
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2016

by Neil Pope BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/16/3158943
29, Holland Villas Road, London, W14 8DH.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Martinis against the decision of The Council of The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.
 - The application Ref. PP/16/04133, dated 29/6/16, was refused by notice dated 25/8/16.
 - The development proposed is a side extension to the south side of the property and alterations to the rear terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side extension to the south side of property and alterations to the rear terrace at 29, Holland Villas Road, London, W14 8DH. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. PP/16/04133, dated 29/6/16 and subject to the following conditions:
 1. the development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision;
 2. the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on drawing refs. 1000 Rev A (site location), 2002.2 Rev F (proposed lower ground floor), 2003 Rev F (proposed upper ground floor), 2004.1 Rev B (proposed first floor), 2008.2 Rev A (proposed front elevation), 2011 Rev C (proposed rear elevation), 2009 Rev B (proposed north elevation) and 2010 Rev E (proposed south sectional elevation).

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Holland Park Conservation Area (HPCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a Victorian villa with later side and rear additions. The southern (side) extension is single storey¹ whilst the northern (side) extension is two storeys². It forms part of a row of attractive houses within the HPCA.
4. During my visit, I walked around the HPCA. This designated heritage asset includes the open space of Holland Park and rows of detached and terraced properties set in tree lined streets. Having regard also to the extracts from the

¹ The garage extension adjoins a two storey extension on the side of No.30.

² This adjoins a boundary wall to No.28.

Holland Park Conservation Area Proposals Statement (1989) that have been supplied, it appears that the significance of this asset lies primarily in the architectural qualities of the Regency and Victorian buildings, the historical development of the Holland Estate and the historic interest of Holland House.

5. The proposed extension and terrace would comprise a very modest addition to the host dwelling. Whilst this new extension would reduce the gap that exists at upper ground floor level with no.30 alongside, the proposal would be subservient in size and scale to the main house with a sizeable gap retained between the dwellings at first floor level and above. The development would be in keeping with the architectural qualities of Nos. 29 and 30 and would restore a sense of balance with the existing two storey extension on the northern side of No.29. The proposal would be designed to a high standard.
6. There is variation in the size of gaps between the properties in Holland Villas Road. The space above the existing garage on the side of appellant's house makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the HPCA. There is nothing of substance to support the Council's argument that the proposal would close a "*critical gap*" in the street scene. From the opposite side of the road glimpses would remain of the tree growing to the rear of the appellant's house. The proposed extension would result in a similar arrangement of side extensions that exist on some neighbouring properties. It would not harm the architectural integrity of the host building or diminish the quality of the pleasing views that exist along the street.
7. I note the findings of the Inspector who dismissed an appeal for upper floor extensions on either side of no.34 (Ref. APP/K5600/D/15/3139612). This is different to the situation before me where no.29 already has a two storey extension on one side and where the space that it is proposed to enclose in the appeal before me does not perform a valuable function in the local townscape. Each case must also be determined on its own merits. This previous decision does not set a precedent that I must follow. Moreover, whilst the above noted Proposals Statement advises that side extensions of more than one storey will not normally be permitted, there is no cogent evidence to demonstrate that the proposal before me would harm the heritage interest of the HPCA.
8. In addition to a planning condition requiring the commencement of development within three years, for the purposes of certainty, a condition would be necessary identifying the approved plans. As these plans specify new painted timber double glazed sliding sash windows "*to match existing*" it would be unnecessary to attach a separate condition requiring white painted timber framed sash windows as suggested by the Council.
9. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the HPCA and in so doing would accord with the provisions of policies CL1, CL2, CL3, CL9 and CL11 of the Council's Consolidated Local Plan (2015). I therefore conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Neil Pope

Inspector

.