



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2019 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/W/19/3228320

38 Kelso Place, London W8 5QP

- 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 Yalda Irani against the decision of The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/18/04559, dated 1 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of two houses and replacement with one house and one flat, including extension and basement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises two town houses situated at the end of a short and staggered terrace of four properties on the north side of Kelso Place which is a cul-de-sac. The existing four storey houses are late 20th Century modernist red brick buildings which feature heavily fenestrated mansard roofs. Both have narrow rear gardens adjacent to the railway lines to the north. No. 38A is set back slightly from No. 38.
 5. The surrounding area is dense and mostly residential, although directly to the west of the site, beyond the cul-de-sac, lies the Copthorne Tara Hotel which is a domineering modern high-rise building. To the east and south, the area is characterised by attractive terraced Georgian properties as well as more modern apartment complexes.
 6. The proposal would result in the demolition of 38 and 38A Kelso Place and the subsequent erection of a building comprising a 7-bed house and 3-bed self-
-

contained flat. Residents would gain access to their properties from the same entry-point at street level albeit through different doors. The proposed 3-bed unit would effectively be at first floor level and sandwiched by the larger 7-bed unit which would be above and below it. I find this to be an odd arrangement which would not be legible from the street scene. The appellant's agent contends this arrangement is similar to that which commonly exists within apartments. I disagree on this point as apartments tend to have separate units of similar sizes on each floor and common landing areas. In this case, it is an unbalanced relationship with a significantly smaller unit implanted in the middle of a large family-sized house.

7. I also find that the replacement of two similarly sized dwellings with a large single building block which appears as one dwelling would conflict with the existing pattern of development in this part of Kelso Place of terraces of narrower town houses, each with their own front door and garage.
8. Although the exterior aesthetic of the proposal, innovative brick detailing and craftsmanship is distinctive and somewhat attractive in its own right, the proposed design differs markedly from the existing context. The agent states that the proposal would reflect the limited detailing of the existing buildings, but I find that the proposed introduction of a flat roof instead of a mansard roof, and the proposed use of a variety of materials instead of uniform materials, as well as the proposed use of large windows of which have a vertical instead of a horizontal emphasis, would appear incongruous, would visually harm the street scene and so would detract from the character of the area.
9. Furthermore, the proposed addition of bulky protruding elements on the building's façade would disrupt the existing terrace, dominate the end of the cul-de-sac and therefore harm the appearance of Kelso Place.
10. I note the agent's point with regards to the specifics of the proposal which were considered to be previously acceptable by the Council or which responded to concerns they may have had. However, I must consider the scheme put before me and I have found that the first-floor flat arrangement and external appearance of the proposed development constitutes poor design which fails to sympathetically tie in with the immediate context.
11. I conclude the proposal harms the established character and appearance of the area. I therefore consider that the proposed development conflicts with Policies CO5, CL1 and CL2 of The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Consolidated Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework which together seek to ensure high-quality design of buildings which respect local context.

Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR