



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 March 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 JULY 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/24/3357985

31 Bassett Road, London W10 6LB

- 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 Mr R. Davies against the decision of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref is PP/24/06221.
 - The development proposed is construction of single-storey rear extension at first floor enclosing upon the roof terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector 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 host dwelling, with particular regard to its location within the Oxford Gardens Conservation Area (CA).
 - The effect of the proposal on fire safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The CA Appraisal (CAA) notes that Bassett Road development consists of three storey pairs and detached asymmetrical houses with highly idiosyncratic Gothic detailing. The area is noted for its uniformity of detail and form, and where uncharacteristic changes have been made, they are noted as having a negative effect. The CAA sets out one negative element of the area: *'Extensions have had an impact on the area, and they are harmful where they have been poorly designed and spoiled the harmony of a group of buildings.'*
5. The rear elevations of Bassett Road properties demonstrate a variety of different types of rear extensions. Some rear outriggers are square in footprint, whilst others are rectangular; however, both types reach two, three and four storeys. Lower ground floor and ground floor extensions are prevalent and often are full width. A

consistent factor is that a proportion of the first and second floor rear elevations remains undeveloped allowing part of the original building wall to the rear to be legible. This uniformity, including that as exhibited by the host building, forms a pattern which contributes positively to the character of the area.

6. The proposal is for a first-floor infill extension which would overwrite the original first floor form of the building at this location, development which is uncharacteristic of the surrounding properties on Bassett Road and would spoil the harmony of the buildings. As such the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the CA.
7. Whilst the space between buildings in the area is limited and thus provides only glimpses of the rear elevations, the fact remains that views of the rear elevations are available from multiple other properties within the CA, adjacent and to the rear of the appeal site.
8. 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 or appearance of Conservation Areas. Given the scale and location of the proposed development, the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial, and towards the lower end of the spectrum of such harm, in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework). Nevertheless, it is a matter of great importance and weight. I am required to balance this harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. The benefits of the scheme are predominately of a private nature. The public benefits of the scheme, to include employment opportunities during works, would be very limited in scope and temporary in nature. Therefore, I find that the limited weight to be given to the benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the harm identified above to which I attach great weight. Consequently, the public benefits would not outweigh the less than substantial harm, identified above, to the character and appearance of the CA.
10. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to comply with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan 2024 Policies CD1, CD2, CD4, CD10, CD12, CD13 and CD15, and the relevant paragraphs of the Framework, insofar as they seek high quality design that respects local character and preserves or enhances the historic environment.
11. The appellant has submitted an image of 11 Bassett Road, which shows substantial four storey and three storey rear additions. That development is not reflective of the wider pleasant uniformity and pattern of the rear elevations in this area. However, I have not been provided with any substantive detail of this development and as such I cannot be certain against which development plan and policies it was considered. The appellant has also highlighted development at 60 Oxford Gardens providing an appeal decision document; however, I have not been provided with any plans and as such I do not know what the cumulative impact of the extensions were. As such, and in any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.

Fire Safety

12. I acknowledge that the appellant submitted a fire safety document which has been produced by an architect. The document concludes that the current fire safety

measures are appropriate, that the addition of the rear extension at first floor would not create an inner room, and therefore the proposed development would result in no adverse effect on the existing fire strategy.

13. The submitted planning fire safety strategy provides justification for that conclusion which, amongst other things, confirms that the proposal would only be increasing the size of an existing bathroom without separation by a door, thereby ensuring the proposed en-suite does not become an inner room. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I find no conflict with Policy CD16 of the Local Plan 2024.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. Whilst I have found no conflict with policy in terms of fire safety, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the CA which is not outweighed by public benefits. As such, 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

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR