



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/23/3325422

49 Campden Hill Road, Kensington and Chelsea, London W8 7DY

- 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 C Crankson against the decision of The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Council.
 - The application Ref PP/23/00656, dated 26 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the alteration to facade.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the alteration to facade at 49 Campden Hill Road, Kensington and Chelsea, London W8 7DY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref PP/23/00656, dated 26 January 2023, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 4830 A4-210 P1, 4830 A4-130 P1, 4830 A4-120 P1, 4830 A4-110 P1, 4830 A4-100 P1, 4830 A4-040 P1, 4830 A4-030 P1, 4830 A4-020 P1, 4830 A4-010 P1, 4830 A3-210 P1, 4830 A3-130 P1, 4830 A3-120 P1, 4830 A3-110 P1, 4830 A3-100 P1, 4830 A3-040 P1, 4830 A3-030 P1, 4830 A3-020 P1, 4830 A3-010 P1 and 4830 A1-020 P1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) External windows and doors hereby permitted shall be timber framed and painted, with the windows being double hung, white painted, sliding sashes, and so maintained.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area, with reference to streetscene and the Kensington Conservation Area (the CA)

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a substantial end of terrace four storey house, forming part of a street frontage of similarly scaled properties, set back from the road with

- heavy boundary walls to their front. Originally built as a brick faced building, following wartime bomb damage, it was subsequently the subject of extensive alterations in 2011/12, including rendered architectural detailing of the façade.
4. This part of Kensington and Chelsea has been recognised as an important heritage asset through the designation of the CA by the Council. The Kensington Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2017) (the CA Appraisal) clarifies its significance as an area with a highly urban form, comprising solidly developed streets made up of largely 19th Century buildings, many of architectural significance. The CA Appraisal also notes the appeal dwelling as making a positive contribution to the CA.
 5. In line with the duty imposed on me by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have given considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
 6. The Council is of the view that the appeal dwelling, as existing, more properly references the terrace of which it forms part, rather than its semi-detached neighbours. The Council have referenced the inspector's decision for a recent allowed appeal¹ for a new roof to the appeal property, which they state supports this position. However, I find that this previous appeal decision, which concludes that a roof reflecting the form of the roofs of its semi-detached neighbours would be appropriate, makes a clear assessment that the appeal dwelling more closely aligns with the character and appearance of these neighbouring properties rather than the houses in the rest of the terrace. I agree with the inspector's assessment in this regard.
 7. Although an end of terrace property, the appeal dwelling is significantly wider than the other houses in the terrace and is set back from the terrace's building line, aligning more closely with the building line of the semi-detached properties to its flank side. Despite being closer in size and layout to its semi-detached neighbours, rather than the houses in the terrace of which it forms part, I find that, due to its proportions, the appeal dwelling does not appear as being particularly architecturally congruent with either.
 8. Rather, the appeal property appears to be an outlier, with smaller windows than usual in the local area and stripped back architectural detailing. Although this detailing does generally reference local historic architectural detailing, it does not fully reflect the quality and compositional completeness seen on other facades on this side of the street or on buildings of similar scale and architectural expression elsewhere in the CA.
 9. The proposal is to rework the façade of the appeal property, referencing architectural detailing from local buildings of similar scale, but with a more generous approach to detailing than seen on the existing facade. This approach would reflect more of the character and appearance of its semi-detached neighbours and other substantial houses in the local area. This includes new window openings to the top floor, replacement pediments, stucco architrave, quoins, rusticated channels, front portico and reconstruction of the front steps.
 10. The proposal, by drawing on immediate and local design exemplars would result in a more architecturally coherent reworking of the façade than previously

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/22/3302437

achieved. This would more clearly reflect the scale and context of the appeal dwelling as an outlier between its terraced and semi-detached neighbours. This would allow the symmetry of the appeal dwelling to be more clearly expressed, mirroring the approach taken for the design of other larger houses in the local area. As such, I find that the proposed façade alterations would better compliment the scale and individual characteristics of the appeal dwelling, including its window openings. I find that this would be the case, with or without the implementation of the recently consented new roof.

11. Within the context of the local streetscene, the proposal would result in the appeal dwelling contributing more fully, by better reflecting local character, rather than a stripped back version of it, as existing. The application of more thoroughgoing contextual references used for the design of the architectural detailing of the proposed façade alterations, would also result in the proposal being complimentary to the established character and appearance of the CA, which the proposal would preserve.
12. For these reasons, I do not find that the proposed façade alterations would result in the appeal dwelling appearing as overly grandiose, harmful to the local streetscene or to the significance of the CA. As such, the proposal would accord with Policies CL1, CL2, CL3, CL6, CL9 and CL11 of The Royal Borough Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan (2019), which seek to ensure development is sympathetic to the age and character of the host building and groups of buildings and reinforces their original integrity, does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building, respects the existing context, is of high architectural and urban design quality and preserves or enhances the appearance and character of conservation areas. For these reasons, the proposal would also be in accordance with Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

Conditions.

13. I have had regard to the council's suggested conditions, should the appeal be allowed. To ensure the design quality, and that the character and appearance of the CA is preserved or enhanced, I have, along with the standard conditions on implementation and adherence to approved plans, attached conditions requiring materials used to match those used in the existing building and that windows and doors be timber framed and painted, with the windows being double hung, white painted and sliding sashes.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR