



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by C Cresswell BSc(Hons) MA MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/ K5600/W/19/3236615

27 Lansdowne Road, London W11 3AG

- 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 I Paley against the decision of The Council of The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/19/02824, dated 18 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is excavation of single storey basement (beneath building footprint and part of garden), amendment to front lightwell, demolition of garage, mansard extension and physical alterations to elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ladbroke Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a dwelling situated in the Ladbroke Conservation Area. The significance of the Conservation Area is mainly derived from the architectural quality of the historic streets and buildings and their physical relationship with gardens and open spaces.
4. The appeal property is situated at the end of a terrace at the junction of Lansdowne Road and St Johns Road. This terrace is architecturally similar to some other properties in this part of Lansdowne Road. Many of these are three stories above street level, with rooflines hidden behind parapets and having similar patterns of fenestration and exterior detailing. Not every property is identical and many have been altered (including some with roof extensions). Nonetheless, a good degree of architectural consistency is evident within the street scene and contributes to the quality of the Conservation Area in this location. Certain design features are also reflected in surrounding streets, including some properties in Clarendon Road to the west.
5. When viewed from street level, the roofline of the appeal property is largely hidden behind the parapet. Although a glazed and steeply pitched part of the roof can be seen, it is not a dominant feature. As such, the roofline appears

- mainly flat when seen from Lansdowne Road. This is consistent with the appearance of several other properties in this part of the street.
6. The proposed mansard roof extension would change this appearance by adding an additional storey above the parapet. While the extension would incorporate traditional materials, it would clearly alter the form of the roofline as currently seen from the public domain. This would be particularly noticeable as the house occupies a corner plot and the side elevation can be seen at distance when approaching from the north along Lansdowne Road.
 7. My attention has been drawn to various examples of roof extensions in the immediate surroundings. This includes the neighbouring property in the terrace at No 25 Lansdowne Road, which has a sizeable roof extension that is clearly visible high above the parapet. Yet although this does interfere with the original design of the terrace, the rooflines of other properties in the terrace (including the appeal property) are mainly hidden behind the parapet wall as seen from ground level within Lansdowne Road. As such, the original form of the terrace is evident, even though it has been subject to alteration.
 8. The effect of the proposed roof extension would be to further alter the original form of the terrace, thereby eroding the architectural similarities seen between properties in this part of Lansdowne Road. While the heights of dwellings do vary in this area, one factor adding to the quality of the Conservation Area in this location is a sense of consistency between the appearance of some groups of properties. Despite the presence of other roof extensions within the street scene, the proposed extension would be highly noticeable and would not be characteristic in this particular location.
 9. I understand that the rear elevation of the property has been subject to extensive alteration in the past. Bearing this in mind, the proposed changes to the fenestration would not have a particularly harmful effect on the overall appearance of the property even though it would appear different from its immediate neighbours.
 10. The proposed chimney removal would be more noticeable due to its visual exposure within the wider surroundings, including St Johns Road and the communal gardens to the west. While I am informed that the chimney on the rear elevation is not original, it is nonetheless historic and hence does add a sense of character to the property. Even though the proposed alterations would add greater symmetry to the rear elevation, they would not result in an improvement sufficient to justify removal of this chimney.
 11. Overall, the proposed alterations would therefore harm the appearance of the Conservation Area. In reaching this decision, I am mindful that paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) indicates that 'great weight' should be assigned to the protection of heritage assets. However, the harm would be less than substantial and in such circumstances the NPPF advises that this harm should be weighed against any public benefits associated with the development. Although I sympathise with the appellant's desire to improve the property, the benefits would be entirely private in nature. Hence the harm would not be outweighed in this case.
 12. I conclude that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Ladbroke Conservation Area. Among the policies quoted by the Council, Policy CL3 of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local

Plan is of particular relevance. The main aim of this policy is to preserve or enhance heritage assets. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with these aims. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C Cresswell

INSPECTOR