
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2020

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17TH January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/19/3238925

21 Cremorne Road, London SW10 0NB

- 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 A Atichison against the decision of the Council of The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/19/04377, dated 24 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is conservatory to rear second floor roof terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Whether the appeal proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Lots Village Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. Characterised by a diverse range of uses, the CA features well preserved Victorian terraced housing with original architectural details. The appeal property is a Victorian mid-terraced house, the rear of which is highly visible in public views within the CA from the northern end of Stadium Street.
4. The rear elevation of the terrace has a consistent appearance with a fairly high solid to void ratio. It is constructed from a cohesive palette of materials with tiled roofs, muted buff brick facades and red brick detailing. Both the appeal property and the adjoining 19 Cremorne Road also feature decorative corbelled eaves. Along the terrace, architectural rhythm is created by the mirrored pairs of 2 storey closet wings. Whilst these are topped by lightweight railings of varying designs, they terminate well below the main eaves line and so appear subordinate to it. Though I noted some examples of windows and dormers in other materials, traditional wooden sash windows are a feature of the appeal property and wider terrace.
5. The proposed conservatory would extend across the entire roof of the closet wing, with the eaves terminating just under the main eaves of the property and the roof rising well above eaves height. Save for the white aluminium frames, it would be glazed.

6. By reason of its prominent high level position, considerable height rising above the main eaves, sizeable footprint, unsympathetic materials and extensive glazing, the proposal would undermine the architectural harmony and detailing of the appeal property and wider terrace and would appear conspicuous and incongruous in public views.
7. Whilst the Council's Conservation Officer may not have raised any concerns regarding the application, this does not materially affect my consideration of the planning merits of the appeal proposal.
8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA, contrary to the design and heritage conservation and enhancement aims of Policies CL1, CL2, CL3, CL8, CL9 and CL11 of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework).
9. In the parlance of the Framework, the harm I have identified is less than substantial. However, any harm requires clear and convincing justification. The provision of additional living accommodation serving the appeal property does not amount to public benefits which convincingly outweigh the harm to the heritage asset.

Conclusion

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

CL Humphrey

INSPECTOR