wilfred Street (RN:14/00787/FULL)

Appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the installation of antennas on the face of the building, which is located within a conservation area.

The Inspector concluded the appeal development would have an unacceptable appearance within the conservation area. There would be conflict with UDP and City Plan policies and would fail to 'conserve' heritage assets. The development causes less than substantial harm to the heritage asset and the public benefits do not outweigh the harm identified.

## 7. THE PROPOSAL

All the applications are seeking retrospective listed building consent for the installation of an alarm box on the front elevation of the building. Each application includes a photograph of the existing alarm box and a historic impact assessment. The specifics of each application is below:

**Application 1:** 18/02778/LBC

White coloured square shaped alarm box located at first floor level between a window and quoins.

**Application 2:** 18/02859/LBC

Beige coloured triangular shaped alarm box with the manufactures name located at first floor level between a window and quoins.

**Application 3:** 18/03077/LBC

Beige coloured triangular shaped alarm box with the manufacturers name located centrally at first floor level between two windows.

**Application 4:** 18/02865/LBC

Beige coloured triangular shaped alarm box with the manufacturers name located centrally at first floor level between two windows.

**Application 5: 18/03228/LBC**

Beige coloured triangular shaped alarm box with the manufacturers name located centrally at first floor level between two windows.

**Application 6: 18/03305/LBC**

Beige coloured triangular shaped alarm box with the manufacturers name located centrally at first floor level between two windows.

**Application 7: 18/03335/LBC**

Yellow hexagonal shaped alarm box with the manufacturers name located at first floor level adjacent to the window.

**Application 8: 18/03293/LBC**

Beige coloured hexagonal shaped alarm box with the manufacturers name located at first floor level adjacent to the window.

## 8. DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

### 8.1 Land Use

The application does not raise land use issues.

### 8.2 Townscape and Design

The application sites are 3 storey terraced houses with basement and attic levels. Dating from c1850 each building is 2 windows wide with square headed windows which are arched above the ground floor level and have a continuous bombe balcony at first floor level. The end buildings are distinguishable by the rusticated quoins and slight projection forward. The buildings have maintained a uniform appearance with the exteriors retaining their original architectural features; this architectural style and detailing is considered to contribute to the special interest of the heritage assets. They also contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty upon the decision maker, in the exercise of planning functions, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area. The 1990 Act also requires the Local Planning Authority to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. Additionally the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation

The pertinent policies contained in the adopted City Plan are S25 and S28. The relevant policies in the adopted UDP are set out in Chapter 10, Urban Design and Conservation. The most applicable policies are DES 1 that sets out principles of urban design and



conservation, DES 5 relating to alterations, DES 9 that concerns the impact of development on conservation areas and DES10 which relates to works affecting listed buildings.

The City Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance document *Repair and Alterations to listed buildings* advised that it should be demonstrated that burglar alarms are necessary and have been designed and located to minimise their impact. Where such proposal are considered to harm to appearance or character of a listed building consent will be refused.

The Supplementary Planning Guidance document *Demolition and Development in Conservation Areas* advises in paragraph L.5 that features such as alarm boxes can have an adverse impact on the external appearance of buildings. It states they should be located where they have minimal visual impact.

The Local Amenity society originally strongly objected to all the applications. They referred to a research document which reports there being no evidence of alarm boxes acting as a deterrent. They stated that the reward to the property owner is slim, piling into insignificance when measured against the risk of public nuisance. They also considered alarm boxes as being visual litter to the public and those who visually enjoy the streetscape, stating that there are modern methods now which can achieve the same result. The society has since clarified their position on the applications, and whilst they still maintain in the objections in general to the many and varied unacceptable designs of the boxes and their locations; they note that alarm boxes have been allowed to proliferate throughout Westminster without the relevant consents. They further note that the official UK Police recommendations include the installation of a visual burglar alarms, as a deterrent to potential offenders and that this is often a requirement of insurance providers. Those boxes connected to a fire alarm, also allow the Fire Brigade to identify properties quicker. The forum conclude that if a consistent location and style could be established for these listed buildings and become a London wide policy then there would be no objections to the proposals.

In their current location the alarm boxes are highly prominent in the street scene and in longer townscape views. All are located at first floor level, have a slight projection, are of a colour which is different from the elevation to which they are attached and contain manufacturers information which results in them being visually apparent. Despite the alarm box being small in scale in relation to the elevation as a whole, due to their location, form and features, the alarm box appears as an intrusive and detracting feature against the attractive Victorian terrace buildings. The alarm boxes are modern utilitarian features which do not sympathetically relate to the architectural style and detailing of the host building and the wider terrace as a whole. The principle elevations are highly decorative with the quoins and window architrave detailing contributing to their appearance, which is juxtaposed with the modern introduction, in some cases located adjacent to them. Therefore the alarm boxes are considered to be intrusive and detracting, having a harmful impact on the special interest of the listed building.

In the appeal decision at 24 Chilworth Street the Inspector acknowledged that the alarm box was not large however it was prominently sited at a high level on the listed building. They stated 'because it is centred on the windows and within a relatively small gap between the architraved/pedimented first floor window and the sill of the second floor

window it is obtrusive and visually distracting... it is in a dominant position between the windows and its colour emphasises its stark visual impact'. Therefore the principle of having an alarm box on a highly visible part of the principle elevation, which does not sympathetically relate to the architectural detailing, was not supported by the Planning Inspectorate and the appeal was dismissed due to the harm caused to the designated heritage assets.

Due to the number of properties that have alarm boxes on their principal elevations the impact on the special interest of the listed buildings and wider conservation area is considered to be exacerbated by the collective impact of the visual clutter. Furthermore should alarm boxes be introduced to every building in the street then the amount of clutter on the elevations would detract from the appearance of the street.

As demonstrated within the Planning History section, 2 properties within the street have complied with the City Council's position and have recognised the harm the alarm boxes caused to the designated heritage assets, and as such have removed their alarm boxes from the principal façade.

In a comparable appeal decision at 21 Hyde Park Square, in relation to CCTV cameras on the front elevation, the Inspector concluded that the security measures serve to harm rather than preserve the character of the listed building and the appearance of the street scene and conservation area. the Inspector noted that the development failed to comply with UDP policies DES 9 and DES 10 as well as the City Council's supplementary planning guidance on siting security cameras, which aim to prevent the historic character of listed buildings from being harmed.

There is a private benefit to the occupant of the building whereby the installation of an alarm box will raise attention in the event of burglary, but more so act as a deterrent. It is acknowledged that the display of security measures help to deter potential crime, however in this case the alarm boxes are insensitively located and would have a harmful impact on the listed building and character and appearance of the conservation area.

There is potentially scope for alternative siting of the alarm box, such as within the front lightwell, behind the top light of the principal entrance and adjacent to the floor of the bomb balcony at first floor level behind the railings. There is also scope for alternative security measures, such as display of warning notifications applied to windows that would serve as a deterrent and which would have no impact on the character and appearance of the building or the conservation area. These alternatives have been suggested to the applicants but they have declined to amend their proposals.

A number of statements accompanying the applications state that the alarm boxes are required to prevent crime within the area. In the appeal at 21 Hyde Park Square the Inspector noted that the appeal site was located in a 'high crime area', however these considerations do not justify the insensitive and damaging positions of the cameras in relation to the historic building. Therefore as there are alternative measures which are considered to be less harmful to the heritage asset, the increased security benefit of the proposal is not considered to outweigh the identified harm.

The alarm boxes have a harmful impact on the listed building and upon the Westbourne Conservation Area, appearing as a highly prominent and incongruous addition and as

such, in accordance with the Act, it is unacceptable. The proposal is also contrary to policies S25 and S28 of our City Plan; and DES 1, DES 5, DES 9 and DES 10 of our UDP.

