



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 March 2021

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/W/19/3243285

70 Cheniston Gardens, London W8 6TD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Paula Durante against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref: PP/19/06224, dated 6 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is alterations at roof level including replacement of existing rooflight with a roof extension in connection with the creation of a new bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations at roof level including replacement of existing rooflight with a roof extension in connection with the creation of a new bedroom at 70 Cheniston Gardens, London W8 6TD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: PP/19/06224, dated 6 September 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: PADH EX01 Location Plan Site Plan, PADH EX02 Existing Front Elevation Rear Elevation, PADH EX03 Existing Side Elevation, PADH EX04 Existing Section A-A Ground Floor Plan, PADH EX05 Existing First Floor Plan Roof Plan, PADH P01 Proposed Site Plan, PADH P02 Proposed Front Elevation Rear Elevation, PADH P03 Proposed Side Elevation, PADH P04 Proposed Section A-A Ground Floor Plan, PADH P05 Proposed First Floor Plan Roof Plan.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is located in a set-back position in the gap between larger residential and hotel buildings. It comprises a mix of profiles and materials, the

variety of which is accentuated by the blank, rendered gable end of the adjoining building. This combination of factors contributes to the building having a somewhat quirky appearance and position in the streetscene.

4. The proposal would increase the building's bulk. Its fenestration would be moderately individualistic. Also, the proposed roof extension with grey metal-clad walls would read as residential mass rather than roof level plant casing. However, it is questionable whether the existing diverse roof level architecture reads as the latter. Furthermore, the proposal would simplify the building profile viewed from the street, set against the adjoining blank gable end. As such, it would visually 'tidy up' the appearance of the building, viewed from the street.
5. Moreover, the building's comparatively low height between two substantially taller buildings and its set-back from the street would help achieve a subordinate presence. The simplified angular profile of its front elevation would better echo the profile of the fourth floor of the adjoining building, viewed from Cheniston Gardens. This is within the context of various building styles and profiles in the locality. Looking down from the neighbouring block of residences to the west the proposed extended green roof would soften the roofscape.
6. The Council considers that brick to match the lower storey would be less harmful to the townscape than proposed metal cladding. However, the above combination of assimilating factors would help the proposed extension with metal cladding to appear as an 'honest' addition that would fit in acceptably with the somewhat quirky appearance of the building and the local townscape character.
7. In conclusion, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not conflict with Policies CL1, CL2 and CL8 of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan (2019), which together seek, among other things, to ensure that development complements local character.

Conditions

8. The conditions suggested by the Council have been considered against the tests of the National Planning Policy Framework and advice provided by Planning Practice Guidance. They have been broadly found to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case. I have made some minor drafting changes in the interests of precision. Conditions regarding timeliness and adherence to the submitted plans are attached in the interests of precision. A condition covering materials is necessary to protect character and appearance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR