CONSERVATION AREA AUDIT

QUEEN’S PARK ESTATE
PREFACE

Since the designation of the first conservation areas in 1967 the City Council has undertaken a comprehensive programme of conservation area designation, extensions and policy development. There are now 53 conservation areas in Westminster, covering 76% of the City. These conservation areas are the subject of detailed policies in the Unitary Development Plan and in Supplementary Planning Guidance. In addition to the basic activity of designation and the formulation of general policy, the City Council is required to undertake conservation area appraisals and to devise local policies in order to protect the unique character of each area.

Although this process was first undertaken with the various designation reports, more recent national guidance (as found in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 and the English Heritage Conservation Area Practice and Conservation Area Appraisal documents) requires detailed appraisals of each conservation area in the form of formally approved and published documents. This enhanced process involves the review of original designation procedures and boundaries; analysis of historical development; identification of all listed buildings and those unlisted buildings making a positive contribution to an area; and the identification and description of key townscape features, including street patterns, trees, open spaces and building types.

Given the number and complexity of Westminster’s conservation areas the appraisal process has been broken down into three stages, the first two of which are complete. This first stage involved the publication of General Information Leaflets or mini-guides for each conservation area covering in brief a series of key categories including Designation, Historical Background, Listed Buildings and Key Features.

The second stage involved the production of Conservation Area Directories for each Conservation Area. A Directory has now been adopted for 51 of the City’s conservation areas and includes copies of designation reports, a detailed evaluation of the historical development of the area and analysis of listed buildings and key townscape features.

The City is now working on a programme to prepare Conservation Area Audits for each of its conservation areas. This will form the third and final stage of the appraisal process. As each audit is adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance it will incorporate the Directory for that conservation area.
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INTRODUCTION

1.1 Conservation Areas are defined as ‘areas of architectural and historic interest, the character and appearance of which is it desirable to preserve and enhance.’ They are areas where buildings and spaces interact to create a distinctive and recognisable townscape.

1.2 The City Council has a statutory duty to review the character and boundaries of its conservation areas. This Audit is the third, and final stage of a review process. The overall appraisal strategy is based upon the English Heritage publication Conservation Area Practice.

1.3 The first stage (Mini-guide) and second stage (Directory) documents have already been adopted. The Mini-guide is a leaflet which provides a brief description of the area and its characteristics. The Directory provided a detailed source of factual information such as listed building descriptions. This has now been incorporated as part of the Audit providing an Appendix of factual information.

1.4 The Audit describes both the historical development, and character and appearance of the conservation area. It is designed to identify and explain important local features such as unlisted buildings of merit, unbroken rooflines and local views. In addition the audit also seeks to apply relevant Unitary Development Plan policies to the local context in order to preserve and/or enhance the character and appearance of the area.

1.5 The Conservation Area Audit for the Queen’s Park Estate was adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance by the Cabinet Member for Customer Services on 15 April 2005. The Queen’s Park Estate Conservation Area was designated in 1978. The designation reports can be found in the Directory, Section 1, at the back of this document.

The draft replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP) as agreed by full Council 13th December 2004, along with the UDP which was adopted in July 1997, is the statutory document setting out planning policies for developing land, improving transport and protecting the environment in Westminster. Relevant policies from the replacement UDP are referred to throughout the audit.
2 LOCATION

2.1 The Queen’s Park Conservation Area is located in the northwestern corner of the City of Westminster, adjoining the London Borough of Brent to the north and the London Borough of Kensington and Chelsea to the south and west. It covers a large swathe of housing between the Harrow Road and Kilburn Lane with the southern boundary running along the Grand Union Canal. The boundaries are shown at Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Boundaries of the Conservation Area
3 HISTORY

3.1 In the mid eighteenth century, the Queen’s Park estate was a peaceful pasture containing half a dozen fields and crossed by a tributary of the River Westbourne. Although some distance from Chelsea, until 1900 this area was administered by the Chelsea Vestry and hence became known as ‘Chelsea detached.’ (See Ordnance Survey 1870, Figure 2)

3.2 Rapid change in the area began in the early 19th century with the Grand Junction Canal opening to the south of Harrow Road in 1801 and All Souls cemetery, Kensal Green to the west in 1833, one of the first out of town cemeteries built to relieve the overcrowding of inner London graveyards. The area was further opened up with the arrival of the Great Western Railway and Paddington Station in 1838 and the development of the land south of the canal, Ladbroke Grove and new housing around Bravington Road to the east. Yet despite this development around it, the land occupied by today’s conservation area remained as open pasture until the late 19th century.

Figure 2: Ordnance Survey 1870

3.3 In 1874 the 80 acres of pasture land of Chelsea detached next to the Harrow Road were purchased for development by the ‘Artisans, Labourers and
General Dwellings Company,’ a housing co-operative founded in 1867 by William Austin. A former labourer, he was determined to form a company to build decent accommodation for the working classes at a time when overcrowding and squalid living conditions were rife amongst the poor in London. Their first estate in London was the Shaftesbury Park Estate in Battersea which was completed between 1873 and 1877, providing a model for the Queen's Park Estate.

3.4 Houses on the Queen's Park Estate were originally designed by Robert Austin in association with Rowland Plumbe, a young architect who went on to specialise in the provision of social housing. The estate was laid out in terraces of two storey cottages with gardens, marking a change in style from the blocks of social housing provided by charitable bodies such as the Peabody Estate in inner London at the time. In this respect Queen's Park was a forerunner to garden suburbs of the early 20th century which sought to promote healthier urban living and better housing for all in leafy surroundings.

3.5 The concept of the estate was not just to provide housing, but to promote a particular social mix and lifestyle, combining new housing of various classes with other facilities including meeting rooms, churches, school rooms and wash houses. There were originally to be four classes of house with rents varying from 7/6d to 11/- per week. In 1881 a fifth class house was added with a rent of 16/-
per week. Some properties were purpose built as flats with a shared front door. Strictly no pubs were to be provided on the estate, in an attempt to reflect and develop temperance principles amongst residents and the company wanted only “the most quiet and provident portion of the industrial classes as tenants”.

3.6 Harrow Road formed the principal shopping street but some corner houses within the estate were converted into shops. In 1880 the company was approached by the congregational Union who wished to provide a church on the estate and by 1890 the Estate had a school at each corner. The Queen’s Park Rangers football team was formed by the old boys of the Droop Street School.

3.7 During the Second World War bombs destroyed properties in Huxley Street, Kilburn Lane and Harrow Road but a land mine dropped by a parachute on Peach Street caused the most significant devastation, with whole households wiped out. Queen’s Park Court was built over the site of the explosion.

3.8 The estate was sold to Paddington Council in 1964 which was then absorbed into the new City of Westminster Council area following the regulation of local authorities act under the London Government Act the following year.

3.9 During the 1960s and 70s the estate suffered from problems with deprivation, crime and vandalism. Some of the peripheral terraces were demolished to make way for new housing estates including the Avenue Gardens and Mozart Estates. In 1977, all of Farrent Street and part of Illibert Street were demolished to provide a much needed recreational area within the estate. In recent years the pattern of tenure on the estate has changed significantly and the number of owner-occupiers has increased significantly.

3.10 The Queen’s Park Estate was designated a Conservation Area in 1978. Further planning controls were introduced in February 1993 when an Article 4 direction took effect requiring a planning application to be made where normally permitted development rights would apply. This is described in more detail in section 4.30-32.

3.10 Queen’s Park Conservation Area was designated as a Town Scheme area in 1992. Under this scheme grants were given for the repair and restoration of properties within the Conservation Area. The scheme expired in 1995 and was replaced by a Conservation Area Partnership Scheme, administered jointly by Westminster City Council and English Heritage. This ran until 1999, providing many grants for restoration and conservation work.

3.12 Today the Queen’s Park Estate remains an important and attractive early example of a philanthropic housing estate, using garden city ideals.

---

1 Quoted in ‘Artizans and Avenues’(2004):10
4 Character of the conservation area

GENERAL

4.1 The Queen’s Park Estate is a large and well-preserved area of picturesque Victorian cottage-style housing. The townscape is characterised by its overall homogeneity and intimacy of scale. All terraces use a similar palette of materials but with gothic detailing repeated in differing combinations to avoid monotony throughout.

Figure 4: Queen’s Park Estate Streetscape

4.2 Terraces are set in wide tree lined streets (Figure 4) with small front gardens and boundary walls. There are few other uses and little traffic giving a peaceful residential atmosphere. At the south of the Conservation Area the Harrow Road is a busy thoroughfare with a more colourful commercial character. This borders the Grand Junction Canal and to the west is a more open area with a landscaped strip along the canal.

STREETS AND SPACES

4.3 Historic street patterns and the relationship of built form to open space define the overall framework of an area. The fine grain of the townscape, including sizes of plots and building lines are also important in establishing the pattern and density of development. This has a significant impact on the character of an area, dictating the scale of development and level of enclosure or openness.
4.4 The Queen’s Park Estate is characterised by its wide streets set in a grid pattern, creating blocks and terraces of various lengths. The shape of the estate as a whole was originally determined by the outline of ‘Chelsea detached’ as described in the history section above. This results in the curving terraces, which mark the edges of the area (Figure 5).

![Image of Queen’s Park Estate](image-url)

**Figure 5:** Their gentle curve is a feature of many of the terraces.

4.5 To the north and south the boundaries of the Conservation Area are delineated by the Harrow Road and Kilburn Lane, which are the main traffic arteries and historic routes through the area. Numbered avenues (First to Sixth) run at right angles to Harrow Road and alphabetical Streets (originally just named A street, B street etc) run parallel to this. Fifth avenue is the main street through the estate and is lined with some of the grander listed buildings.

4.6 Many of the terraces are very long with few breaks in the building line. Repetition of building frontages, with consistent plots sizes give a sense of regularity to the streetscape, creating a tight urban grain. Both front and rear gardens are small and there is only one open space within the estate. Yet despite the density of development, the wide streets and gaps at the end of terraces afford views to the backs of terraces and give a feeling of spaciousness.

**POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE**

Dominant street patterns should be respected and where historic patterns remain these should be protected and reflected in any proposed schemes. Policies DES1 A 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and DES 12 should be consulted.
ARCHITECTURE

Overview

4.8 The architecture of the Queen’s Park Estate brings some of the elements of Victorian Gothic revival to a more domestic setting. The gothic revival of the late Victorian era was based on a return to historicist styles and romanticised medieval detailing, as well as new colour and animation in building facades.

4.9 Such ecclesiastical detailing sought to bring a sense of otherworldliness to even the most domestic setting. Religious references in the architecture fit with the moral aspirations of the artisans company who sought to promote temperance and clean living amongst its residents.

4.10 Individual houses are generally two stories and two bays wide and are predominantly of yellow stock brick in Flemish bond, with red brick detailing, some properties having more extensive areas of red brick. Rainwater goods are of cast iron, painted black

4.11 All are arranged in terraces, with each street consisting of houses of similar design and repeated gothic architectural motifs. Variety and relief in the street scene is provided by the use of gables, towers or bay windows, varying from street to street (Figures 6, 7, 8 & 9) but detailing and palette of materials is repeated to provide an overall consistency. Such features avoid the appearance of seemingly endless rows of monotonous flat-fronted identical houses.

4.12 Gothic style porches supported on columns with corbels, often coupled, mark many of the entrances. Some have pointed gables containing the badge of the artisans company. See ‘Windows and Doors’ at paragraph 4.24 below for further details and images. End of terraces and corner properties are often larger marked by projecting gables or corner towers. Some end houses have entrances to the return wall. Building lines on east/west streets are set back.
Figure 6,7,8 & 9: Tower, Projecting Gable and Porch Details

Gable with polychromatic brickwork

Projecting porches on Nutbourne Street

Projecting tower with pyramidal roof, 5th Avenue.

Castellated turret on Peach Road.
4.13 Significant buildings on the estate include Droop Street School (1877) designed by Robson which is listed Grade II, an early example of the work of the London School Board. Queen’s Park Meeting Hall on the Harrow Road is also listed Grade II and was built as the centre of the social life for the estate for meetings, non-alcoholic refreshment, entertainment and education, with shops.

4.14 In addition the properties fronting Fifth Avenue between Ilbert Street and Kilburn Lane, including nos 68-170 (even) Fifth Avenue are listed for their distinctive townscape and group value and as good examples of their type. Listed Buildings are shown on the map at Figure 12 and listed in the directory at the end of the audit.

4.15 The mixed retail and residential blocks that line the Harrow Road also vary from prevailing type, and are higher at three stories, a reflection of their position on a busy thoroughfare and forming the boundary of the estate. (Figure 10)

Figure 10: Mixed retail and residential blocks line the Harrow Road.

4.16 All development should complement the character and appearance of the area and have regard to the materials, layout, height and scale of the existing townscape. Original architectural details should be retained and kept in good repair.
POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE

Any proposal should take into account the character of its context having regard to the scale, form and materials of adjoining buildings. Policies, DES1 A 3 and 4 and DES4 should be consulted on the Principles of Development and DES5 A and B should be consulted on alterations and extensions. Relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance documents are noted throughout the document.

DES4B should be referred to for scholarly replicas within terraces of unified townscape and/or DES4A in terms of respecting adjoining buildings in areas of varied townscape.

The Queen’s Park Estate Design Guide provides further advice on repair and alteration to properties in the estate.

Unlisted Buildings of Merit

4.16 Unlisted buildings contribute to the character and quality of the local area. They may make a valuable contribution to the townscape, and can be of architectural interest in their own right or have local historic and cultural associations for example with a famous resident or event. Within the Conservation Area Audits these are identified and defined as ‘unlisted buildings of merit’. By definition these properties are considered to be of value to the character and appearance of the conservation area and their demolition or unsympathetic alteration will be resisted.

4.17 The Queen’s Park Estate has a homogenous character with consistent materials and repetition of architectural detailing throughout. All of the unlisted buildings original to the estate are therefore considered important to its character and have been identified as ‘unlisted buildings of merit’. These are shown on the map at Figure 12.

4.18 Most of the unlisted buildings on the estate are residential properties of relatively modest scale. Other buildings of particular interest include the Queen’s Park library (Figure 11), dating from 1890 by Karslake & Mortimer and the meeting hall on Ilbert street.
POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE
Policy DES9 2 states that permission will not normally be given for proposals which involve the demolition or partial demolition of buildings which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that the existing building cannot be repaired or adapted so as to extend its useful life and that the proposed development will preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area.
Roof Profiles & Alterations

4.18 The roofscape of the Queen’s Park estate is distinctive and is characterised by its regularity. Roofs are of Welsh slate and of shallow pitch, originally with clay ridge tiles and are subdivided by party wall upstands, with stout, corniced brick chimney stacks and clay pots. There is a red brick corbelled brickwork dentil course at eaves level. At various points along the front elevation the roofscape is punctuated by turreted roofs, raised bay windows and gables. Some corner properties have attractive, patterned pyramid roofs with finials.

Figure 13: The regular rhythm of the roofscape, punctuated by stout chimney stacks and raised party wall upstands.

4.19 Long vistas down continuous roofscapes interrupted only by raised party walls and chimney stacks are fundamental to the character of the estate (Figure 13) The simplicity and regularity of roof forms and their low pitch mean roof extensions terraces and dormers are unlikely to be permitted within the Queens Park Estate. Chimneys are also a features of the roofscape and should be retained.

4.20 Clutter such as antennae and satellite dishes can have a significant and detrimental impact on the character of the area, affecting both short and long distance views and careful consideration should be given to the siting of such equipment to minimise its visual impact. They should be located away from the front façade of buildings and the roof, chimneys or other locations where they are highly visible.

4.21 Original slate roof coverings should be retained wherever possible. The Council will not normally accept the use of modern materials such as concrete tiles or artificial
slate as they rarely meet the high quality, appearance or longevity of traditional natural materials.

**POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE**
Policy DES6 highlights instances where roof extensions and other roof structures would not be acceptable. Guidance on roof repairs can be found in the Queen's Park Estate Design Guide. Advice is also given in the publication 'Roofs. A Guide to Alterations and Extensions on Domestic Buildings (1995).

---

**Plan Form and Rear Extensions**

4.21 There is a slight hierarchy of design and estate houses are of four basic types or classes distinguished by the number of rooms (only the highest class originally had bathrooms). All are small in scale. Original plans and elevations for a third class house are shown at **Figure 14**.

4.22 In some locations, open gaps at the end of terraces provide views down the rear elevations to rear closet wings of consistent detail. Where rear elevations are prominent, the scale and design of rear extensions requires particularly careful consideration and in many cases may not be acceptable.

4.23 The council will usually limit any rear extension to ground floor level and this will only be acceptable where it is subordinate to the parent building, uses high quality materials and detailing and does not significantly reduce outdoor amenity space.

---

**POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE**
Policy DES 5 a and b should be consulted with regards to alterations and extensions.
Figure 14: Original Plans and elevations for a Third Class House (With the permission of Westminster Archives)
Windows and Doors

4.24 Window and door openings establish the character of any building's elevation. Original doors and windows, including their detailing, materials and method of opening therefore make a significant contribution to the historic and architectural character of Conservation Areas.

4.24 Throughout the Queen’s Park Estate, windows are double hung, single glazed, timber sliding sashes, set back from the brickwork in reveals. The glazing pattern is distinctive, with margin lights. Many windows are twinned with stone moulded lintels over and there are also some tripartite windows (see Figure 15). Joinery is generally painted in white or cream, providing an important unity to the appearance on the area. A variety of styles of brick arches, including blind pointed arches are used over some windows and doors. Brickwork arches are unpainted but are in contrasting brick. Stone lintols and details are generally unpainted or else picked out in light cream. Brackets support window cills, all of which originally had cast iron pot retainers.

![Figure 15: Typical window detailing.](image)

![Figure 16: Cast iron pot retainers are a feature of many windows.](image)

4.26 Painted timber panelled doors are also characteristic of the estate. These are recessed and have chamfered stiles and fielded or herringbone lower panels below glazed upper panels. (Figure 17) Many of the properties have attractive original door
and window furniture, in particular the cast iron goats head door knockers and cast iron letter boxes.

Figure 17: Typical door with cast iron goats head knocker and cast iron letter box.

Figure 18: The most common type of porch hood, over double doorways, with pointed gable containing the badge of the artisans company and supported on corbels.

4.27 Interest and variety in the townscape is provided by the range of styles of porch hood detail. These include pointed gables with the badge of the artisans company (Figure 18). Other doors have simpler stone moulded arches or more embellished porches above pointed arches with polychromatic brickwork (see Figure 19, 20 & 21). In Nutbourne Street there are paired projecting porches. (see architecture section: Figure 7)

4.28 Replacement of windows and doors is likely to require planning permission (see ‘minor alterations’ below) and the council will encourage the repair and retention of original doors and windows throughout the estate. Regular maintenance and painting of timber is essential to ensure that problems of decay are not allowed to flourish and to prolong their life expectancy. Porches and other architectural detail should also be retained and specialist advice sought on repair.

4.29 Where wholesale replacement is needed doors and window should match existing original detail in terms of glazing patterns, method of opening. Poor quality replacement doors and windows with materials and detailing which do not reflect the original can have had a significant and detrimental impact on the architectural integrity of
individual buildings and the character of the conservation area as a whole (see also ‘negative features’ section below) and will be resisted. Original detailing such as cast-iron pot retainers and door and window furniture should be retained.

**Figures 19, 20 & 21. Examples of Porch Hoods**
POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE
Policy DES 9 C states that the council will not allow schemes which involve loss of original features and where they are missing these should be reinstated to original design detail and materials.

Minor Alterations

4.30 Many minor alterations have a cumulative and detrimental impact on the conservation area, detracting from the homogeneity of the townscape. This includes the replacement of doors and windows or the painting or cladding of brickwork. (See negative features below for further information)

4.31 For this reason many of the properties on the estate are also covered by an ‘Article 4 Direction.’ This means that planning permission is required for many small alterations and home improvement works, which affect the external appearance of buildings. If works are undertaken without permission, the city council can take enforcement action to require reinstatement.

4.32 Works which are controlled are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTICLE 4 CONTROLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Alterations which affect the appearance of the front elevation or any elevation visible from the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Erection of a porch or similar enclosure visible from the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changing roofing material or colours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Erection of boundary walls, fences gates to the front of a property or where visible from the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Erection of an oil storage tank, dustbin store, meter cupboard or similar construction within the curtilage of a dwelling, which is visible from the highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Painting the front elevation or any elevation fronting a highway including boundary walls, fences or gates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Installation of a satellite dish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The map at Figure 22 shows properties covered by the Article 4 direction on the Queen's Park Estate. These are also listed in the directory appended to the end of this document.
Figure 22: Properties affected by the Article 4 Direction
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VIEWS & LANDMARK BUILDINGS

4.32 Policy DES15 in the Unitary Development Plan defines two categories of views which contribute to Westminster’s townscape and historic character.

- Metropolitan views include both views from Westminster to other parts of London and views from other parts of London into Westminster, such as views along and across the river Thames. They also include views within and across Westminster, particularly views of landmark buildings.

- Local views are by definition more localised and can be of natural features, skylines, smaller landmarks and structures as well as attractive groups of buildings and views into parks, open spaces, streets and squares.

4.33 The Queen’s Park estate has a tight urban grain and overall there is a sense of enclosure. As such, views into and out of the Conservation Area are restricted and there are no long open views. There are therefore no metropolitan views identified into and out of the Queen’s Park Estate.

4.34 However there are local views of importance. Important views are at junctions particularly where gaps between terraced blocks offer views into and along back gardens, helping to soften the dense urban character of the environment and giving a feeling of openness and space.

4.34 Views to landmark buildings are also of importance. Most of the buildings within the Queen’s Park Estate Conservation Area are of a small scale and consistent detail and there are few taller or more elaborate buildings. However the London School Board School in Fourth Avenue, the library on the Harrow Road and the meeting hall on Harrow Road/ First Avenue junction stand out in use and scale from the rest of the estate and these are identified as landmark buildings. (See Figure 24) Other views are mainly flanking terraces where long rows of London plane trees, front garden walls, carriageways and pavements of even width combine to produce a distinctive streetscape characterised by a sense of regularity, despite the variety of house types. There are particularly attractive views along curved terraces.

4.35 There are some more open views from Illbert Street and within Queen’s Park Gardens, particularly towards the BT Tower. On Harrow Road there are views to the canal from the Harrow road open space and adjacent to the pedestrian bridge. Various vantage points in the estate provide views towards Kensington and Chelsea and the post war Trellick Tower by the architect Erno Goldfinger, which provides a dramatic silhouette showing the contrast between the post-war approach to high rise social housing next to the late Victorian cottage style development. (Figure 23).
Figure 23: Looking from First Avenue to the meeting hall with the Trellick Tower beyond.

4.36 Full consideration must be given to the impact of any development proposals on important metropolitan and local views both within the conservation area and into and out of it. In particular the infilling of open gaps will be resisted. Views and landmark buildings are shown on the plan in Figure 24.

POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE
There are no strategic views affected by development in this conservation area. In the Unitary Development Plan DES15 seeks to protect metropolitan and local views.
Figure 24: Local Views and Landmarks
LOCAL TOWNSCAPE DETAIL

4.37 Local townscape detail contributes to the sense of local distinctiveness and may be unique to a particular conservation area. This can range from boundary treatments and street furniture to soft and hard landscaping. Individually and collectively they contribute to the overall quality of Westminster streetscape as well as enhancing individual areas of character within the City.

Railings, boundary walls & enclosure

4.38 Railings and boundary walls are part of the character of a conservation area. They add interest and variety of scale in the streetscene and provide a sense of enclosure, separating spaces of differing character, often marking the boundaries between public and private spaces.

4.39 Small front garden walls survive throughout the Queen’s Park Estate and are built to an identical design. The consistent boundary treatments make a significant contribution to the streetscene and character of the area. Boundary walls comprise a low wall with coping and a pair of gate piers in square I plan, with a pyramidal cap. Originally these would have had railings but these were removed during the second world war. In some locations, traditionally detailed railings in cast iron have been reinstalled. (Figure 25). These would have been painted black. There are also Victorian railings along the canalside. At road junctions where a gap opens up, there are often higher brick walls to the returns. Some have openings and lintols which match those on adjoining houses.

Figure 25: Typical front boundary railings, reinstated to traditional design.
4.40 Where boundary walls are being repaired or reinstated, these should replicate original brickwork in terms of colour, texture, brickwork bond and pointing detail. The reinstatement of traditionally detailed railings will be encouraged.

**POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE**
The city council will seek to protect and repair boundary features of interest. Council policy in respect of these is DES7 G and further guidance can be found in the design guide ‘Railings in Westminster: A guide to their design, repair and maintenance’.

**Trees & Landscaping**

4.41 Trees and green spaces are vital to the quality of urban environments in both visual and environmental terms. They contribute significantly to the character and appearance of conservation areas and the local townscape, providing a soft edge within urban landscapes as well as bringing environmental benefits. Often a single tree can provide a focal point, whilst avenues or groups of mature trees may form part of an historic planting scheme or an estate layout. All trees within conservation areas are protected. The council must be notified of works to prune or cut down a tree in a conservation area.

4.42 In the Queen’s Park estate many of the existing London Plane trees were planted as part of the original development around or after 1881 and these are therefore part of the original estate design. Gardens are small and street trees help to soften the uniformity and densely urban nature of the townscape. Trees have been uniformly pollarded so that their trunks are just slightly lower than eaves level of the surrounding houses, making for a distinctive townscape. Trees in back gardens also make a contribution when these can be glimpsed from the public highways and where a gap between groups of terraces presents itself.

4.44 The Conservation Area has few open spaces. Queen’s Park Gardens, is therefore particularly important as the only significant public open space within a densely developed urban area. The gardens were opened in 1977 and provide an attractive open space, subdivided into several areas with differing character and surrounded by a beech hedge. There is also a strip of landscaping along the canal side on Harrow Road and a small landscaped area adjacent to the canal by the pedestrian bridge.

4.45 Some environmental improvements have been undertaken on the estate including the introduction of traffic calming using granite setts and bollards to create pinch points.

**POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE**
UDP policy ENV 14 seeks to protect trees which make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of a conservation area. Advice on trees and their protection is given in the City Council design guide, Trees and Other Planting on Development Sites. Policy DES 13 should be consulted with regards to any development adjacent to the canal.
Shopfronts

4.45 Shopfronts, including well-designed, non-original shopfronts, can be of great importance in contributing to the character and appearance of both individual buildings and the conservation area as a whole and can be of historic and architectural interest in their own right.

4.46 There are two types of shopfront in Queen’s Park. The earliest in the blocks along Harrow Road have rather substantial painted timber fronts with gothic detailing to the surrounds. Some are in good condition and where details survive the City Council will seek to preserve them and promote sympathetic repair. The second type of shop were those added later, though at an early point in the estate history, in response to demands from residents for local shops in other areas. These occur mostly at significant points in the layout often at corners, in places acting as gateway buildings. These shops are important visually, providing variety within the uniform street scene and also in use terms providing vitality within this overwhelmingly residential area.

Figure 26: Typical shopfront on the Harrow Road with gothic detailing.

4.46 The city council seeks to retain original shopfronts wherever possible and new signage and other alterations should use materials and detailing sympathetic to the age and style of the individual buildings and conservation area as a whole. Unsympathetic alterations, signage and solid external security shutters will be resisted.
POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE
The relevant City Council policy concerning historic shopfronts and the design of new ones is DES5 C. Reference should be made to the design guide 'Shopfronts, Blinds and Signs: A Guide to their Design' (1990) and 'Advertisement Design Guidelines (1992).

Street Furniture

4.48 Westminster has a wide range of interesting and historic street furniture, much of which is listed. The appropriate maintenance and protection of this is important.

4.49 There is no listed street furniture in the Queen’s Park Estate. The street furniture is co-ordinated and simple and wide uncluttered streets are characteristic of the estate. There are cannon style bollards on corners, some city of Westminster bollards and several red pillar letter boxes.

4.50 Unnecessary modern street clutter and signage can detract from the character of conservation areas and should be kept to a minimum. The proliferation of clutter in the streetscape will be resisted and a co-ordinated approach to street furniture design promoted.

POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE
Policy DES7 C & F intends to protect these historic and characteristic features of the street scene.

For guidance relating to both street furniture and public realm works, the Westminster Way is the council’s emerging public realm manual.

CHARACTERISTIC LAND USES

4.50 Land uses also contribute significantly to the character and appearance of a Conservation Area. These have a direct influence on the building types and make-up of an area but also on the nature, atmosphere and use of the public spaces and streets. Particular uses may be of historic or national importance and will have dictated the evolution of an area.

4.51 The Queen’s Park Estate has a peaceful residential character and there are few other uses within the main swathe of housing. There is mixed retail and residential use along the Harrow Road and small corner shops are interspersed throughout the estate. The schools, meeting hall and church were also important as part of the original estate design as outlined in the history section above.

4.51 These uses are important to the character of the area, retaining some vitality and activity, as well as providing some variety in building type and styles in an otherwise homogenous townscape.
POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE
The City Council will consider the contribution of existing and proposed uses to the character or appearance of the conservation area. DES9 D is the relevant UDP policy.

NEGATIVE FEATURES & ENHANCEMENT

5 Negative features are those elements which detract from the special character of an area and present an opportunity for change and enhancement. It may be that simple maintenance works could remedy the situation or in some cases there may be the opportunity to redevelop a particular site.

5.1 Window and Door Alterations. Inappropriate replacement doors and windows have been installed in various locations throughout the estate. For example neo-Georgian panelled doors, non-traditional materials such as uPVC and aluminium or changes in fenestration patterns result in an erosion of character and detract from the architectural integrity of individual buildings (Figure 27). See ‘windows and doors’ above for description of traditional window and door detailing.

Figure 27: Small scale building alterations including replacement windows, painting and changes to boundary walls.

5.2 Boundary Alterations: Removal or alteration of original front boundary walls and gate piers and the installation of inappropriate fencing and railings also
has a detrimental impact on the streetscape. Original boundary detail is described in more detail under townscape detail above.

5.3 **Pointing, Painting, Cladding and cleaning of brickwork:** Poor standards of repointing of brickwork have had a significant and detrimental impact on the appearance of buildings and boundary walls in the estate. Use of hard cement mortars should be avoided as this can cause significant damage to brickwork. Similarly cladding, painting and inappropriate cleaning of brickwork has a radical impact on the appearance of buildings and can lead to long term damage.

5.4 In particular **Queen’s Park Meeting Hall**, a prominent and attractive building within the Conservation Area, has been damaged due to a poor standard of repair, using inappropriate non-traditional materials and application of paint to the brickwork.

5.5 **Satellite Dishes and Telecommunications Equipment:** These can have a significant and detrimental impact on the roofscape and long views. The large telegraph poles and wires within the estate also have a detrimental impact on the street scene. Further advice on the siting of satellite dishes is given under ‘roof profiles’ above.

![Figure 28. Disused shop on Ilbert Street](image)

5.6 **Shopfronts and signage:** whilst many original shopfronts remain, some of those on the Harrow Road have been unsympathetically altered with oversize and inappropriate signage and internal illumination. Some of the shops within the estate are boarded up (Figure 28) and would benefit from sensitive reuse.

5.7 **Security Measures.** Many of the shopfronts on the Harrow Road also have solid roller shutters, which have a deadening impact on the streetscene. A solid roller shutter door has been installed to the side wall of 41 Third Avenue (Figure 29) and is a particularly inappropriate and unsympathetic element in the street-scene.
5.8 External Plant and Air-conditioning Equipment: The provision of external plant and air-conditioning equipment can have a significant visual impact. There is particularly unsympathetic and visible plant to the rear of the school on Droop Street. Smaller wires, pipework, boiler flues and meter boxes thoughtlessly sited to the front elevations of buildings also spoil the appearance of individual buildings and cumulatively have an impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

5.9 The Canalside Environment provides an important area of open space and would benefit from environmental improvement and upgrading.

5.10 Vacant Properties. A number of houses throughout the Queen’s Park Estate have boarded up windows and doors. This has a deadening impact on the street scene and is detrimental to the character of the area. (See Figure 30 below)

Figure 29. Solid Security Shutters have a negative impact on the street scene.

Figure 30. Boarded up windows and doors on Sixth Avenue
5.11 Other negative areas in the Conservation area include some of those buildings which have been developed following World War II bomb damage. For example Droop House below at Figure 31 does not reflect the prevailing building type in style, scale and detail.

![Droop House](image)

**Figure 31**: Droop House

**POLICY & FURTHER GUIDANCE**
The city council will take appropriate steps to ensure the preservation and enhancement of its conservation areas. Schemes for the improvement and enhancement of conservation areas will be encouraged and initiated where possible. Any proposal will be judged against policies DES1 and DES9.
6 Management Proposals

6.1 It is expected that the effective management of the Queens Park Estate Conservation Area can, for the most part, be met through an effective policy framework and the positive use of existing development control and enforcement powers. The analysis of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area within this audit therefore identifies those elements the planning department, working with Citywest Homes and other housing providers in the area, will seek to protect. It also identifies negative features which may present opportunities for change or enhancement.

6.2 Each section of the audit is linked to relevant policy guidance, which provides the framework for the future management of the area. Other statutory designations and existing controls in place to manage the Conservation Area are listed in the Directory, which follows this section. This includes a list of documents, supplementary planning guidance and planning briefs relevant to the management of Queens Park Estate Conservation Area. In addition, the following table provides a list of proposals related specifically to those features identified as ‘negative’ in Section 5.

Table of proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Negative Feature</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Window and Door alterations. Pointing, painting, cladding and cleaning of brickwork</td>
<td>Article 4 Direction applies to minor work on most of Queens Park Estate. (see p24) Undertake 4 yearly photographic followed by enforcement campaign to enable successful monitoring of work. Copies of conservation area audit to be made more available to residents at estate office and on the Citywest Homes website to promote awareness of conservation and Article 4 controls. Encourage re-instatement of original design detail to doors, windows and boundaries, making reference to guidance set out in the audit and the Queen’s Park Estate Design Guide. Incorporate best practice/conservation guidance within information given to new tenants and lessees, and in Citywest Homes conservation area management plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite dishes, Aerials and Telecommunications equipment</td>
<td>Update Satellite Dish SPG and make available on website and on Citywest homes website. Conservation Area Audits and satellite dishes SPG to be made available on the web and at estate office Promote use of alternative technologies where possible to avoid need for satellite dishes. Targeted enforcement campaign to be undertaken as a result of 4 yearly photographic survey to secure removal of unauthorised dishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopfronts and Signage</td>
<td>Original features such as shopfront surrounds and elements of architectural detailing identified in the audit at paragraph 4.46 to be retained wherever possible as part of refurbishment proposals. Many poor quality shopfronts have been in place for more than four years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and are therefore exempt from enforcement action. Where this is the case, improvements will be sought through the development control process as and when planning applications are received.

Targeted enforcement campaign to be undertaken to secure removal of any recent unauthorised signage

Encourage awareness among shop owners of original design detail through circulation of the audit and shopfront design guides, Audit to be made available on the website.

Future applications for internally illuminated signage to be resisted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post war Infill Buildings</th>
<th>Any new development should include an analysis of the characteristics of the conservation area, making reference to the findings of the audit. Future schemes to reflect prevailing scale materials and architectural detail of the area, as set out in audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any proposals for redevelopment adjacent to the conservation area should also have regard to their impact on the setting of the conservation area, making reference to the findings of the audit and in particular any impact on identified local views.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Measures</th>
<th>Refer any recent unauthorised roller blind/shutter to enforcement for investigation. Reference to be made to guidance in Guidelines for Shopfront Security (see directory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant and Machinery, External Plant and Air- Conditioning Equipment</th>
<th>Update and republish guidance note on Plant and air-conditioning and make available on the Council website Seek the removal/ resiting of unnecessary and redundant equipment as part of future redevelopment or refurbishment proposals. If possible secure removal of equipment by condition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Queen's Park Meeting Hall</th>
<th>The building remains on the Buildings at Risk Register. The Council will continue to pursue enforcement action to restore the building and secure removal of inappropriate paint work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Canalside Environment</th>
<th>Seek improvements as part of redevelopment proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant Properties</th>
<th>Encourage applications to bring buildings back into use wherever possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Monitoring**

Progress on management proposals will be reviewed on a yearly basis and the audit reviewed and updated every five years.
DIRECTORY
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AUDIT ADOPTION REPORT AND STATEMENT OF DECISION

CONTACTS
1. Queens Park Estate Conservation Area

Proposed Designation

On 9 February 1978 the Town Planning Committee considered a report on this early artisan estate and its possible designation as a conservation area. The officers were authorised to carry out consultations with a view to designating the area shown on the attached plan. An extract from the report of 9 February is appended.

2. Consultations

The Greater London Council, Civic Trust, Victorian Society, Paddington Society and the Queens Park Tenants Association have been consulted.

2.1 Greater London Council

The matter has not been reported to the Historic Building Committee but it is understood that the officers will be reporting in support of the proposals.

2.2 Civic Trust

No longer comment on the designation of conservation areas but, should the area be designated, a copy of the plan will be sent to them for their records.

2.3 Victorian Society

'Enthusiastically’ support the scheme and state that ‘the sooner the area is designated, the better’, as alterations out of character with the properties are occurring.

2.4 Paddington Society

The Society welcomes the proposal and inter alia states that:-

'We agree with the observations contained in this report on the desirability of designating this area as a conservation area and indeed, as far as we are concerned, the sooner this action is completed the better as there are indications that new owners may contemplate altering their particular properties to the detriment of the cohesive whole. Indeed, in a number of cases this has already occurred.

We consider that designation as a conservation area would serve to safeguard (within limits) this particular estate, which is surprisingly complete and at the same time give guidance to owner occupants, where they exist, as to the style of up-grading which they can undertake, which would assist this objective.'
2.5 **Queens Park Tenants Association**

The Association was consulted on 1 March and a further letter was sent on 27 April, but no reply has been received.

3. **Comment**

Should Committee decide to designate the area it is suggested that it would be useful and helpful if each tenant or owner was sent a concise explanatory leaflet showing the area and setting out the reasons for designation and the general policies for conservation areas. These could be adapted to take account of the rather special nature of the Estate.

3.1 The restrictive covenants appeal to cover the controls required but, as the Paddington and Victorian Societies have pointed out, some rather insensitive alterations have been, and are still being, made.

3.2 The covenants are as follows:-

(All properties)

i. Not to make or permit any alterations in the plan or elevations of the property or set up any erection in the yard or garden or any part of the property which may lessen the air, obstruct the light or in any way interrupt the view from the adjoining premises or to destroy the uniformity of appearance of the property and the adjoining premises.

ii. Not to exhibit or permit to be exhibited on the property any advertisement board or illuminated or other sign or anything whatsoever in the nature of advertisement by display of lights or otherwise except a board or sign advertising that the property is for sale or letting. Not to hold or permit or suffer to be held any sale by auction on the property or on any part thereof.

iii. At all times to keep in good repair and condition all walls and fences not being part walls and fences.

iv. To pay a reasonable proportion of the cost of maintaining and repairing all sewers, pipes, drains, wires, cables party walls and party fences used in common with the adjoining and neighbouring premises.

3.3 The suggested leaflet could draw attention to these covenants and reinforce the control.

4. **Recommendation**

4.1 That the area shown on the attached plan No. CD/CO/0022/A be designated as the Queens Park Conservation Area.

That an explanatory leaflet be prepared and presented to Committee illustrating the area, setting out the general policies and drawing attention to the restrictive covenants already in operation.

J M Hirsh
DIRECTOR OF ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING
Appendix 1
A/10/78

CITY OF WESTMINSTER
TOWN PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 FEBRUARY 1978
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING
QUEENS PARK ESTATE

Introduction

In October 1977 the Architect to the Greater London Council drew the attention of the City Council to the fact that the Department of the Environment have already added many estates of flats to the statutory list (including the GLM Millbank Estate in Westminster) and were now considering further additions.

The Historic Buildings Council, who advise the Department on these matters, had also considered the possible listing of some cottage estates but had decided that it would be more appropriate to designate these as conservation areas and make Article 4 Directions where necessary.

Queens Park Estate

This is the only estate within the City boundary which would appear to come within the category of a cottage estate. It was designated in 1873 by Austin and Roland Plumber for the Artisans, Labourers and General Dwellings Company Limited following the success of their development at Shaftesbury Park in Battersea, and subsequently sold to the Paddington Council in '964.

It is a remarkable complete survival in spite of the loss of some of the peripheral terraces, which closed the vista long internal streets, and the demolition of other terraces for the introduction of much needed open space in the area in which the estate is situated.

The small brick terraced houses, paired by the arrangement of the porches, are given additional charm by their ornate Victorian trimmings of gabled porches, ‘classical’ columns, turreted roofs and gables at salient points in the townscape and small apron gardens on the main frontage. All these factors contribute to a very definitive and unique character for a housing area so rear to the heart of London.

The area has not been recommended for designation as it is in the ownership of the City Council. However, this is rather anomalous bearing in mind that the large proportion of the designated areas in the City are owned by major Estates, contain a large number of listed buildings, and are also the subject of many restrictive covenants.

It is considered that Queens Park, which for historical, townscape and architectural reasons, is well qualified to be added to the City’s conservation areas: it also comes well within the category of ‘familiar and cherished local scene’ as mentioned in the Circular (No. 46/73) issued by the Department of the Environment in April 1974.

Some of the houses have been sold and may of them are being smartened in a way that is altering the cohesive quality of the townscape. Brick porches and brick surrounds to windows are being painted in a variety of colours; one house has been rendered and
another has suffered as a result of modernisation of windows and door. The front fences are decidedly varied.

Nevertheless, restrictive covenants have been drawn up and these should be sufficient to control any alterations which, to quote, 'destroy the uniformity of appearance of the property and the adjacent premises'.

Designation would help to remind owners of their responsibilities, and, providing that the painting work was considered to be a factor which could destroy the uniformity of the estate, it is considered that at this stage Article 4 Directions are not essential.

**Recommendation**

That officers be authorised to carry out consultation with a view to designating the area shown on the attached plan as the Queens Park Conservation Area.

J M Hirsh
DIRECTOR OF ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING
1. SUMMARY

As previously reported to this Committee British Waterways Board have commissioned a consultants study of the four miles of canal within the City boundaries. A draft report entitled 'Making the Most of the Canals in Westminster' has been received and is reported to Members with recommendations for various actions and further consultations.

The draft report is the culmination of major discussions with the Board in relation to a number of sites (including Hormead Wharf, Little Venice and Maida Avenue) and the concern that this important environmental amenity must be properly managed and planned so as to enable the resolution of conflicting and competing pressures for development, conservation area enhancement. The proximity of many residential areas to the canal further magnifies this issue.

The report finds the canals in Westminster to be an under utilised resource, and outlines a strategy for improving the surrounding environment, including encouraging access, increasing water activity and amenity improvements. The report also identifies the need for planning policy guidelines governing canalside development. In addition a series of suggested organisational measures intended to ensure the successful implementation of the strategy are outlined.

In view of the unrealised potential identified in the report and current pressures for development along the canal, Draft Policy Guidelines for canalside development and moorings, for possible inclusion in the Unitary Development Plan, have been prepared. Suggested extensions to existing conservation areas to include sections of the canalside and draft Planning Briefs for four key sites, namely Hormead Wharf, Westbourne Park Bus Garage, 453 Edgware Road and Northbank Iron Foundry Site have also been drafted. These are submitted for initial consideration by Committee to be followed by consultation and reporting back to Sub-Committee.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS
2.1 The British Waterways Board be advised that the Committee welcome the progress to date on the draft report 'Making the Most of the Canals in Westminster' and that further public consultation be carried out with the organisations listed in Appendix 3 as well as the original consultees, and a further final report be submitted to this Committee.

2.2 That Committee agree the draft planning policies governing development adjacent to the canal, contained in Appendix 4A as well as the draft planning briefs governing key canalside sites contained in Appendix 5A, for the purposes of public consultation with the organisations listed in Appendices 4B and 5B; and that the Director prepares further planning briefs on the sites listed in Appendix 5C as necessary.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Origins of Study

3.1.1 The canal study was commissioned by British Waterways to make the most of what is recognised as an under-utilised asset. The need for a strategy governing the use and improvement of the four miles of canal within the City of Westminster was identified when British Waterways and Trafalgar House Developments employed URBED (Urban and Economic Development Consultants) to devise a water use strategy for Paddington Basin in connection with the current major development proposals following discussions with officers.

3.1.2 The report is based on appraisals of the study areas, interviews with over 25 key groups and individuals as well as the consultants' experience regarding other waterside sites. (A list of consultees is included as Appendix 1B).

3.2 Review of the Study

3.2.1 The report outlines a strategy for the improvement of the canals in Westminster, including proposals for implementation. A summary of the points arising from consultation, outline guidelines for future canalside development, development briefs for 2 key sites, just outside the City boundaries (namely, Cumberland Basin, (London Borough of Camden) and Kensal Green, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea) and programmes for action, are all included as appendices.

3.2.2 The study initially assess the challenge posed by the canals and finds them to be an under-utilised recreational resource which suffers from wasted opportunities and has a poor image, which in turn acts as a deterrent to potential users.

3.2.3 The report identifies three distinct stretches of the canal each providing a different sequence of experiences, and highlights opportunities to create new attractions and provide public facilities at various sites along the canal, such as Hormead Wharf, Beauchamp Lodge, 'The Florist Shop' (at 453 Edgware Road) and the Iron Foundry site and land adjacent to Marylebone Station on the north-eastern stretch.

3.2.4 In addition to identifying major development opportunities, the report outlines a strategy of action aimed at overcoming the general problems identified in the survey. The programmes include encouraging access to the canal, increasing water activity (including provision of new moorings), improving amenity through environmental improvements and landscaping and ensuring appropriate
development in locations where new buildings are justified. The report identifies the need for guidelines governing canalside development, endorsed by the local authority, to secure appropriate development.

3.2.5 The final section of the report sets out four measures intended to ensure that the strategy is successfully implemented. It proposes establishing a Canal Task Force made up of officers from this and adjoining boroughs and British Waterways staff, (initially for a period of approximately three years) to progress proposals for improvements and package resources. The review, of the status of the maintenance agreement between British Waterways and the City Council is identified as one issue requiring immediate review.

3.2.6 Secondly, in order to support the implementation of the strategy, to raise and channel funds for improvements and involve local interest and business communities, the establishment of a canal development trust is recommended. The trust would also undertake small scale improvements and promote the use of the canal as a recreational and educational resource.

3.2.7 The study also proposes that the current system of 'caretaker' wardens be replaced by a more pro-active Canal Ranger Service, a trained uniformed team working on a 'shift basis' responsible for towpath maintenance, angling and cycling permits and canalside and mooring security etc. The ranger service would be backed up by an environmental training scheme, supported by the new Training and Enterprise Council for Westminster and Kensington and use projects as a means of providing work experience for training those interested in the building industry, as well as the long-term unemployed and those with special employment difficulties.

3.2.8 Finally, the report recommends use be made of planning briefs for major sites, as well as planning agreements with developers, to secure planning gains either through improving the surrounding environment or contributing to the Trust Fund.

3.3 Funding Arrangements

3.3.1 A schedule of suggested project works has been drawn up and potential sources of funding identified. (This schedule is included as Appendix 2.) It is not proposed at this stage that any capital works be undertaken or any cost be borne by the City Council. It is suggested however, that if the multi-functional Canal Ranger Service is implemented, funding currently allocated for Park Department caretakers could possible be reallocated for this purpose.

3.3.2 The Environment Sub-Committee recently resolved (18 June 1990) that the City Council should withdraw its membership from the London Canals Committee, the only existing Forum which has the potential to discuss and co-ordinate canal issues in a strategic manner. It was considered that, given the infrequency of the meetings, current arrangements including the commissioning of URBED to undertake this study of the use and management of the canal and direct officer liaison with officers of British Waterways about specific canalside sites including the Paddington Basin redevelopment proposals, were adequate for protecting the City Council's interests. The annual membership fee for the Committee was £1,315 for 1989, to be increased to approximately £2,030 for 1990/91.

3.4 Current or Anticipated Development Proposals
There are currently planning applications or development proposals for a number of sites adjacent to the canal, including some of those identified in the Canal report; (A map identifying key canalside sites is included as Appendix 6), i.e.,

i. Hormead Wharf: Proposed B1/residential scheme
   - Planning permission was refused on 16 August 1990 on office policy, design (overdevelopment) and highways grounds.
   - Involved encroachment of the site into the Grand Union Canal.

ii. Westbourne Park Bus Garage, Great Western Road: Proposed redevelopment by London Buses Limited of land between the bus garage and Great Western Road for offices for the garage and residential units for L.R.T. staff.
   - An application is expected shortly.

iii. 149 Harrow Road: Reorganisation of timber yard/depot on roundabout site (bounded by Bishopsbridge and Harrow Roads and the canal).
   - Application by Travers Perkins Limited submitted in March 1990, currently held in abeyance.
   - To include provision of a towpath along the canal bank.

iv. 55-65 North Wharf Road: Proposed remodelling of existing office building.
   - Application submitted in June 989 by Dares Estates, currently held in abeyance.
   - To include provision of public access along the canal.

v. 453 Edgware Road: Premises rebuild in July 1990 in accordance with conditional planning permission granted in 1985.
   - Enforcement action against the structure is under review.

vi. North of Marylebone Station: Proposed redevelopment of office buildings adjacent to Marylebone Station.
   - Recent application was reported to Planning Sub-Committee on 30 August, recommended for approval, together with a draft planning brief.

3.5 Planning Policy Issues

In view of pressures for development, the access and design issues which they raise, and the problems of under-utilisation identified in the Canal Study, it is considered that there is a clear need for Development Policy Guidelines. Apart from the general design and amenity policies and one policy on open space which expresses the Council's intention to seek the completion of a canalside walk through the borough by opening up of the towpath and to encourage new opportunities for recreational use of the waterspace of the canal and basins (Policy 6.16 v), the Council's District Plan contains no policies relating directly to the development and enhancement of canalside sites.
3.5.2 Draft Policy Guidelines for Canalside Development have therefore been prepared to provide advice for applicants and developers on canalside sites and enable the Council to take advantage of new development opportunities arising on or near to the canal. The guidelines cover the form, layout and design of buildings and encourage use beside the canal which compliment and support public activity and provide opportunities for leisure activities. Planning Guidelines for canalside moorings have also been drafted and are included as appendix. (Copies of the draft guidelines be circulated for public comment to the bodies and individuals listed in Appendix 5B.)

3.5.3 Draft Planning Briefs have also been prepared for four key canalside sites, namely:

i. Hormead Wharf  
ii. Westbourne Park Bus Garage  
iii. 453 Edgware Road  
iv. North Bank Iron Foundry Site

Copies of these draft briefs are included as Appendix 5. These briefs are intended to supplement and be read in conjunction with the general policy guidelines but contain more site specific information, such as site assets and constraints, preferred uses, appropriate scale and form of development and possible planning advantages in terms of canalside access and environmental improvements etc.

3.5.4 It is intended that Planning briefs also be prepared for other key sites in due course including, Ladbroke Grove Bridge, which is subject of a road widening proposal.

3.5.5 Extensions to existing conservation areas to include significant sections of the canalside are also considered appropriate to ensure the environment and character of the canal is safeguarded. The suggested areas are shown in Appendix 7. It is recommended that these also be circulated for public comment.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Background Papers

1. Report to Planning and Development Committee 19.9.89.
2. Report to Planning and Development Committee 30.1.90.
3. Report to Planning and Development Committee 20.3.90.
4. Report to Environment Sub-Committee 28.6.90.
5. 'Making the Most of the Canals in Westminster' (Discussion Draft) July 1990. URBED.
Appendices

   a) Executive Summary.
   b) List of Consultees.

2. URBED/BWB Schedule of Projects.

3. Suggested Bodies to be consulted about URBED Draft Report.

   b) Suggested list of consultees.
   c) Map of Westminster's (Grand Union and Regents) Canals.

5. a) Draft Planning Briefs.
   i) Hormead Wharf.
   ii) Westbourne Park Bus Garage.
   iii) North Bank (Thames Bank Iron Co. site).
   iv) 453 Edgware Road.
   b) Suggested list of consultees.


7. Suggested Extensions to Conservation Areas.
Suggested Extensions to Existing Conservation Areas

The following properties adjacent to the canal are identified as warranting consideration for inclusion within existing conservation areas:-

i) St. Mary Magdalen Church, Rowington Close, W9, as identified on Map 1 to be included within the Maida Vale Conservation Area.

ii) Queens Park Library, 666 Harrow Road. Nos. 427-525 Harrow Road including the public open space and the Floral Hotel on south side of Harrow Road up to and including the canal and Royal Borough boundary and the Cobden Club, 170 Kensal Road, W10 (as identified on Map 2) to be included within the Queens Park Conservation Area. (The merits of including Nos. 527-551 Harrow Road should also be assessed.)
3. List of Buildings of Special Architectural and Historic Merit

The list of buildings of special architectural and historic interest set out below was prepared in 2005. As new buildings are constantly being listed this list should not be treated as definitive.

At the time of preparation there were 102 listed buildings, (all of which are Grade II) in the Queen's Park Estate Conservation Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Droop Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droop Street School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(London School Board)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-82 even (east side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-98 even (east side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-114 even (east side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116-130 even (east side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132-154 even (east side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156-170 even (east side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses No. 170 shop/flat</td>
<td>1874 (Nos. 166-8) 1876 (others)</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-81 odd (west side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-97 odd (west side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-113 odd (west side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115-129 odd (west side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131-145 odd (west side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147-167 odd (west side)</td>
<td>Terraced houses No. 167 shop/flat</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow Road</td>
<td>Ground floor shops with Estate Meeting Hall above</td>
<td>1883-4</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS the Council of the City of Westminster ('the Council') being the local planning authority within the meaning of Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Development Order 1988 is satisfied that it is expedient that development of the descriptions set out in Schedule 1 hereto should not be carried out on land at Queen's Park Estate, W10 in the City of Westminster ('the land') being the land shown edged red on the plan annexed hereto and listed in Schedule 2 hereto unless permission is granted for the development on application made under the Town and Country Planning General Development Order 1988.

NOW THEREFORE the Council under the powers conferred on it by Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Development Order 1988 ('the order') hereby directs that:

(1) the permission granted by Article 3 of the said Order shall not apply to development on the land of the description set out in Schedule 2 hereto.

(2) the Direction relating to the land, made by the Council on the 6 May 1981 and approved by the Secretary of State on the 4 November 1981 is hereby cancelled.

SCHEDULE 1

1. Physical alterations which would affect the appearance of any part of the front elevation or an elevation which is visible from the highway (including alterations to front doors and windows), being development comprised within Class A referred to in Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order.

2. The erection or construction of any type of porch or similar enclosure on the front elevation or any other elevation which fronts on to the highway, being development comprised within Class D referred to in Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order.

3. The erection or construction of any boundary walls, fences and gates in front of the dwellings or where they can be viewed from the highway, being development comprised within Class A referred to in Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the Order.

4. Any change in roof material or colour, being development comprised within Class B and/or Class C, referred to in Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order.

5. Painting any part of the front elevation or any other elevation which fronts on to the highway, being development comprised within Class C being referred to in Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the Order.

6. Painting any boundary walls, fences and gates located in front of the dwelling or where they can be viewed from the highway, being development comprised within Class C, referred to in Part 2 of the Schedule of the Order.

7. Locating or erecting an oil storage tank, dustbin store, meter cupboard or any similar construction within the curtilage of the dwelling where it is visible from the...
highway, being development comprised in Class G, referred to in Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order.

8. The installation, alteration or replacement of a satellite antenna on a dwelling house or within the curtilage of a dwelling house which would be visible from a highway, being development comprised in Class H, referred to in Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order.

SCHEDULE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alperton Street</td>
<td>1-35 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-32 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barfett Street</td>
<td>1-37 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-38 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caird Street</td>
<td>1-47 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droop Street</td>
<td>2-48 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52-84 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94-112 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enbrook Street</td>
<td>1-39 (off)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-54 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Avenue</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67-165 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68-168 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Avenue</td>
<td>1-37 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-78 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Avenue</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galton Street</td>
<td>1-47 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-48 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley Street</td>
<td>1-47 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-48 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilbert Street</td>
<td>69-79 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85-127 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100-136 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162-170 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilburn Lane</td>
<td>2-24 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-158 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164-208 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilravock Street</td>
<td>1-123 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lothrop Street</td>
<td>2-120 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marne Street</td>
<td>1-119 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-118 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutbourne Street</td>
<td>1-101 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-58 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliphant Street</td>
<td>1-109 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113-165 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-56 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-128 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peach Road (previously part of Droop Street)</td>
<td>201-263 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150-216 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Avenue</td>
<td>1-57 (odd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-38 (even)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Avenue</td>
<td>1-123 (odd)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2-118 (even)
9-15 (odd)
43-107 (odd)
111-113 (odd)
2-58 (even)
176-208 (even)

GIVEN under the Common Seal of the Lord Mayor and Citizens of the City of Westminster this 29 day of October one thousand nine hundred and ninety two.
OTHER DESIGNATIONS

Adjacent Conservation Areas: None

Strategic Views: Not affected

Areas of Archaeological Priority: Not affected

Regulation 7 Directions: None
Westminster Publications and Design Guides

Unitary Development Plan
Westminster’s Planning Policies are set out in the adopted City of Westminster Unitary Development Plan 1997 and the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2nd deposit version, pre-inquiry version and modifications agreed May, September and December 2004). This can also be viewed on the Internet at: www.westminster.gov.uk

Design Guides and Publications
Other Westminster City Council publications, produced by the Department of Planning and City Development are listed below. These are available from One Stop Services (see addresses under ‘contact details’) or can be viewed on the Westminster City Council website.

1. The Queens Park Estate Design Guide
2. Conservation Areas: A Guide to Property Owners
3. Development and Demolition in Conservation Areas
4. Design Matters in Westminster – Supplementary Planning Guidance on Creating Good City Architecture
5. A Guide to Providing Access for All
8. Designing Out Crime in Westminster
9. Façade Cleaning - The removal of soiling and paint from brick and stone facades
10. Lighting Up the City - A good practice guide for the illumination of buildings and monuments
11. Plant and Air Conditioning Equipment - Guidance notes on applications for planning permission
12. Public Art in Westminster
14. Railings on Domestic Buildings in Westminster
15. Roofs - A Guide to Alterations and Extensions on Domestic Buildings
16. Trees and other Planting on Development Sites
17. A Brief Guide to Planning Enforcement

Citywest Homes also produce a Lessees Handbook and a Tenants Handbook with information about how Westminster City Council and Citywest Homes, as the Council’s Agent, manage its properties on the Queens Park Estate. These can be obtained from One Stop Services, your local estate office or can be downloaded from the Citywest Homes website at: http://www.cwh.org.uk.
Further Reading


2. E MacDonald and D Smith (1990) Artizans and Avenues: A History of the Queens Park Estate (City of Westminster Libraries)


Local History

For information on all aspects of local history contact:

**City of Westminster Archive Centre**
10 St. Ann's Street
London SW1P 2XR
General Enquiries: Tel: *(020) 7641 5180*
City of Westminster

Decision-maker | Date | Title of Report
--- | --- | ---
CABINET MEMBER FOR CUSTOMER SERVICES | | Queens Park Estate Conservation Area Audit—Adoption as Supplementary Planning Guidance
CLASSIFICATION FOR GENERAL RELEASE | | Report of Director of Planning and City Development

Wards Involved | Queens Park

Policy Context | The Civic Review Initiative has a target to adopt 5 Conservation Area Audits as supplementary planning guidance by the end of 2004/05 in order to implement the programme to prepare audits for the City’s 53 conservation areas.

Financial Summary | There are no financial implications arising from this report at this stage.

Summary

1.1 National guidance places responsibility on the City Council to produce detailed appraisals of each of its 53 conservation areas and to consider the designation of further areas. Following a public consultation exercise including a public meeting this report seeks the adoption of the Queens Park Estate Conservation Area Audit as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That the Cabinet Member for Customer Services resolves to adopt the Queens Park Estate Conservation Area Audit (attached in Appendix 5) as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

3 Background Information

3.1 On 22 October 1998, Sub-Committee agreed a priority list of conservation areas to be audited as part of the City Council’s comprehensive review of its then 51 Conservation Areas (there are now 53). This review is a statutory duty and an updated timetable is being progressed.

3.2 Given the complexity and scale of the City’s conservation areas this process has been broken into three stages involving the production of mini-guides (General Information Leaflets), directories and audits. The audits represent the
third and final stage of the preparation of appraisals of all of the Borough’s 53 Conservation Areas.

4 Detail
4.1 The draft Queens Park Estate Conservation Area Audit was adopted for consultation on 17 September 2004. Since this time, a public consultation exercise has been undertaken, as detailed below. A summary of all correspondence and comments received and the council’s response can be found in Appendix 3. The amended Audit is included in Appendix 5.

Consultation
4.3 Letters of consultation were issued on 18 October 2004 and sent to local amenity groups, national bodies, ward Councillors and other local organisations. A list of consultees is attached in Appendix 1. Consultation included an exhibition at the Maida Vale Area Forum, the library and the opening ceremony for the new Avenue Gardens playground.

4.4 Two written responses were received commenting on the content of the audit, in addition to internal responses and these are listed in the background paper section and summarised in Appendix 3.

Public meeting
4.5 The letter of 18 October 2004 also invited local groups, national bodies, ward Councillors and other local organisations to attend a public meeting, which discussed the audit. This was held on 8 November 2004.

4.6 The meeting was chaired by Councillor Duncan Sandys, and attended by six members of the public/representatives of local organisations. The audit was presented to the meeting and issues of concern were then discussed.

4.7 A summary of all comments including those from the meeting is set out at Appendix 3. Comments relating to the audit have generally been supportive with Citywest Homes and attendees at the meeting including the Queens Park Estate Society expressing their support for the document. Areas of debate and concern amongst residents of the estate raised at the meeting and in written comments are discussed below.

• Importance of Enforcement: The attendees at the meeting were supportive of the audit and its aims but felt that in order to retain the special character of an area, it is also important to enforce against unauthorised works. The primary aim of the audit is to identify what is important within the estate but in order to protect the special character of the estate enforcement against unauthorised works is important. A survey of the estate is undertaken by the City Council every four years to identify and take action against any unauthorised works and this is currently underway. The enforcement manager also suggested that the section on minor alterations referring to the Article 4 direction be expanded. Text has therefore been added with regards to the direction, indicating that planning legislation gives local authorities the power to take action against breaches of planning control. A map showing the
location of properties covered by an Article 4 direction has also been added to increase awareness of restrictions to individual properties.

- **Regulation 7 Direction:** Estate agents boards were felt to be a problem and the possibility of their control through an Article 7 direction for the estate was raised at the meeting. The Town and County Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992 states which signage and advertisements require consent. Under Class 3(A) there are certain ‘deemed consents’ or instances where a sign of a certain size, in a certain location can be put up without permission. Where appropriate the council can apply to the Secretary of State for a ‘Regulation 7 Direction’ to be used to remove this deemed consent, controlling the display of estate agents boards and preventing the build up of visual clutter. These have been designated in those areas of the city which were experiencing an overwhelming number of estate agent boards causing significant harm to the amenity of the area. However, the Council would need to demonstrate a need for this additional control and a fair balance must be struck between the needs of owners and the needs of agents and businesses. Following the meeting two small surveys were undertaken within the Queens Park Estate and only three estate agents boards were found in the conservation area. Many of the properties are in council ownership and most are single family dwellings. As such, subdivision of properties and shorter term lettings which tend to lead to a proliferation of estate agents boards are not significant problems in this area. It is not therefore considered that a case could be made for a Regulation 7 at this moment, but this will be kept under review. Reference to vacant properties has also been added under ‘negative features.’

- **Management of the council’s own properties:** The issue of the four cottages recently demolished without consent in Fourth Avenue was raised as was the quality of the ongoing programme of works on Council properties around the estate. One particular concern is that the contractors carrying out works are not aware of the importance of good repair. These are managed by Haywards Property Services for Citywest Homes, both of whom were consulted on the audit and had representatives at the meeting. It is hoped that their participation in the process should help raise awareness. A copy of the audit as adopted will also be forwarded to them to help inform future programmes of work. Advice on materials and references to the importance of good maintenance and repair are contained within the audit document.

- **Views Section:** Several queries were raised with regard to the views section. In particular it was suggested there are metropolitan views from Illbert Street. Only a very small number of metropolitan views are identified within Westminster and these are of landmark buildings and river panoramas. Additional views have been identified as local views within the audit and reference made to this within the views section. However it is not considered likely that the focus of this view (the Post Office tower) is sufficiently close to constitute a metropolitan view. An SPG on metropolitan views is under preparation and any proposals for additional metropolitan views can be considered as part of the consultation on this document.
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• **Negative Features**: Various comments were made with regards to the negative features identified. Discussions have been underway about works to improve and upgrade Queens Park Gardens and there have been discussions with regards to the maintenance of the park and fear of crime within the gardens. However, attendees at the meeting felt that the Gardens themselves were not negative and form an attractive space within the estate. It is accepted that the gardens themselves make a significant contribution to the estate and these have therefore been removed from the negative features section with further information and description with regards to the gardens and their importance added to the paragraph on trees and landscape.

4.8 As well as those described above, other minor alterations to text and more illustrations have been added based on comments received from internal and external consultees and at the public meeting (see appendix 3 for detail). Higher quality maps in colour will be substituted in the final document if adopted.

5 **Financial Implications**

5.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report at this stage. Expenditure costs will be met from existing revenue budgets.

6 **Legal Implications**

6.1 Under Section 69 (1)(a) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 every local authority “shall from time to time determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance”. Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 ‘Planning and the Historic Environment’ interprets this responsibility by advising local authorities to periodically review existing conservation areas and their boundaries.

7 **Consultation**

7.1 A programme of public consultation was undertaken as detailed above involving national amenity societies, local resident groups and ward Councillors.

8 **Human Rights Act 1998**

8.1 The Human Rights Act came into force in England on 2 October 2000. It gives teeth to the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which was ratified by the UK in 1951 and has been in force since 1953. The Act confers the direct protection of English law in relation to Convention rights. For the purposes of the role of a local planning authority the relevant provisions are: Article 2 - right to life, Article 6 – right to a fair hearing, Article 8 - right to respect for private and family life, Article 14 – prohibition of discrimination and Article 1 of the First Protocol - protection of property.

9 **Conclusion**
9.1 The Queens Park Estate Conservation Area Audit has now been through a process of public consultation. As a result of this process the findings have received general support. The audit has been amended to reflect comments received. Illustrations have been added and minor amendments to the text have also been made in response to comments, as detailed at Appendix 3. It is therefore recommended that the audit now be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance to ensure the continued preservation and enhancement of the Queens Park Estate Conservation Area.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUERIES ABOUT THIS REPORT OR WISH TO INSPECT ANY OF THE BACKGROUND PAPERS, PLEASE CONTACT JANE HAMILTON ON 020 7641 8019; EMAIL ADDRESS jhamilton@westminster.gov.uk; FAX NUMBER 020 7641 2338

BACKGROUND PAPERS

1 Queens Park Estate Conservation Area mini-guide

2 Minutes of public meeting

3 Letters from Citywest Homes, Brent Council and comments from the Parks and Leisure department.

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF CONSULTEES

Queens Park Estate Office
Queens Park Neighbourhood Forum
Queens Park Estate Society
Queens Park Bangladesh Association
Queens Park Estate Tenants and Residents Association
Citywest Homes
Queens Park Library
Queens Park Primary School
New Avenues Youth Centre
United Reform Church, Harrow Road
All Stars Youth Club, 576 Harrow Road
Westminster Property Owners Association
English Heritage
Victorian Society
London Borough of Brent
London Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Colin Buttery, Head of Parks
Martin Low, Assistant Director of Transportation
Senior Arboricultural Officer
Head of City Planning (Economic Development and Policy)
Head of City Planning (Strategic Schemes)
Councillor Paul Dionoldenberg
Councillor M Quereshi
Councillor B Taylor
APPENDIX 2: ATTENDEES AT PUBLIC MEETING

Elaine Kelly
Sarma Allison
Penny Youard
Mary Nicholas: Queens Park Estate Society
Nicholas Waring: Citywest Homes
Femi Ogumua: Haywards Property Services
Councillor Sandys
Rosemarie MacQueen
Jane Hamilton
Emily Wade
## APPENDIX 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation responses</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITYWEST HOMES</td>
<td>Section 3 History - I believe this section would be of particular interest to residents and would ask you to consider how such information could be made available on the CWH website under &quot;My Village&quot;. I note the Conservation Area Partnership Scheme ceased in 1999. This is regrettable as it was very successful in encouraging lessees to carry out conservation works, and also acted as supplementary funding for the Housing Department to do likewise. I would be pleased if you could exert your influence with English Heritage and Government bodies to reinstate a similar funding regime. I am keen to ensure any extra costs to the Housing Revenue Account capital programme resulting from such works is appropriately reflected in the Housing Investment Programme returns. In relation the above it would be useful if you would make explicit just how the Council intends to &quot;.....encourage the repair and retention of original doors and windows throughout the estate.&quot; I note you consider views of Trellick Tower from within Queens Park CA have some merit. I am interested whether you take the same view of Glastonbury House from Pimlico CA, and would be grateful for an explanation of any similarities or differences. We have just produced our draft 3-year city-wide programme of capital works and I previously provided you with details. This programme is under continual review and I welcome your advice on the planning implications so I may incorporate these into our own Conservation Area Management Plans. Importance of keeping residents informed and aware of the estate is recognised and this information will be supplied to Citywest homes. The final audit will be available on-line on the Westminster web site and we will seek to create links between Citywest Homes website and audit documents. Westminster has been unsuccessful in obtaining grant support from English Heritage for other parts of the City of Westminster, due to the socio-economic profile of the area. However, it is agreed that a grants scheme would be of benefit in the Queens Park Estate and we will continue to review the situation and maintain dialogue with English Heritage as to the possibility of grant aid. The estate is covered by an Article 4 direction, meaning replacement windows may require planning permission. When an application is received for inappropriate replacement windows, it is likely this will be refused and the council will encourage repair rather than replacement. Reference to the fact replacing windows and doors requires permission will be added here. (p21) This is a local view of interest in the context of the Queens Park Estate Conservation Area. The Trellick Tower is an iconic building of the 20th century: a social housing scheme by Erno Goldfinger. It is of some interest to consider this approach in relation to the approach to social housing taken in the QP estate. Glastonbury House does not have the same historical or architectural interest but views in Pimlico will be considered as part of the Pimlico Audit. Look forward to providing input into this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRENT COUNCIL</td>
<td>Document was of great interest and look forward to following progress on this Support welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS AND LEISURE</td>
<td>Page 28 referred to the canalside cannot really be seen from the roadside anyway because it is higher than the road. Wording amended p35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation responses</td>
<td>Council response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGHWAYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No transportation implications</td>
<td>Only a very small number of metropolitan views are identified within Westminster and these are of landmark buildings and river panoramas. Views from Ilbert Street and Queens Park gardens will be identified as a local views within the audit and reference made to these within the views section. An SPG on metropolitan views is under preparation and any proposals for additional metropolitan views can be considered during public consultation on this document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Youard (at public meeting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Views’ section: this does not identify any metropolitan views within the Conservation Area. It was suggested that the view of the Post Office tower from Ilbert street should be identified.</td>
<td>Word mesmerising removed. This has been reworded to reflect the fact that although terraces are regular in terms of plot size, palette of materials and building height, they also retain a diversity of style that maintains the interest of the streetscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt that the wording “the layout and design produce a sense of mesmerising regularity” was inaccurate and that the way the estate was designed with different types of houses and grouping in fact stop the streetscape from appearing too regular.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was felt that within ‘canalside environment’ the reference to views to the canal being obscured by the landscaping strip should be omitted. These gardens are very peaceful in the middle of the Harrow Road traffic.</td>
<td>Reference to views being obscured has been omitted and this reworded at para 5.9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary Nichols, Queens Park Estate Society (at public meeting)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt that Queens Park estate gardens are attractive as they are and these should not be in ‘negative features’ Particular reference to importance of the hedge to wildlife.</td>
<td>Omitted from negative features. Further description and reference to the hedge added under paragraph on landscaping para 4.44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate Agents boards were felt to be a problem on the estate and it was suggested that the council looked into the possibility of trying to control these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The possibility of inserting Victorian postboxes on the estate was mentioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was also suggested that the library should be listed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The four cottages which had been lost in fourth avenue were referred to. These had been almost entirely demolished without conservation area consent. It was felt to be most important the city council obey their own rules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sarma Allison (at public meeting)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is passionate about the estate and feels that quite a lot of unauthorised works are being undertaken for example satellite dishes and bad renovation work. What is being done about this?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting of brickwork details etc. is a particular problem.</td>
<td>This is covered further in the report above. The council is also committed to enforcing against unauthorised works and a survey is currently underway to identify these on the Queens Park Estate. The primary objective of the audit is to identify those original features which the council would seek to retain. Further info added to ‘windows and doors’ re painting of details/brickwork arches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WESTMINSTER CITY COUNCIL

STATEMENT OF DECISION

SUBJECT: Queens Park Estate Conservation Area Audit – Adoption as Supplementary Planning Guidance

Notice is hereby given that Councillor Robert Davis, the Cabinet Member for Customer Services, has made the following executive decision on the above mentioned subject for the reason set out below.

Summary of Decision:

That the Queens Park Estate Conservation Area Audit be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Reason for Decision:

National guidance places responsibility on the Council to produce detailed appraisals of each of its 53 conservation areas. The Queens Park Estate Conservation Area Audit has now been through a process of public consultation. As a result of this process the findings have received general support. The audit has been amended to reflect the comments received. The adoption of the Audit as Supplementary Planning Guidance will ensure the continued preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area.

C T Wilson
Director of Legal and Administrative Services
Westminster City Hall
64 Victoria Street
LONDON
SW1E 6QP
Publication Date: 15 April 2005
Decision Ref: no. CMfCS/11/2005
Westminster City Council Contacts

Planning Information
For general information, to obtain planning application forms and copies of publications, to find out if a property is listed or in a conservation area or to make an enforcement complaint, contact:
Planning Records (Customer Service Centre)
Tel: (020) 7641 2513 or Fax: (020) 7641 2515
Email: PlanningInformation@westminster.gov.uk

Planning Advice
For advice about planning permission, conservation area, listed building or advertisement consent, design and restoration advice, restrictions in Article 4 Direction Areas, lawful development certificates and details of design guide publications contact the North Area Planning Team:
Tel: (020) 7641 2924 or Fax: (020) 7641 2338
Email: NorthPlanningTeam@westminster.gov.uk

Or write to:
Development Planning Services
Department of Planning and City Development
Westminster City Council
City Hall, 64 Victoria Street,
London SW1E 6QP

One Stop Services
Where you can view or purchase the Council's Unitary Development Plan and other documents giving advice on access and design matters. The addresses are:

62 Victoria Street, SW1
(Open 8.30am - 7pm Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday & Friday; 9am - 1pm Saturday)
317 Harrow Road, W9
(Open 8am - 5pm Monday, Wednesday & Friday; 8am - 7pm Tuesday & Thursday)
91-93 Church Street, NW8
(Open 8am - 5pm Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday & Friday; 8am - 7pm Thursday; 9am - 3pm Saturday)

Housing Advice
To report any repairs or maintenance problems, and for any queries concerning the management of your property, please contact:

Queens Park Estate Office
82 Bruckner Street
London
W10 4EY
E-mail QueensParkEO@cwh.org.uk
The City Council also makes available many documents in Braille, on tape and in large print. If you require any of the information contained in these documents in one of these alternative formats please contact (020) 7641 8088.