



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2021

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/W/21/3279674

22 Bonchurch Road, London W10 5SD

- 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 Tom Faulkner against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/21/02903, dated 5 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a slate clad mansard roof extension to the rear of the roof with terrace at front of roof and construction of closet wing extension at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a slate clad mansard roof extension to rear of the roof with terrace at front of roof and construction of closet wing extension at first floor level, at 22 Bonchurch Road, London W10 5SD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PP/21/02903, dated 5 May 2021, 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:
 - Location Plan scale 1:1250
 - 2f plans – as existing/proposed (BON A12 rev A)
 - Roof plans – as existing/proposed (BON A13 rev A)
 - Section – as proposed (BON A15 rev A)
 - Front elevation – as existing/proposed (BON A20 rev A)
 - Rear elevation – as existing/proposed (BON A21 rev A)
 - Street section – as proposed (BON A25 rev A)
 - 3) The railings to the roof terrace shall be painted black, and so maintained thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The Council do not raise concern with the proposed closet wing extension at first floor level. The main issue is therefore whether the proposed mansard roof extension with terrace to the front would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Oxford Gardens Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located within a four-storey terraced building, constructed in stucco and brick, with a butterfly roof behind a parapet. It is located within the CA, which covers an extensive area and whose significance, in as far as it relates to this appeal, derives from the long rows of unbroken Victorian terraces of similar architectural style, resulting in a predominantly close-knit and largely unified appearance. The appeal site reflects the broad characteristics of the CA and makes a positive contribution to it.
4. The proposed development would consist of a mansard roof extension which would cover only the rear part of the host roof, with a terrace to the front. Owing to the siting of the terrace behind the high parapet of the host property and the considerable set-back of the proposed mansard extension, along with the angle of view from the street below, there would be extremely limited views of both elements of the proposal from the public realm. Therefore, whilst front roof terraces may not be a characteristic feature in the street scene, the host building would however largely appear as it does currently, with its traditional roof form and characteristics remaining prominent.
5. Nevertheless, should any views be achieved from public vantage points, the change to the building would be small and inconspicuous. The mansard extension would respect the pitch and ridge height of the adjoining mansard and the overall development would be finished in traditional materials that match and relate well to the host building. It would therefore appear subordinate to and reflect the character of the appeal property and would not be an intrusive addition that detracts from the group of adjoining properties.
6. As acknowledged, there is an existing mansard roof extension immediately adjoining the appeal property at No 20, with other examples at Nos 18 and 8. Approval was also recently granted for a similar extension at No 16 and it appears that Nos 12 and 14 have extant permissions for mansard extensions. It is therefore evident that the roof line of the terrace is evolving, and the Council has acknowledged that there is a pattern emerging for full width mansard extensions.
7. By virtue of its half roof design, the Council are concerned that the proposal would not assist in reuniting the aforementioned group of altered properties, as required by Policy CL8 of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan (September 2019) (the LP). However, the building up of the brickwork to the rear of the existing butterfly roof and the introduction of additional massing would reflect the rear of the adjoining group of altered properties. Furthermore, as there would be no readily discernible change to the host property from the public realm given the set-back position of the mansard extension, and as the proposed development would not be intrusive to the host building or wider group, I am therefore satisfied that it would reflect the general requirement of LP Policy CL8 that roof alterations should be architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and group of buildings.
8. Accordingly, the proposed development would be a sympathetic addition to the building and would preserve the character or appearance of the CA. It would accord with Policies CL1, CL2, CL3, CL8 and CL11 of the LP which collectively seek to ensure that developments are of a high quality that respects and conserves the character of buildings and their context.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit and plans condition, I agree that a condition requiring the railings of the roof terrace to be painted black is necessary to ensure they are appropriate to the character and appearance of the CA. However, it is not necessary to attach a condition requiring the external materials of the proposal to match the existing building as these are annotated on the approved drawings.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate otherwise. Therefore, subject to the specified conditions, the appeal should be allowed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR