



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2022 by S Wilson LLB MSc LRTPI

Decision by David Smith BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/22/3297310

48 Redcliffe Road, London SW10 9NJ

- 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 R Agostinelli against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/22/00032, dated 22 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is a 3rd floor extension to existing closet wing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the terrace group and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Boltons Conservation Area (BCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. 48 Redcliffe Road is a traditional Victorian 3 storey over basement terrace property with a mansard roof extension. To the rear is a closet wing rear projection over three storeys, set approximately one storey below the eaves.
5. The significance of the Conservation Area derives primarily from its largely Italianate style of architecture and from its coherent development between 1850 and 1876. However, the Boltons Conservation Area Appraisal (BCAA) also notes the significance of the rear elevations of Victorian terrace buildings, such as the appeal property, to include that their construction is of less decorative materials, such as stock brick, and contains features such as cambered brick lintels, forming a key feature of the Victorian terraces in the BCA. Regarding form, the BCAA notes that typically rear closet wings projections extend half way across the rear elevation, are paired with adjacent properties, and finish one storey below the eaves line. The BCAA identifies that where uniformity remains, these features contribute very positively to the BCA, and that disruption of rhythm, and extensions that are out of scale with the

main house, are elements that detract from the BCA. It is further noted that all rear views are enjoyed by surrounding neighbours and that these factors make them a strong component of the character of the BCA.

6. The property is identified within the BCAA as making a positive contribution to the historic and architectural character and appearance of the BCA. Indeed, its rear elevation has many of the attributes described in the Appraisal and so this also contributes positively to the wider qualities of the area.
7. The appeal property's paired rear closet wing has an unsympathetic extension set over four storeys. Further south east of the appeal site there are some further unsympathetic extensions to closet wings. However, this is not the general character of the area. Properties to the north west of the appeal site retain their uniformity of closet wing height, have roof terraces, as does the appeal property, and have many of the characteristics referred to in the BCA. Whilst there have been extensions to the same depth of many of the closet wings in the area, a uniformity of rear elevations of the grouping from No 48 northwards is retained to the benefit of the BCA. Furthermore, closet wings to the rear of Seymour Walk, which backs onto the rear of Redcliffe Road, remain uniform, meaning that the extensions to the south east of the appeal site are discordant exceptions to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would extend the existing closet wing upwards by one storey, and so would break the eaves line, and interrupt the rhythm of the rear projections, contrary to the character of the closet wings in the terrace grouping and the wider area. The cumulative effect of the extension, when viewed alongside its paired closet wing, would increase the scale and bulk of the pair, overpowering the rear elevation. In addition, the step in the heights between the closet pair would draw attention to and exacerbate the harmful elements of the proposal. The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan 2019 (the Local Plan) Policy CL9(b) indicates that extensions which rise above eaves height will be resisted.
9. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. Given the location of the harmful elements proposed, the harm to the significance of the BCA would be less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework). Nevertheless, it is a matter of considerable importance and weight.
10. The appellant has submitted a design that removes the roof terrace and balustrade railings that are present on the closet wing. Such features are evident at multiple other properties in the terrace, at the same height, and so reinforce the uniform character of the terrace. Whilst not of historic value, I nevertheless attach limited weight to this aspect of the proposal.
11. The appellant refers to the importance of putting heritage assets to viable uses consistent with their conservation in line with the Framework. However, the property is already a viable and substantial residential property and there is no evidence that the proposed extension is required to enable this to continue. Therefore, I give this matter little weight.
12. The proposal includes the reinstatement of aligned, traditional fenestration, including box timber sash windows with brick arches above to the rear

elevation of the closet wing. However, this is shown on the rear elevation plans to be approved and installation is already in progress. Therefore, I have afforded this positive aspect of the proposal little weight in the consideration of this appeal.

13. Therefore, the public benefits referred to do not outweigh the harm, identified above, to the character or appearance of the appeal property and the terrace group. Consequently, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the BCA.
14. Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with Policies CL1, CL2, CL3, CL6, and CL9 of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan 2019, insofar as they require development to be of high-quality design that preserves the character and appearance of the host property and preserve the Conservation Area. The proposed extension is therefore contrary to the development plan and there are no other material considerations to outweigh this finding.

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 dismissed.

S Wilson

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 the appeal is dismissed.

David Smith

INSPECTOR