



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 April 2021 by S Witherley CIHM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/W/20/3264116

Second Floor Flat, 14 Edge Street, London W8 7PN

- 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 Thomas against the decision of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
- The application Ref PP/20/05397, dated 1 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2020.
- The development proposed is Demolition and rebuilding of existing rear mansard extension. Demolition of existing roof stair and store enclosure. Construction of new roof extension to provide new kitchen, dining and living room plus retained terrace.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for demolition of rear mansard extension, roof stair and store enclosure. Reconstruction of roof extension to provide kitchen, dining and living room plus retained terrace, at Second Floor Flat, 14 Edge Street, London, W8 7PN, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PP/20/05397, dated 1 October 2020, 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 plans: 19285 150 P1; 19285 151 P1; 19285 153 P1; 19285 154 P1; 19285 155 P1; 19285 156 P1.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of the development given on the application form is set out in the banner heading above. However, in the formal decision above I have used the description given in the Council's decision notice as that describes the development adequately and is more succinct than the description given on the application form.

Main Issue

4. The Council do not appear to have any concerns regarding the replacement balustrade or second floor replacement mansard roof. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed roof top extension on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kensington Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. No. 14 is a 3-storey property which features an existing roof top and terrace extension located behind a distinctive parapet roof. It is linked to a single storey building which in turn is linked to a similar 3 storey building, No. 16. Historically it is noted that No. 14 and No. 16 were end of terrace properties which sat either side of a former railway line which was subsequently removed and the link building developed over the former rail track. Within the wider street are two storey terrace mews along with a modern 5 storey building located at the end of the street.
6. A number of properties within the terrace including No. 14 and No. 16 have been altered at roof level, some of these additions include full width dormer extensions. Whilst the various roof top additions have altered the original roof scape of Edge Street, as a result of the consistent use of materials, symmetry in window openings and remaining parapet roofs, there remains a consistency in the character and appearance of the area which contributes positively to the value of the street and its importance to the character and appearance of this part of the CA and the CA as a whole.
7. It is located in a mixed-use area on the eastern edge of the CA. The Kensington Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2017) (the KCAC) identifies that the significance of the CA, in as far as it relates to this appeal, derives from the terraced houses of a grand scale, many of which are located formally around private garden squares. The tight grain of the terraces is interspersed with other building types, for example at the western end of Edge Street is a school and mid-way along on the southern side is a garage with residential flats above. In terms of architecture, the CA incorporates the Georgian period, late Regency and Italianate designs, and the Queen Anne style at the end of the Victorian period. There is also evidence of modern in fill development. This is apparent along Edge Street as a result of the prominent 5 storey commercial building located on the corner which overlooks Edge Street and Kensington Church Street.
8. The proposal seeks to replace the existing staircase enclosure located on the eastern part of the roof with a full width dormer. From street level the full extent of the proposal would not be evident, nor would the entire roof form of the wider terrace be fully appreciated given the angle of view from the street below and the existing built form surrounding the appeal site.
9. Similarly, when viewed from along Kensington Church Street where it meets Edge Street only partial aspects of the proposal would be seen from some distance away and at an upward oblique angle. It would appear set back from the parapet, sloping back from the street to provide a terrace area and leaving the parapet intact. Given its scale, height and width the dormer would appear as a subordinate addition upon the appeal property and would not be particularly prominent within the wider roofscape. Its proposed height does not appear to be significantly greater than the existing stairway enclosure, thereby it would not create an imbalance or appear overly dominant in relation to No. 16, particularly as it would be seen in many views against the back drop of the modern five storey corner property and also in the back drop of much taller buildings within the surrounding streets.
10. When viewed from the west end of Edge Street the proposal would not look significantly altered from the existing situation thus the contrast in scale from this viewpoint would be extremely modest.

11. From the rear the proposal would present in isolation as a blank box like structure, however, given the existing built form along with the existing varied roof scape, along with the back drop of larger buildings and limited opportunities to view the entire structure from the street, it would not appear overly dominant in this context.
12. Overall, in the context of the far more established roof alterations of the wider terrace and its varied roofscape, along with the backdrop of larger and more prominent roofscapes, the proposal would not appear dominant or incongruous from either the front or rear. From what I saw, several other properties in the street and the surrounding area have full width roof extensions including dormers, these appear without significant detriment to the character or quality of the CA. The proposed roof top extension would, therefore, preserve the character and appearance of No. 14 and would not be an uncharacteristic addition within this part of the CA or the CA a whole.
13. In conclusion, the proposal would be a sympathetic addition to the building and would not harm the character and appearance of the host property therefore the character and appearance of the CA would be preserved. This accords with Policies CL1, CL2, CL3, CL6, CL8, CL 9 and CL11 of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan (2019) (LP), which require all new development, including small-scale roof alterations, to be of a high standard of design and to respect local context and which seek to ensure the preservation and enhancement of the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, including views into and out of it.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings and to require that the development is carried out in accordance with them as this provides certainty. It is not considered necessary to attach a separate condition requesting the external materials to match the existing as details of these are annotated on the relevant drawings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall allow the appeal subject to the recommended conditions.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR