



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/19/3241890

117 Blenheim Crescent, London W11 2EQ

- 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 Leanda Fauset against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/19/04685, dated 1 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2019.
 - The proposed development is erection of mansard roof extension.
-

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 Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Ladbroke Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a three-storey dwellinghouse with lower-ground floor level on the southern side of Blenheim Crescent. It forms the eastern end of a terrace, Nos. 117-135, the properties of which are characterised by their architectural uniformity and unbroken roofline. The appeal property adjoins a distinctly separate terrace to the east, which is set at a higher level than the terrace of Nos. 117-135 and features a more prominent parapet wall. The appeal site lies within the Ladbroke Conservation Area (LCA), whose significance is largely derived from the architectural merit and uniformity of its terraces and semi-detached properties, many of which feature established rooflines. The appeal property is identified as a positive contributor in the Ladbroke Conservation Area Appraisal (2015). The Appraisal also states that the appeal property, the rest of the properties in the terrace and many properties in the adjoining terrace have retained their historic butterfly roof forms. The appeal site abuts a Grade II listed communal garden to the south.
 5. Although the proposed mansard extension would be set back from the front parapet wall, due to its height and width it would remain plainly visible and prominent within public views, as well as within semi-public views from the communal garden to the south and within private views from the upper floor
-

- windows of other properties in the surrounding area. As the appeal property would be the only property within the terrace to feature such a roof extension, the appeal property would have a particularly incongruous appearance within the streetscene. As such, the proposal would result in the loss of a historic roof form, relate poorly to the original proportions of the appeal property and have a detrimental effect on its character and appearance, as well as the positive contribution it makes to the LCA. Furthermore, with the loss of an established unbroken roofline across the terrace, the proposal would also result in the erosion of the terrace's architectural cohesion and would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and significance of the LCA.
6. The proposed mansard extension would alter the relationship between the two adjoining terraces, where one is clearly distinguished from the other in terms of its height and design. This relationship reflects the historic pattern of development and contributes positively to the significance of the LCA. As the proposal would obfuscate this clear differentiation between the two terraces, it would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the LCA in this respect.
 7. The appellant states that there are other properties with mansard roof extensions along Blenheim Crescent. However, as the details and circumstances surrounding these other extensions are not before me to consider, I cannot determine whether they are directly comparable to or set any precedent for the proposal. Regardless, each appeal must be considered on its own merits, and I have found that the proposal would be unacceptable for reasons provided above.
 8. The appellant's heritage statement asserts that the proposal could not harm the appeal property as it is not listed. Regardless of its lack of designation as a heritage asset, the appeal property contributes positively to the character, appearance and significance of the LCA, which is a designated heritage asset. As the proposal would have a deleterious effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property, terrace and the LCA for reasons set out above, it would therefore be unacceptable.
 9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Ladbroke Conservation Area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policies CL1, CL2, and CL6 of the Local Plan (2019), which state that development must respect the existing context, character and appearance and be of the highest quality design, Policies CL3 and CL11 of the Local Plan (2019) which require that development must preserve and enhance heritage assets and protect views within conservation areas, and Policy CL8 of the Local Plan (2019) which states that roof additions must be architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and group of buildings.
 10. The harm that the proposed development would cause to the significance of the Ladbroke Conservation Area would be less than substantial. However, there would be no public benefits that would outweigh that harm.

Other Matters

11. It is understood that the proposal would provide additional living accommodation for the appellant and their family. However, this does not provide sufficient justification for the proposal given the identified harm that would result.

12. The parties agree that the proposal would not cause harm to the significance of the adjacent listed communal garden. Having viewed the evidence, and based on my observations on site, I see no reason to disagree.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR