



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 14 July 2021

by J Hunter BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/21/3268808

2 Slaidburn Street, London SW10 0JP

- 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 Ms Ting I against the decision of The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/20/06264, dated 11 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey rear extension replacing a rear balcony to habitable space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the Council determined the proposal, the revised National Planning Policy Framework has been published on 20 July 2021. Both main parties have been given the opportunity to comment and my decision is made in the context of the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Sloane Stanley Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The Sloane Stanley Conservation Area (CA) is characterised by rows of well-preserved Victorian terraced housing set out in a tightly knit grid pattern. The appeal property is a three storey, flat fronted mid-terraced house with a stucco ground floor and painted brickwork above. The roof formation of the terrace consists of a parapet to the front and a hipped butterfly roof form to the rear.
5. Like the remainder of the host terrace, the appeal property has a rear closet wing which reaches to the second floor and is finished with a modest roof terrace enclosed by metal railings. This is a common arrangement on both the host terrace and to the rear of Langton Street which lies directly opposite and it is a feature that creates a sense of architectural rhythm and uniformity. Of particular relevance to this proposal is the way that the closet wings terminate well below the eaves line so as to appear subordinate to the main body of the terrace.

6. The proposal would see an additional storey of development constructed on top of the closet wing which according to the submitted drawings would terminate in line with the parapet wall.
7. Although I do accept that there are extremely limited, if any, public views into the proposed location of the extension I consider that by reason of its height the proposal would undermine the architectural harmony, rhythm and detailing of the appeal property and wider terrace thus failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. In this regard it would be contrary to the requirements of Policies CL1, CL2, CL3, CL6, CL9 and CL11 of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. In the parlance of the Framework, the harm I have identified is less than substantial. However, any harm requires clear and convincing justification. The provision of additional living accommodation serving the appeal property does not amount to public benefits that would sufficiently outweigh the harm to the heritage asset.

Conclusion

9. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR