



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Colin Cresswell BSc (Hons) MA MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/22/3290794

14A Pembridge Crescent, London W11 3DU

- 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 Harry Blain against the decision of The Council of The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/21/05751, dated 1 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "alterations to the existing rear dormer windows by infilling the space between them".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a development described as "alterations to the existing rear dormer windows by infilling the space between them" at 14A Pembridge Crescent, London W11 3DU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PP/21/05751, dated 1 September 2021, 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: GSA960-PL200, GSA960-PL204, GSA960-PL205, GSA960-PL207, GSA960-PL208, GSA960-PL209, GSA960-PL212.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension 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.
 - 4) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Pembridge Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a relatively substantial, detached property which faces Pembridge Crescent. It is of an older-style design and, despite some modern alterations, appears to have retained many of its original features and proportions. Alongside surrounding development, the property forms part of the Pembridge Conservation Area, the significance of which is mainly derived from the architectural quality of the historic buildings it contains.
4. The rear roof slope of the appeal property contains three individual dormer window extensions. They are modestly proportioned, being roughly as tall as they are wide. Being visually separated from one another, they appear as relatively lightweight additions to the rear of the host property.
5. It is proposed to fill the gaps between the existing dormers to accommodate two additional windows. This would have the effect of merging the existing dormers into a single extension containing five windows, which would run across almost the entire width of the roof. Apart from appearing somewhat bulkier than the existing dormers windows, the new extension would maintain a long, low profile which would not be particularly representative of the architectural styles present in the surrounding area.
6. However, views of the extension would be mainly confined to the private areas at the rear of surrounding development. The rear elevations of properties in this part of Pembridge Crescent have a mixed appearance and the appeal property is of a different design to others in the street. Although extensions of the type proposed are not a common feature in this location, the development would nonetheless be compatible with the individual characteristics of the appeal property. Despite its shape and additional bulk, the extension would appear subservient to the property and would not substantially alter the proportions of the building when viewed as a whole. When seen from the rear windows and gardens of the surrounding housing, the extension would represent a comparatively small and innocuous feature amongst the wider backdrop of adjacent properties.
7. The development would not be easily seen from the Pembridge Crescent street frontage where architectural styles are somewhat more consistent. Indeed, due to the arrangement of surrounding buildings, the extension would not be easily seen from any public vantage points within the Conservation Area. This gives further weight to my findings that the proposed development would not harm the significance of the heritage asset.
8. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Pembridge Conservation Area. There would be no conflict with Policies CL1, CL3, CL6 and CL8 of the Local Plan¹. These policies aim for appropriate standards of design.

Other matters

9. Although the development would introduce additional glazing at roof level, the new windows would face away from the nearest housing in Chepstow Villas. Views from the new windows towards this housing would be at oblique angles which would not facilitate harmful levels of overlooking. Besides, there are

¹ Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea Local Plan, September 2019.

already windows in this part of the roof and the additional glazing being proposed would do little to change the existing situation.

10. As the new additions to the property would occupy the space between the existing dormer windows, the proposal would not result in development extending any closer to the housing in Chepstow Villas. Nor would the proposal result in an increase in the overall height of the roof. Any impact on light levels within Chepstow Villas would therefore be negligible and would have little impact the living conditions within those properties.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.
12. In the interests of clarity, standard conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the plans and within a time limit have been imposed. To help protect the character and appearance of the area, there is also a condition which requires further details of external materials. Taking into account the comments in the Council Officer Report, and to protect the living conditions of surrounding occupiers, there is also a condition requiring a construction method statement.

C Cresswell

INSPECTOR