The works are considered to result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Heritage Assets, which in this instance is the application site, the terrace it forms part of and the Westbourne Conservation Area. In accordance with section 12 of the NPPF, noting in particular that under paragraph 134, any harm identified should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The Planning Practice Guidance sets out at Reference: ID 18a-020-20140306 that public benefits should be of a nature or scale to benefit the public at large and not just a private benefit. During the course of the applications it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would create any notable public benefits and as such there are not considered to be any public benefits that would outweigh the harm identified. The proposal would only provide private benefits to the occupants of the building. It is therefore concluded that the public benefits of the proposal would be limited and do not amount to the clear and convincing justification for the harm that would be caused.

### **8.3 Residential Amenity**

The application does not raise amenity issues.

### **8.4 Transportation/Parking**

### **8.5 Economic Considerations**

No economic considerations are applicable for a development of this size.

### **8.6 Access**

### **8.7 Other UDP/Westminster Policy Considerations**

Not applicable.

### **8.8 London Plan**

This application raises no strategic issues.

### **8.9 National Policy/Guidance Considerations**

The City Plan and UDP policies referred to in the consideration of this application are considered to be consistent with the NPPF unless stated otherwise.

### **8.10 Planning Obligations**

Planning obligations are not relevant in the determination of this application.

### **8.11 Environmental Impact Assessment**

Not applicable.

## 8.12 Other Issues

Not applicable.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUERIES ABOUT THIS REPORT PLEASE CONTACT THE PRESENTING OFFICER: KIMBERLEY DAVIES BY EMAIL AT <a href="mailto:kdavies1@westminster.gov.uk">kdavies1@westminster.gov.uk</a>
--



## 9. KEY DRAWINGS

Application 1: 18/02778/LBC



Application 2: 18/02859/LBC



Application 4: 18/02865/LBC



Application 3: 18/03077/LBC



Application 6: 18/03305/LBC

**Application 5: 18/03228/LBC****Application 6: 18/03305/LBC****Application 7: 18/03335/LBC****Application 8: 18/03293/LBC**

**DRAFT DECISION LETTER – 18/02778/LBC**

**Address:** 70 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AL,

**Proposal:** Installation of an alarm box on the front elevation. (retrospective).

**Plan Nos:** Photograph (alarm box centrally located on front elevation at first floor level).

**Case Officer:** Rebecca Mason

**Direct Tel. No.** 020 7641 7540

**Recommended Condition(s) and Reason(s) or Reason(s) for Refusal:****Reason:**

Because of its prominent high level location, projection, materials and design the alarm box on the front elevation at first floor level would harm the special architectural and architectural interest of the grade II listed building. It would also fail to maintain or improve (preserve or enhance) the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area. This would not be in accordance with S25 and S28 of Westminster's City Plan (November 2016) and DES 1 and paras 10.108 to 10.146 of the Unitary Development Plan that we adopted in January 2007 and the advice set out in paragraph 4 of our Supplementary Planning Guidance: Repairs and Alterations to Listed Buildings.

**Informative(s):**

- 1 In dealing with this application the City Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way so far as practicable. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in Westminster's City Plan (November 2016), Unitary Development Plan, Supplementary Planning documents, planning briefs, and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application that is likely to be considered favourably. In addition further guidance was offered by the City Council to the applicant during the processing of the application to identify amendments to address the concerns of the scheme considered unacceptable. However, the necessary amendments to make the application acceptable are substantial and would materially change the original proposal. They would require further consultations to be undertaken prior to determination, which could not take place within the statutory determination period specified by the Department for Communities and Local Government. You are therefore encouraged to consider making a fresh application incorporating the material amendments set out below, if necessary to make the scheme acceptable.

**Required amendments:**

You are advised that a sympathetic approach would be to locate an alarm box:

- o Just behind the front door so the box is visible through the fan light
- o At basement level, within the lightwell - preferably under the entrance stairs or adjacent to a window (and painted white)
- o Immediately above the first floor balcony (and painted white)

**DRAFT DECISION LETTER – 18/02859/LBC**

**Address:** 85 Hereford Road, London, W2 5BB.

**Proposal:** Installation of an alarm box on the front elevation. (retrospective).

**Plan Nos:** Photograph (alarm box centrally located on front elevation at first floor level).

**Case Officer:** Rebecca Mason

**Direct Tel. No.** 020 7641 7540

**Recommended Condition(s) and Reason(s) or Reason(s) for Refusal:****Reason:**

Because of its prominent high level location, projection, materials and design the alarm box on the front elevation at first floor level would harm the special architectural and architectural interest of the grade II listed building. It would also fail to maintain or improve (preserve or enhance) the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area. This would not be in accordance with S25 and S28 of Westminster's City Plan (November 2016) and DES 1 and paras 10.108 to 10.146 of the Unitary Development Plan that we adopted in January 2007 and the advice set out in paragraph 4 of our Supplementary Planning Guidance: Repairs and Alterations to Listed Buildings.

**Informative(s):**

- 1 In dealing with this application the City Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way so far as practicable. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in Westminster's City Plan (November 2016), Unitary Development Plan, Supplementary Planning documents, planning briefs, and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application that is likely to be considered favourably. In addition further guidance was offered by the City Council to the applicant during the processing of the application to identify amendments to address the elements of the scheme considered unacceptable. However, the necessary amendments to make the application acceptable are substantial and would materially change the content of the proposal. They would require further consultations to be undertaken prior to determination, which could not take place within the statutory determination period specified by the Department for Communities and Local Government. You are therefore encouraged to consider making a fresh application incorporating the material amendments set out below, which are necessary to make the scheme acceptable.

**Required amendments:**

You are advised that a sympathetic approach would be to locate an alarm box:

- o Just behind the front door so the box is visible through the fan light
- o At basement level, within the lightwell - preferably under the entrance stairs or adjacent to a window (and painted white)
- o Immediately above the first floor balcony (and painted white)



**DRAFT DECISION LETTER – 18/03077/LBC**

**Address:** 82 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AL.

**Proposal:** Installation of an alarm box on the front elevation. (retrospective).

**Plan Nos:** Photograph (alarm box centrally located on front elevation at first floor level).

**Case Officer:** Rebecca Mason

**Direct Tel. No.** 020 7641 7540

**Recommended Condition(s) and Reason(s) or Reason(s) for Refusal:****Reason:**

Because of its prominent high level location, projection, materials and design the alarm box on the front elevation at first floor level would harm the special architectural and architectural interest of the grade II listed building. It would also fail to maintain or improve (preserve or enhance) the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area. This would not be in accordance with the policies of the Westbourne Conservation Area (WCA) set out in the Westbourne Conservation Area (WCA) S25 and S28 of Westminster's City Plan (November 2016) and DES 1 and paras 10.108 to 10.114 of the Unitary Development Plan that we adopted in January 2007 and the advice set out in paragraph 4 of our Supplementary Planning Guidance: Repairs and Alterations to Listed Buildings.

**Informative(s):**

- 1 In dealing with this application the City Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way so far as practicable. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in Westminster's City Plan (November 2016), Unitary Development Plan, Supplementary Planning documents, planning briefs and other material written guidance, as well as offering a full pre application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application that is likely to be considered favourably. In addition further guidance was offered by the case officer to the applicant during the processing of the application to identify amendments to address the concerns of the scheme considered unacceptable. However, the necessary amendments to make the application acceptable are substantial and would materially change the development proposal. They would require further consultations to be undertaken prior to determination, which could not take place within the statutory determination period specified by the Department for Communities and Local Government. You are therefore encouraged to consider submission of a fresh application incorporating the material amendments set out below, where necessary to make the scheme acceptable.

**Required amendments:**

You are advised that a sympathetic approach would be to locate an alarm box:

- o Just behind the front door so the box is visible through the fan light
- o At basement level, within the lightwell - preferably under the entrance stairs or adjacent to a window (and painted white)
- o Immediately above the first floor balcony (and painted white)

**DRAFT DECISION LETTER – 18/02865/LBC**

**Address:** 86 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AL.

**Proposal:** Installation of an alarm box on the front elevation. (retrospective).

**Plan Nos:** Photograph (alarm box centrally located on front elevation at first floor level).

**Case Officer:** Rebecca Mason

**Direct Tel. No.** 020 7641 7540

**Recommended Condition(s) and Reason(s) or Reason(s) for Refusal:**

Reason:

Because of its prominent high level location, projection, materials and design the alarm box on the front elevation at first floor level would harm the special architectural and architectural interest of the grade II listed building. It would also fail to maintain or improve (preserve or enhance) the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area. This would not be in accordance with the policies of the Westbourne Conservation Area (WCA) set out in the Westbourne Conservation Area (WCA) Management Plan (November 2016) and DES 1 and paras 10.108 to 10.116 of the Unitary Development Plan that we adopted in January 2007 and the advice set out in paragraph 14 of our Supplementary Planning Guidance: Repairs and Alterations to Listed Buildings.

**Informative(s):**

- 1 In dealing with this application the City Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way so far as practicable. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in Westminster's City Plan (November 2016), Unitary Development Plan, Supplementary Planning documents, planning briefs, and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application that is likely to be considered favourably. In addition further guidance was offered by the City Council to the applicant during the processing of the application to identify amendments to address the elements of the scheme considered unacceptable. However, the necessary amendments to make the application acceptable are substantial and would materially change the original proposal. They would require further consultations to be undertaken prior to determination, which could not take place within the statutory determination period specified by the Department for Communities and Local Government. You are therefore encouraged to consider making a fresh application incorporating the material amendments set out below which are necessary to make the scheme acceptable.

Required amendments:

You are advised that a sympathetic approach would be to locate an alarm box:

- o Just behind the front door so the box is visible through the fan light
- o At basement level, within the lightwell - preferably under the entrance stairs or adjacent to a window (and painted white)
- o Immediately above the first floor balcony (and painted white)

**DRAFT DECISION LETTER – 18/03228/LBC**

**Address:** 80 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AL

**Proposal:** Installation of an alarm box on the front elevation. (retrospective).

**Plan Nos:** Photograph (alarm box centrally located on front elevation at first floor level).

**Case Officer:** Rebecca Mason

**Direct Tel. No.** 020 7641 7540

**Recommended Condition(s) and Reason(s) or Reason(s) for Refusal:**

Reason:

Because of its prominent high level location, projection, materials and design the alarm box on the front elevation at first floor level would harm the special architectural and architectural interest of the grade II listed building. It would also fail to maintain or improve (preserve or enhance) the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area. This would not be in accordance with the policies of the City of Westminster's City Plan (November 2016) and DES 1 and paras 10.108 to 10.114 of the Unitary Development Plan that we adopted in January 2007 and the advice set out in paragraph 4 of our Supplementary Planning Guidance: Repairs and Alterations to Listed Buildings.

**Informative(s):**

- 1 In dealing with this application the City Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way so far as practicable. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in Westminster's City Plan (November 2016), Unitary Development Plan, Supplementary Planning documents, planning briefs, and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application that is likely to be considered favourably. In addition further guidance was offered by the City Council to the applicant during the processing of the application to identify amendments to address the elements of the scheme considered unacceptable. However, the necessary amendments to make the application acceptable are substantial and would materially change the original proposal. They would require further consultations to be undertaken prior to determination, which could not take place within the statutory determination period specified by the Department for Communities and Local Government. You are therefore encouraged to consider making a fresh application incorporating the material amendments set out below, if necessary to make the scheme acceptable.

Required amendments:

You are advised that a sympathetic approach would be to locate an alarm box:

- o Just behind the front door so the box is visible through the fan light
- o At basement level, within the lightwell - preferably under the entrance stairs or adjacent to a window (and painted white)
- o Immediately above the first floor balcony (and painted white)

**DRAFT DECISION LETTER- 18/03305/LBC**

**Address:** 48-50 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AJ

**Proposal:** Installation of an alarm box on the front elevation. (retrospective).

**Plan Nos:** Photograph (alarm box centrally located on front elevation at first floor level).

**Case Officer:** Rebecca Mason

**Direct Tel. No.** 020 7641 7540

**Recommended Condition(s) and Reason(s) or Reason(s) for Refusal:**

Reason:

Because of its prominent high level location, projection, materials and design the alarm box on the front elevation at first floor level would harm the special architectural and architectural interest of this grade II listed building. It would also fail to maintain or improve (preserve or enhance) the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area. This would not be in accordance with the policies of the City of Westminster's City Plan (November 2016) and DES 1 and paras 10.108 to 10.114 of the Unitary Development Plan that we adopted in January 2007 and the advice set out in paragraph 14 of our Supplementary Planning Guidance: Repairs and Alterations to Listed Buildings.

**Informative(s):**

- 1 In dealing with this application the City Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way so far as practicable. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in Westminster's City Plan (November 2016), Unitary Development Plan, Supplementary Planning documents, planning briefs, as well as offering a full pre application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application that is likely to be considered favourably. In addition further guidance was offered by the City Council to the applicant during the processing of the application to identify amendments to address the elements of the scheme considered unacceptable. However, the necessary amendments to make the application acceptable are substantial and would materially change the original proposal. They would require further consultations to be undertaken prior to determination, which could not take place within the statutory determination period specified by the Department for Communities and Local Government. You are therefore encouraged to consider making a fresh application incorporating the material amendments set out below, if necessary to make the scheme acceptable.

Required amendments:

You are advised that a sympathetic approach would be to locate an alarm box:

- o Just behind the front door so the box is visible through the fan light
- o At basement level, within the lightwell - preferably under the entrance stairs or adjacent to a window (and painted white)
- o Immediately above the first floor balcony (and painted white)

**DRAFT DECISION LETTER – 18/03335/LBC**

**Address:** 54 Hereford Road, London, W2 5AJ.

**Proposal:** Installation of an alarm box on the front elevation. (retrospective).

**Plan Nos:** Photograph (alarm box centrally located on front elevation at first floor level).

**Case Officer:** Rebecca Mason

**Direct Tel. No.** 020 7641 7540

**Recommended Condition(s) and Reason(s) or Reason(s) for Refusal:****Reason:**

Because of its prominent high level location, projection, materials and design the alarm box on the front elevation at first floor level would harm the special architectural and architectural interest of this grade II listed building. It would also fail to maintain or improve (preserve or enhance) the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area. This would not be in accordance with the policies of the City of Westminster's City Plan (November 2016) and DES 1 and paras 10.108 to 10.114 of the Unitary Development Plan that we adopted in January 2007 and the advice set out in paragraph 14 of our Supplementary Planning Guidance: Repairs and Alterations to Listed Buildings.

**Informative(s):**

- 1 In dealing with this application the City Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way so far as practicable. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in Westminster's City Plan (November 2016), Unitary Development Plan, Supplementary Planning documents, planning briefs, and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application that is likely to be considered favourably. In addition further guidance was offered by the City Council to the applicant during the processing of the application to identify amendments to address the elements of the scheme considered unacceptable. However, the necessary amendments to make the application acceptable are substantial and would materially change the original proposal. They would require further consultations to be undertaken prior to determination, which could not take place within the statutory determination period specified by the Department for Communities and Local Government. You are therefore encouraged to consider making a fresh application incorporating the material amendments set out below, if necessary to make the scheme acceptable.

**Required amendments:**

You are advised that a sympathetic approach would be to locate an alarm box:

- o Just behind the front door so the box is visible through the fan light
- o At basement level, within the lightwell - preferably under the entrance stairs or adjacent to a window (and painted white)
- o Immediately above the first floor balcony (and painted white)

**DRAFT DECISION LETTER – 18/03293/LBC**

**Address:** 49 Hereford Road, London, W2 5BB.

**Proposal:** Installation of an alarm box on the front elevation. (retrospective).

**Plan Nos:** Photograph (alarm box centrally located on front elevation at first floor level).

**Case Officer:** Rebecca Mason

**Direct Tel. No.** 020 7641 7540

**Recommended Condition(s) and Reason(s) or Reason(s) for Refusal:****Reason:**

Because of its prominent high level location, projection, materials and design the alarm box on the front elevation at first floor level would harm the special architectural and architectural interest of this grade II listed building. It would also fail to maintain or improve (preserve or enhance) the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area. This would not be in accordance with the policies of the Westbourne Conservation Area (WCA) set out in the Westbourne Conservation Area (WCA) Development Plan (November 2016) and DES 1 and paras 10.108 to 10.114 of the Unitary Development Plan that we adopted in January 2007 and the advice set out in paragraph 14 of our Supplementary Planning Guidance: Repairs and Alterations to Listed Buildings.

**Informative(s):**

- 1 In dealing with this application the City Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way so far as practicable. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in Westminster's City Plan (November 2016), Unitary Development Plan, Supplementary Planning documents, planning briefs, and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application that is likely to be considered favourably. In addition further guidance was offered by the City Council to the applicant during the processing of the application to identify amendments to address the elements of the scheme considered unacceptable. However, the necessary amendments to make the application acceptable are substantial and would materially change the original proposal. They would require further consultations to be undertaken prior to determination, which could not take place within the statutory determination period specified by the Department for Communities and Local Government. You are therefore encouraged to consider making a fresh application incorporating the material amendments set out below, if necessary to make the scheme acceptable.

**Required amendments:**

You are advised that a sympathetic approach would be to locate an alarm box:

- o Just behind the front door so the box is visible through the fan light
- o At basement level, within the lightwell - preferably under the entrance stairs or adjacent to a window (and painted white)
- o Immediately above the first floor balcony (and painted white)



## BACKGROUND PAPERS

### Appeal decisions

24 Chilworth Street (RN: 09/43652/P)

21 Hyde Park Square (incorporating 20 and 20A Hyde Park Square and 43 and 43A Gloucester Square) (RN:05/07454/LBC)

The Colonies, 25 Wilfred Street (RN:14/00787/FULL)

### Application 1: 18/02778/LBC

1. Application form
2. Letters from Notting Hill East Neighbourhood Forum dated 16 May and 1 June 2018

### Application 2: 18/02859/LBC

1. Application form
2. Letters from Notting Hill East Neighbourhood Forum dated 16 May and 1 June 2018 (attached only under Application 1 for Background Paper purposes)

### Application 3: 18/03077/LBC

1. Application form
2. Letters from Notting Hill East Neighbourhood Forum dated 16 May and 1 June 2018 (attached only under Application 1 for Background Paper purposes).

### Application 4: 18/02865/LBC

1. Application form
2. Letters from Notting Hill East Neighbourhood Forum dated 16 May and 1 June 2018 (attached only under Application 1 for Background Paper purposes)

### Application 5: 18/03228/LBC

1. Application form
2. Letters from Notting Hill East Neighbourhood Forum dated 16 May and 1 June 2018 (attached only under Application 1 for Background Paper purposes).

### Application 6: 18/03305/LBC

1. Application form
2. Letters from Notting Hill East Neighbourhood Forum dated 16 May and 1 June 2018 (attached only under Application 1 for Background Paper purposes).

### Application 7: 18/03335/LBC

1. Application form
2. Letters from Notting Hill East Neighbourhood Forum dated 16 May and 1 June 2018 (attached only under Application 1 for Background Paper purposes).

Item No.
<b>14</b>

3. Letter from applicant dated 24 May 2018

**Application 8:** 18/03293/LBC

1. Application form
2. Letters from Notting Hill East Neighbourhood Forum dated 16 May and 1 June 2018  
(attached only under Application 1 for Background Paper purposes).