
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2020

by D.R McCreery MA BA (Hons) MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/20/3244839

11 Strangways Terrace, London W14 8NE

- 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 Talib Al Qasimi against the decision of The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/19/07053, dated 16 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is third floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal site is located within the Holland Park Conservation Area. In deciding this appeal I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area¹.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

4. The character of the area is informed by its residential nature, with post World War II tower blocks and terraced houses (such as the appeal site) around Strangeways Terrace sitting within the environs of older buildings that are identified in the Holland Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (Character Appraisal) as being a mix of Victorian terraces and detached or individually designed buildings.
5. The site is at the end of a short terrace and is in a prominent corner position. Although it's principal elevation addresses Strangeways Terrace, the rear of the property faces towards Addison Road. This gives the rear upper floor of the site, along with others in the terrace, a high degree of visibility in the street scene along this part of Addison Road. The rear upper floors are also visible from the private spaces such as the upper floor windows of surrounding properties.

¹ S72(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

6. There is a level of variety to the presence of built forms at third floor roof level to the front of the terrace in which the appeal site sits. However, the rear sections that face Addison Road remain predominantly open. As such, I judge that the rear section of the terrace roofline is unimpaired by extensions. The proposed development therefore falls within the circumstances in Policy CL8b of the Local Plan where roof level alterations will be resisted as a matter of principle.
7. I agree with the general assessment in the Character Appraisal that the site falls within a class of buildings that make a neutral contribution to the Conservation Area, notable because of its ability to blend into the street scene. Due to its form and scale the proposed development would increase the prominence of the site in the local street scene and therefore its ability to blend in effectively. The proposal would have the effect of unbalancing and detracting from the appearance of the short terrace in which it sits and the character and appearance of the conservation area. The setback of the extension behind the rear parapet wall would not go far enough to lessen the impact and visibility of the proposal.
8. In light of the matters discussed above, I see no reason to depart from the presumption against the proposed development in Policy CL8b. I judge the harm identified to the conservation area to be less than substantial. While the proposal could be argued to optimise the use of the property by creating additional floorspace to the benefit of the wider housing stock, this is not a benefit that weighs in favour such as to overcome the harm identified.
9. For the reasons set out, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Holland Park Conservation Area. Consequently, I find conflict with policies in the Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan, in particular Policies CL1, CL2, CL3, CL6, CL8 and CL11 which collectively seeks to ensure that development achieves a good standard of design and conserves the historic environment, and includes a presumption against roof alterations where the existing roof line is unimpaired.

Conclusion

10. The appeal is dismissed.

D.R. McCreery

INSPECTOR