
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2017

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/W/16/3157947

13, 13A and 13B Addison Crescent, London W14 8JR

- 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 the Wavell Group against the decision of The Council of The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/16/02968, dated 10 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is:
"No 13 1st floor mansard addition and corresponding refurbishment works to the existing approved development (case No PP/15/05709), in order to ensure continuity of the street scene;
No 13A 2nd floor habitable mansard addition and corresponding refurbishment works on the 1st floor;
No 13B 2nd floor habitable mansard addition and corresponding refurbishment works on the ground and 1st floors."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The above description is taken from the planning application form. This differs from the Council's description on the decision notice but it is not clear that there was any agreement to the changes.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposals would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Holland Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes three dwellings and the land around them. These dwellings were part of a terrace although an extension to No 13 had been demolished by the time of my site visit. There is currently a gap therefore between the side of No 13 and No 13A.
 5. Planning permission exists for a development that would include the reconstruction of an extension linking Nos 13 and 13A, reinstating the terrace. The current planning permission would include a pitched roof with a ridge a little lower than that of No 13A and which in turn would be substantially lower than the main roof at No 13. The roof of No 13B is lower than both existing
-

- roofs and so there would be a stepping up and down of the roofs if the existing approval were implemented.
6. The Council and appellant have referred to the Holland Park Conservation Area Proposals Statement (CAPS). This is a useful guide to help explain the character and appearance of the CA although it was adopted in October 1989 and it does not take account of current policies within the Consolidated Local Plan¹ (CLP).
 7. The CA covers a wide area which developed on the extensive land around Holland House. No 13 is a villa in the classical style including decorative mouldings and distinctive bays. The other dwellings within the site are less grand in appearance and may have originally been coach houses used in association with nearby dwellings at 64 and 65 Addison Road. The buildings have undergone external alterations to enable their residential use but they have remained smaller in scale than most other buildings nearby. The buildings on the opposite side of Addison Crescent from the site are a mixture of 2 and 3 storey buildings and there is some variety in the style of those as well. The nearby buildings fronting onto Addison Road are of a much bigger scale generally than those within this part of Addison Crescent.
 8. The stepping up and down of the roofs and informality of the buildings is in contrast to some of the grander buildings nearby and adjoining the site. The party walls between the properties along with the chimneys on Nos 13A and 13B are significant to the existing character of the buildings and can be clearly seen from within the road although views from the wider CA are limited.
 9. The CAPS identifies the buildings within Addison Crescent as having group value and I agree. Together these buildings are indicative of some of the development of the area giving them some historic interest. The visual subservience of the buildings in terms of size reflects their former functional subservience to surrounding grander buildings. The group has a roofline unimpaired by further extensions and policy CL8 seeks to resist additional storeys in such circumstances. Policy CL8 also requires additional storeys to be architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of groups of buildings.
 10. The proposal would involve the addition of mansard roofs with flat roof dormers within the front and rear of the 2 dwellings at No 13A and No 13B and also the extension at No 13. These 3 properties in this way would be unified in terms of the general design theme as well as in terms of detailed elements such as the size and form of the windows. A stepping up and down of the roofs would also be produced albeit in a much more formal manner than at present.
 11. The existing features proposed for retention such as the chimneys and party walls would be obscured by the mansard roofs. The proposed design would also make them grander buildings with features seen elsewhere on larger buildings within the CA. The buildings would take on a much more sanitised, strident appearance which would undermine their current informal charm. In my view this would have a harmful impact upon the group value of the buildings.
 12. The changes would be seen in a limited part of the CA. However the impact

¹Consolidated with alterations since the Core Strategy (December 2010) incorporation Pubs and Local Character Review (October 2013), Miscellaneous Matters Review (December 2014), Conservation and Design Review (December 2014) and Basements Review (January 2015)

would be visually harmful within the area along this part of Addison Crescent. This would not comply with the requirement within CLP policy CL11 to preserve or enhance views within conservation areas. CLP policy CL3 relates to designated heritage assets amongst other things. It is consistent with the requirement in paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets.

13. The properties at No 9 and No 10 Addison Crescent are not comparable in terms of the nature of the buildings and are within a very different part of the road, visually detached from the appeal site. The similarity of the roof alterations in those cases does not justify the current proposals.
14. In relation to the main issue, the proposals would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This would not comply with CLP policies CL3 and CL11 which relate specifically to the CA nor to CLP policies CL1, CL2, CL8.

Other Matters

15. The proposals would provide more spacious internal accommodation particularly at No 13A and No 13B. Some external green space on flat roofs at the rear would also be provided. These changes would help the existing occupants adapt to changing circumstances as they get older. These benefits for those occupants may also provide some public benefits if they help to reduce the future burden upon public services. However the representations about this do not provide much in the way of evidence to indicate the scale of those possible advantages. I give this matter limited weight.
16. The proposals would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA, the conservation of which I give great weight to in accordance with paragraph 132 of the Framework. The above other matters do not provide sufficient public benefits to outweigh my conclusion in relation to the main issue. This proposal would not comply with paragraph 134 of the Framework.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR