The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2020

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th November 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/W/20/3250821
Tennyson Mansions, Flat 7/8, Lordship Place, London SW3 5HT

- 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 Guagnini Guagnini against the decision of The Council of The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.
- The application Ref PP/19/08407, dated 17 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2020.
- The development proposed is continued use of roof space as habitable accommodation, together with removal of existing pitched front roof slope and the provision of a mansard roof.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for continued use of roof space as habitable accommodation, together with removal of existing pitched front roof slope and the provision of a mansard roof at Tennyson Mansions, Flat 7/8, Lordship Place, London SW3 5HT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PP/19/08407, dated 17 December 2019, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 646/A/1.0001 Location Plan, 646/A/1.0002 Existing Third Floor Plan, 646/A/1.0003 Existing Fourth Floor (loft space) Plan, 646/A/1.0004 Existing Roof Plan, 646/A/1.0020 Existing Sections A-A and B-B, 646/A/1.1030 Existing Front (South) Elevation, 646/A/1.1031 Existing Rear (North) Elevation, 646/A/1.1032 Existing Side (East) Elevation, 646/A/1.1033 Existing Side (West) Elevation, 646/A/1.1024 Proposed Fourth Floor Plan General Arrangement, 646/A/1.1025 Proposed Roof Floor Plan General Arrangement, 646/A/1.2021 Proposed Section AA, 646/A/1.3024 Proposed Front (South) Elevation, 646/A/1.3026 Proposed Side (East) Elevation, 646/A/1.3027 Proposed Side (West) Elevation, 646/A/1.6001 Existing Building Photographs Lordship Place, 646/A/1.6050 Photomontage with Proposed Mansard 1 of 2, 646/A/1.6051 Photomontage with Proposed Mansard 2 of 2, 646/A/1.6052 3D model Aerial View, 646/A/1.6053 3D Model Street Elevations 1 of 2, 646/A/1.6054 3D Model Street Elevations 2 of 2.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The applicant is detailed as Guagnini Guagnini on the application form but Ms F Guagnini on the appeal form. As other appeal documentation refers to Ms Guagnini I believe this name is more accurate and have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cheyne Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. Tennyson Mansions, a four-storey mansion block with accommodation within the roof space, lies within the Cheyne Conservation Area (CA) which appears to draw its significance from its riverside location and the variety and plethora of historical development. The townscape is varied, though similarities in the urban form are clear and the materials within the area appear to be part of a similar, traditional, palette. Gaps between buildings make an important contribution to the character of the CA.

5. The appeal property is located on the upper floors of Tennyson Mansions. Tennyson Mansions is a symmetrical building constructed largely of red brick with a prominent and detailed central entrance. The windows on each floor appear as pairs which line up on either side of the building. Other attractive architectural detailing results in Tennyson Mansions appearing as an attractive building which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA.

6. I am required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (The Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. In addition to the requirement under section 72 of The Act, the CA is also a designated heritage asset as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks to ensure that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

7. The proposal is to replace the pitched roof to the front of the building with a mansard roof and two dormer windows. These alterations would be in addition to a rear mansard roof with associated alterations which was granted planning permission in late 2019[1].

8. The mansard would be set back from the existing front parapet and would maintain the existing ridge height. This would ensure that the proposal would not appear unduly bulky and would respect the proportions of the existing dwelling. The two prominent chimney stacks and the front parapet would retain their prominence in views towards the roof. The dormer windows would reflect the symmetry created by the windows below and would be set down and in, thus ensuring they would not dominate the front roof profile of the building.

9. Tennyson Mansions is notably taller than a number of surrounding buildings. Whilst the proposal would alter the roof profile of the building it would not add excessive height so as to alter the relationship between the appeal building and others in the

[1] PP/19/06826

area. A number of other nearby buildings also have mansard style roofs and I consider that this roof form would be consistent with others in the area. Thus, the proposal would not appear incongruous in this setting. Furthermore, in order to make sure that the proposal would not appear visually jarring, the materials to be used would match those used on the existing building. These details could be secured by a suitably worded planning condition.

10. I note that the proposal would be visible from several public and private vantage points in the area. However, due to the height of the building and the close-knit nature of the urban grain in the area, views towards the roof are limited. A mature tree in front of the building would provide additional screening. Furthermore, the proposal would maintain the key visual break between Tennyson Mansions and No 9 Cheyne Row.

11. Whilst I note that the proposal would undoubtedly change the appearance of the roof of the building, I do not consider that this change would, in itself, cause harm. In my view the proposed development would not appear unduly prominent and would represent a sympathetic addition to the building.

12. Accordingly, I consider that the proposal would maintain the general consistency of scale, proportion and materials in such a way so as to preserve the character and appearance of the area and the significance of the heritage asset.

13. For these reasons, the proposal would be in accordance with Policies CL1 and CL2 of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan, September 2019 (LP). Amongst other things these policies require all development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality which responds to the local context. The proposal would also comply with the aims of LP Policy CL8 which specifically relates to roof alterations. Policy CL8 sets out that the Council will require roof alterations and additional storeys to be architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and group of buildings.

14. Furthermore, the proposal would conform with the Framework which sets out arrangements for the protection of heritage assets, promotes high standards of design and states that developments should be visually attractive and sympathetic to the character of the area.

Conditions

15. Alongside the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In order to ensure that the development has a satisfactory appearance, particularly given the sensitive location of the development, I have imposed a condition requiring the materials to be used to match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR