

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2023

by R Lawrence MRTPI, BSc (hons), PGDip (TP)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/22/3306223

14A Pembridge Crescent, Kensington and Chelsea, 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 Blain of 23 Architecture and Guy Stansfeld Architects / 318 Studio against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application ref PP/22/02423, dated 7 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is enlarging the existing front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for enlarging the existing front dormer at 14A Pembridge Crescent, Kensington and Chelsea, LONDON W11 3DU in accordance with the terms of the application, ref PP/22/02423, dated 7 April 2022, 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: GSA960 PL203 – Proposed Attic Plan, GSA960 PL204 – Proposed Roof Plan, GSA960 PL220 – Proposed front elevation, GSA960 PL222 – SE Side Elevation Proposed, GSA960 PL223 – NW Side Elevation Proposed and GSA960 PL200 – Site Plan.
 - 3) The windows hereby permitted shall be timber framed and white painted, to be thereafter permanently maintained as such.
 - 4) The cheeks of the dormer windows hereby permitted shall be clad in lead, and thereafter permanently maintained as such.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Pembridge Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is detached, has the appearance of a coach house and is located within the Pembridge CA, although it is not listed. Section 72(1) of

the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

4. The Pembridge Conservation Area is a high-quality built environment that is primarily residential and quiet in character. Its significance derives from providing a welcome break from the noise and bustle of three primary thoroughfares Notting Hill Gate, Westbourne Grove and Pembridge Road / Pembridge Villas. The varied architecture, which includes characterful streets of Georgian and Victorian date contributes to the significance, along with the large number of mature trees which soften the architecture and create an attractive streetscape. The original roof forms of properties in the CA also make a positive contribution to the character of the CA.
5. The appeal property is recognised within the Pembridge Conservation Area Appraisal 2017 as having a positive impact on the character and appearance of the CA. This is due to its individual character, which adds visual interest and variety in contrast to the larger mid-Victorian houses within the street.
6. The appeal property features a traditional pitched roof with its front roof slope including chimneys and a pediment element, together with the existing dormer. The extension to the dormer would increase its width and thereby would occupy a greater percentage of the front roof slope. Notwithstanding the increase in width, the proposal would retain the set back from the eaves together with good separation to both gable ends. These factors would ensure the dormer remains both domestic and subordinate in scale to the existing roof and would safeguard the prominence of the existing traditional pitched roof.
7. The proposed dormer extension would not replicate the balanced positioning of the more vertically emphasised doors and windows featured on the frontage at the lower floor levels, instead the appearance of the proposed extension would replicate that of the existing dormer. This would be similar to the existing situation, thereby, together with the factors referred to above, preserving the overall balance of the property that currently exists. Whilst the front roof slope is clearly visible in the street scene, given the above factors, I find that the proposal would preserve the modest coach house style of the appeal property as seen in the context of the surrounding area.
8. Having regard to the above considerations, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property, and it would also preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such, I find the proposal to be in general accordance with Local Plan Policies CL1, CL2, CL6 and CL8 which seek to ensure appropriate standards of design and Policy CL3 which seeks to preserve the character of Conservation Areas. The proposal would therefore comply with the Development Plan.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested several conditions in the event that the appeal is allowed. The standard time condition would be necessary, and a plans condition is required in the interests of certainty. Conditions would be necessary to control the materials of the dormer extension, such to ensure

the character and appearance of the Conservation Area are preserved. Whilst one of the Council's suggested conditions includes reference to the type of windows, the design of the windows is clearly shown on the submitted plans as appropriately matching those of the existing dormer that would be extended. It is therefore unnecessary for any reference to the type of windows to be included in the condition.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

R Lawrence

INSPECTOR