



Mr D Marr  
Head of West Midlands Planning Team  
Government Office for the West Midlands  
5 St Philip's Place  
Colmore Row  
Birmingham  
B3 2PW

**By post and email**  
[WMPPlanning@gowm.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:WMPPlanning@gowm.gsi.gov.uk)

30 July 2008

Our ref. CW/676001

Dear Mr Marr

**HOLLAND PARK SCHOOL, AIRLIE GARDENS, CAMPDEN HILL ROAD,  
LONDON W8**

**CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT APPLICATION (RBK&C REF.  
CC/08/00592)**

Further to my telephone conversation with your colleague Beverley Jones last week, please find enclosed recent correspondence sent on behalf of the Campden Hill Residents' Association (CHRA) to the Government Office for London (GOL) and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBK&C), in connection with revised applications to demolish and redevelop the above school.

As you are aware, the 2006 applications were called-in by the Secretary of State on 13 July 2007 (refer to GOL letters on behalf of SoS enclosed) but they were withdrawn prior to the inquiry. GOL is currently reviewing the revised planning application for the new school and flats (RBK&C ref PP/08/00591) and the revised planning application for the temporary classrooms (RBK&C ref PP/08/0594), following RBK&C's resolution to approve the scheme on 26 June 2008.

Following a reorganisation of planning casework across the country, we understand that the Government Office for the West Midlands (GOWM) will now be determining the conservation area consent application (RBK&C ref. CC/08/00592) to demolish the existing school buildings, on behalf of the Secretary of State (with specialist input from English Heritage, London Region).

Paragraph 4.27 of PPG15 states that consent for demolition should not be given unless there are acceptable and detailed plans for any redevelopment. It goes on to state that it has been held that the decision-maker is entitled to consider the merits of any proposed development in determining whether consent should be given for the demolition of an unlisted building in a conservation area.

**Indigo Planning Limited**

Swan Court  
Worple Road  
London  
SW19 4JS

T 020 8605 9400  
F 020 8605 9401  
[info@indigoplanning.com](mailto:info@indigoplanning.com)  
[indigoplanning.com](http://indigoplanning.com)

Registered office  
Swan Court  
Worple Road  
London SW19 4JS  
Registered number 2078863

**Directors**

Simon Neate  
BA (Hons) MRTPI

Philip Villars  
BA (Hons) MRTPI

Ian Laverick  
BSc (Arch) BArch (Hons 1)  
RIBA FRAIA

Bill Davidson  
BA (Hons) DipTP DipUD MRTPI

Mathew Mainwaring  
BA (Hons) MRTPI

Sean McGrath  
BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Tim Waring  
BA (Hons) MRTPI

Stewart Miller  
BA(Hons)

Helen Greenhalgh  
BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Doug Hann  
BA (Hons) MTPL MSc MRTPI

Consultant  
John Spain  
BBS MRUP MRICS MRTPI MIPI

Associate Director  
Rob Crolla  
BA(Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

**Also in Manchester, Leeds and Dublin**

For the reasons provided in our earlier correspondence (copies enclosed), we consider the proposals for redevelopment are contrary in material respects to a number of policies in the Development Plan. The existence of various policy conflicts was also identified by RBK&C and Greater London Authority (GLA) officers in their reports and these were not properly resolved.

Of particular relevance to GOWM when determining the conservation area consent application, is that the proposed scale, height, bulk, massing and elevation design of the new development would be entirely inappropriate in this sensitive location. The scheme has been heavily criticised by English Heritage in their letter dated 11 June 2008 (copy enclosed) and the council's own Architectural Appraisal Panel (from RBK&C committee report 26/6/08 enclosed).

The design was also condemned by the council's own design officers and paragraph 8.15 of the RBK&C committee report 26.6.08 (extract enclosed) states:

*As with the previous application, the uniform building height combined with the building's forward position does give the building undue prominence within the streetscene and is less sensitive to the park's setting.*

Paragraph 8.20 of the RBK&C committee report 26.6.08 (extract enclosed) goes on to state:

*Overall, the architects have chosen to adopt a design which is [sic] pushes at the acceptable limits of bulk, massing and prominence. They have also chosen an individualistic style that takes little inspiration from its surroundings. These factors challenge the general presumptions set out in our conservation and design policies and in particular CD25, CD27, CD28, CD57 and CD62.*

In addition, CHRA does not consider that the revised proposal has addressed the issues raised by the Secretary of State in respect of the previous called-in application (refer to GOL letter on behalf of SoS enclosed), in terms of PPS1 and PPG15.

We trust that you will review the enclosed correspondence and take the concerns of CHRA into account when determining the conservation area consent application. If you require any further information, please contact me.

Yours sincerely



Caroline Wilberforce

Enc: Hard copies of enclosures only:  
Letters from GOL to RBK&C and Indigo, on behalf of SoS, 13 July 2007  
Email from Indigo to Mr D Taylor, RBKC, 15 April 2008  
Letter from AtisReal, 23 April 2008  
CHRA 'Alternative Vision'  
Extracts from RBK&C committee report, 26 June 2008  
Letter from Indigo to RBK&C, 9 May 2008  
Letter from English Heritage to RBK&C, 11 June 2008  
Letter from Indigo to GOL, 14 July 2008

cc: Mr D White, CHRA (letter by email only)  
Mr T Smith, Berwin Leighton Paisner (letter by email only)  
Ms S Stones, English Heritage (letter by email only)  
Mr A Ross, GOL (letter by email only)  
Mr D Prout, RBK&C (letter by email only)  
Mr D Taylor, RBKC (letter by email only)  
Mr B Collins, DP9 (letter by email only)