
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/W/17/3169722

Flat B, 99 Golborne Road, London W10 5NL

- 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 Oliver Gough against the decision of The Council of The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/16/07612, dated 9 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as a residential self contained unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development used in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. In determining the application the Council described the proposal as the erection of an additional storey with a mansard roof and associated alterations and this appears to be a more accurate description of the proposal. I have determined the appeal accordingly.
3. The appeal site address used in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. Whilst the appeal form states the site address to be Flat C, 99 Golborne Road, the appellant has confirmed that it is Flat B.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a three storey mid terraced property located within a row of similar properties containing commercial uses at ground floor with residential uses above. The host building and the other buildings within the terrace have parapets fronting Golborne Road and these parapets form a strong architectural feature when the buildings are viewed from street level. The host building and most of the neighbouring buildings within the terrace have butterfly roofs behind the front parapets and these roofs are visible when the terrace is viewed from Bevington Road, although views of the rear roof of the host building are to some extent obscured by the rear part of buildings fronting Bevington Road. There are a limited number of examples of roof

extensions of varying scale and design to buildings within the terrace and on the opposite side of Golborne Road, though the roof of the terrace within which the appeal site is located appears to be largely unaltered.

6. The proposed mansard roof extension with front and rear dormers would result in the loss of the butterfly roof of the host building and whilst the front parapet would remain, its visual impact and architectural significance would be diluted. Though the mansard would be set back behind the parapet, its height, form and design incorporating dormers means that it would nevertheless be visible above the parapet when viewed from street level, particularly from the junction of Golborne Road and Portobello Road. The appearance of the rear elevation of the host building would also be significantly altered by the loss of the butterfly roof with the increased height of the proposed roof meaning that it would become more visible when viewed from Bevington Road. Consequently the proposal would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and to the surrounding area.
7. My attention has been drawn by the appellant to a number of other roof extensions on Golborne Road and surrounding roads, some of which have yet to be constructed. I am not aware of the details or particular circumstances of these other cases and note that the Council states that the roof extensions referred to at Nos 97 and 105 Golborne Road do not benefit from planning permission. As previously stated, at my visit I noted a limited number of roof extensions nearby on Golborne Road including at Nos 97 and 105. However whilst some of these extensions are visible from various vantage points, none appeared to be comparable to the proposal in that they differ in terms of their scale and design. In any event I must determine the proposal before me on its own merits and for the reasons stated I consider that it would be harmful.
8. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the fact that the proposal would provide additional and improved living and amenity space for occupiers of the flat and that high quality materials would be used. However these matters do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
9. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to policies CL1, CL2 and CL8 of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Consolidated Local Plan. These policies require all development, amongst other things, to be of the highest architectural and urban design and to respect the existing context. With regard to roof alterations, these will be resisted on terraces that are already broken only by isolated roof additions and where the roof line is exposed to long views from public spaces.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR