
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2017

by R J Jackson BA MPhil DMS MRTPI MCMi

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

Decision date: 26 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/17/3168438
32 Stanford Road, London W8 5PZ

- 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 Mrs Anne-Cecile Clair against the decision of The Council of The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/16/06320, dated 22 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of new dormer window to side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new dormer window to side elevation at 32 Stanford Road, London W8 5PZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PP/16/06320, dated 22 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 257-DWG-100-PA-SP Rev P1, 257-DWG-000 Rev P1, 257-DWG-001 Rev P1, 257-DWG-002 Rev P1, 257-DWG-010 Rev P1, 257-DWG-020 Rev P1, 257-DWG-021 Rev P1, 257-DWG-100 Rev P1, 257-DWG-101 Rev P1, 257-DWG-110 Rev P1, 257-DWG-120 Rev P1, 257-DWG-121 Rev P1.
 - 3) The cheeks and roof of the dormer window hereby approved shall be clad in lead, and the windows shall be framed in white painted timber. The development shall hereafter be so maintained.

Procedural Matters

2. Following the refusal of planning permission that led to this appeal the Council granted planning permission for 'Enlargement of front dormer to nos. 32 and 34 Stanford Road'¹ and 'Construction of side dormer window at second floor level'². The Council was given the opportunity of making additional comments in the light of these approvals, and the appellant to respond to those representations. I have taken these additional comments into account in this decision.

¹ Council Ref: PP/16/06977

² Council Ref: PP/16/07876

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the De Vere Conservation Area (the DVCA).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of similar semi-detached dwellings on the west side of Stanford Road. This pair is the most southerly of three such pairs, although there is a single 'extra' dwelling to the north. The appeal property is located opposite the end of Eldon Road so it can be seen down that street. The site lies in the DVCA and is thus within a designated heritage asset.
5. The Council has published the De Vere Conservation Area Appraisal (the Appraisal). This notes these buildings as being positive buildings making a positive contribution to the historic and architectural character and appearance of the DVCA. The appeal site lies in the Vallotton Estate character area within the DVCA with the semi-detached pairs being particularly noted. They are described in the Appraisal as "a charming design in stock brick with an unusual pattern of nail-head quoins clearly framing the single structural unit and discreetly camouflaging the fact that these are pairs of houses and not detached as they seem. They are two storeys with half-basements and later dormer windows (most matching) and entrances in an original set-back element to the side. Ground floor windows are tripartite and upper floor sashes single. No 32 has original sashes that have a horizontal glazing bar at ground floor and a single vertical glazing bar at first floor".
6. The adjoining property to the south (No 34) has been extended with an additional floor to the set-back element connecting into the roof plane. This appears as an extension to the terrace of taller properties to the south, being set below the parapet cornice of the terrace.
7. The proposal is to erect a dormer in the side roof plane. This would have a projection from the roof plane along the horizontal of 2.3 m which compares with the 1.5 m on the approval. The proposal would consequently be taller than the approval.
8. The recent approval for the replacement of the dormers on the front elevations of Nos 32 and 34 permits the enlargement of the widths of the existing dormers rather than their heights. At the time of my site visit the dormers remained unenlarged.
9. The dormer windows in the roof planes of these semi-detached properties have a number of different sizes and there is already a larger dormer in the side of No 24. The junction between the three storey element to No 34 and the roof of that main house already has a similar effect on the appearance of that property to the dormer here proposed. To that extent the proposal would re-balance the pair.
10. The proposed dormer would be taller in absolute terms than both the existing and permitted dormers on the front elevation. However, the additional height would not be readily apparent, being only a small distance. Due to the proposed location on the roof the dormer could only be seen from a small number of vantage points on both Stanford Road and Eldon Road, as evidenced in the 'Close and Long View Analysis'. At the site visit I looked at the site and surrounding area and am satisfied that the Analysis provides a fair

representation of the effects of the proposal. The proposal would not be intrusive in the street scene or adversely affect the building itself.

11. It would therefore preserve the character and appearance, and thus the significance, of the building and the DVCA in the sense that the proposal would do no harm to it. Special attention should be paid, in line with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the DVCA.
12. As such the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the DVCA. It would therefore comply with Policies CL 1, CL 2, CL 3, CL 6, CL 8 and CL 11 of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Consolidated Local Plan in that it would respect the existing context, character and appearance, being of the highest architectural quality, preserving the character and appearance of the DVCA, would not harm the character and appearance of the building or cause cumulative harm, would not interrupt any long views and vistas. It would also comply with paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which emphasises the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Conditions

13. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the national Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition relating to the materials of the dormer in order to preserve the character and appearance of the DVCA. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision I have altered the conditions to better reflect the relevant guidance.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

RJ Jackson

INSPECTOR