



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by **K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/25/3361183

1A Lamont Road, Kensington and Chelsea, London SW10 0HP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs N Strang against the decision of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
- The application reference is PP/24/07061.
- The development proposed is the construction of a front, ground floor extension to create an additional 2.36sqm floor area to the front entrance, including the removal of the storage box and replacement landscaping in the front garden area.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - The character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area including the Sloane Stanley Conservation Area (SSCA); and
 - Fire Safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located within the SSCA. It is characterised by well-preserved Victorian terraced housing set out in a tightly knit grid pattern. The appeal property is a three storey, flat fronted end terraced property with a stucco and painted façade at the end of the terrace where it transitions to smaller mews style properties along Lamont Road Passage and Kings House Studios behind. The property features a projecting metal balcony at first floor. It is unique along Lamont Road in that it is modest in its height and width, with its front façade set back from the main terrace it is attached to. Although the appeal property was built during the mid-20th Century and is not listed, the Sloane Stanley Conservation Area Appraisal 2015 confirms that it contributes positively rather than neutrally to character and appearance of the area.
4. Although the upper floors of the property would remain set back from the main terrace, at ground floor the façade would be stepped forward and would appear as a continuation of the main terrace façade. Consequently, it would result in a disruption in the sense of hierarchy of properties here where the appeal property is a later addition designed as being intentional subservient. Therefore, the integrity of the original form of the group of buildings here would be compromised in direct conflict with the aims of Policy CD13 the Kensington and Chelsea New Local Plan

Review 2024 (LPR), although I recognise that the proposal would not breach the front building of the main terrace it would be forward of the deliberate set back of the existing front façade.

5. Whilst the scheme would be in the corner of the cul-de-sac end of Lamont Road and it would not affect wider views within the SSICA, it would be readily visible to passers-by, particularly those on foot. As such the impact on the character and appearance of the CA would be noticeable.
6. 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. The harm to the significance of the SSICA would be less than substantial in terms of the test set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), albeit at the lower end of the scale. Nevertheless, it is a matter of considerable importance and weight.
7. In assessing any benefits of the scheme in accordance with paragraph 208 of the Framework, the additional internal accommodation provided by an internal porch which would be a private benefit for the enjoyment of the occupiers of the property. Any maintenance of the front elevation of the property derived through the scheme offers a public benefit, in terms of safeguarding the appearance of the building within the SSICA, however, this is ascribed only limited weight and would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the SSICA that I have found.
8. For these reasons, therefore, the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the SSICA and would therefore conflict with the duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It would also fail to accord with LPR Policies CD1, CD2, CD4, CD10, CD13 and CD15 which together seek to ensure development is of the highest standard which respects its context including those within conservation areas.

Fire Safety

9. The proposal would not alter the internal layout of the appeal property. However, it would be necessary to pass through an additional door to enter and exit the property. This entrance appears to form the main escape route from the property in the event of a fire. Although the change is minor, taking the precautionary approach it would not be unreasonable to provide a short Planning Fire Safety Statement (PFSS) or Reasonable Exception Statement (RES) as required by LPR Policy CD16.
10. I note that fire safety is covered by other regulatory regimes such as Building Control, however, the supporting text to LPR Policy CD16 makes it clear that planning has a role to play ensuring fire safety is adequately considered at all stages of development.
11. Therefore, in the absence of a PFSS or RES I conclude that the proposal does not sufficiently address fire safety. This is in conflict with LPR Policy CD16 which seeks to ensure that all development demonstrates that it achieves the highest standards in this respect.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge that the proposal may help to make the current occupier of the property feel safer when entering and exiting and the lime tree at the front may have previously caused some damage to the garden area. However, the appeal proposal would not be the only means of overcoming these matters. Furthermore, I have not been presented with any substantive evidence that the proposal would resolve any building issues which may have been caused by the tree. I therefore place little weight on these matters which do not outweigh any harm I have found in the main issues above.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the SSICA and therefore harm its significance. It would also conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole and there are no material considerations, that outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR