



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

by **R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCI Arb MCIL**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 September 2025

Appeal Reference: APP/K5600/D/25/3366175

31 Holland Villas Road, London W14 8DH

- 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 Band Assets Limited against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application reference is PP/24/08528.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as follows: *"Infill extension works to the rear of the property at ground and first floor level; and maintenance and repair works to the roof coverings, fascia / barge boards, brickwork and handrails / railings"*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for "proposed brick infill extension at rear ground and first floor levels with painted timber framed sash windows to match existing and additional side door at ground floor level; replacement of rear door; replacement and relocation of metal staircase; maintenance and repair works to roof coverings, fascia / barge boards, brickwork and handrails / railings", at 31 Holland Villas Road, London W14 8DH, in accordance with the terms of the application (reference PP/24/08528), subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule of Conditions.

Preliminary point

2. Notwithstanding the description of the development that was given in the application form, the development can more clearly be expressed as set out in the Council's decision notice and in the appeal form, as follows: "proposed brick infill extension at rear ground and first floor levels with painted timber framed sash windows to match existing and additional side door at ground floor level; replacement of rear door; replacement and relocation of metal staircase; maintenance and repair works to roof coverings, fascia / barge boards, brickwork and handrails / railings". That is the description that I have adopted.

Main issue

3. The main issue to be determined in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings in the Holland Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a central part of London, in Holland Park. It is an attractive and accessible part of London, well established as a pleasant residential

location. Holland Villas Road is lined with substantial Victorian mansions, on large plots in a leafy setting, with trees set in the highway as well as in private gardens. The area was developed during the middle part of the nineteenth century and is designated as the Holland Park Conservation Area. Number 31 is not a “listed” building, however, and the appeal proposals would not have an impact on any nearby “listed” building.

5. Number 31 Holland Villas Road is an imposing Victorian residence, set back from the highway behind a front garden area that includes a large tree and front hedge and which also provides access for vehicles. The front boundary is defined by a secure front fence and gates. The main part of the house has two principal floors raised above a lower ground floor that is set below the main ground level. Additional bedroom accommodation is provided within the roof structure, at second floor level, and there are subsidiary wings either side of the main part of the building, at ground floor and lower ground floor levels.
6. It is now proposed to construct brick infill extensions at the rear of the house, at ground and first floor levels. In addition, a range of refurbishment and improvement works is proposed, in conjunction with the extension proposal.
7. Provisions in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 impose obligations on those considering whether to grant planning permission for development that would affect a conservation area. In such cases, decision makers are required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas affected by development proposals.
8. Those formal requirements are reinforced by the ‘National Planning Policy Framework’, especially at Section 16, which emphasises the importance of conserving or enhancing the historic environment, though it also points out the desirability of putting a heritage asset to its “optimum viable use” as does the ‘Planning Practice Guidance’.
9. Policies in the Development Plan also reinforce the underlying principles that are established in the primary legislation. Notably, Section 6 of the Council’s the ‘New Local Plan Review’ (dated July 2024) is concerned with “Conservation and Design”. Policies CD1 and CD 2 focus on design considerations generally, while Policy CD4 relates to conservation areas in particular. Policies CD10 and CD13 are of more general application but they are relevant to the current appeal, since they are concerned with extensions and modifications to existing buildings. Among other things, they provide that extensions should be subordinate to their host buildings and should not “harm the existing character and appearance of the building and its context”.
10. Many of the separate elements that are included in the description of the proposed development are minor works that are not contentious (even if planning permission may be required). These non-contentious items include the additional side door at ground floor level, the replacement of a rear door, the replacement and relocation of a metal staircase and maintenance and repair works to roof coverings, to fascias or barge boards and to brickwork and handrails or railings.
11. The more significant elements of the proposed development are the two proposed “infill” extensions to the rear of the property at ground and first floor level. The rear elevation of the building is asymmetrical at present and, like some of the

neighbouring buildings, appears to have been altered over the years. The proposed “infill” extensions would “square off” the main part of the house, at the rear, creating extra floor space on the ground floor and first floor levels.

12. The proposed extensions would be finished with flat roofs at a lower level than the main eaves. Complete symmetry would not be achieved, due to the configuration of the rear part of the existing building, but the design would be in harmony with the host building, making use of the established architectural language and employing matching materials. Intrinsically, the proposals would not be harmful to the architecture of the existing house and would respect the host building and its context.
13. The extensions would not be visible from public viewpoints in Holland Villas Road and no general view in the Conservation Area would be affected. Views from private properties to the rear would be limited, restricted to some extent by trees on the appeal site.
14. The existing house is obviously large and impressive and although the additional space would be useful (adding in a small way to the existing housing stock), the benefits of the proposed extensions would be very limited. I have concluded, however, that the project would not harm, but would preserve, the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings in the Holland Park Conservation Area. Hence, I have concluded that the project would not be in conflict with the ‘National Planning Policy Framework’ or the Development Plan, in principle, and that it is acceptable in planning terms.
15. In short, I am persuaded that the scheme before me can properly be permitted and, although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations, I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decision.
16. I have, however, also considered the need for conditions and, in imposing conditions, I have taken account of those suggested by the Council in the usual way (without prejudice to their main arguments in the appeal), as well as the appellants’ comments on the suggested conditions.
17. I have concluded that conditions are necessary to define the planning permission and to ensure that quality is maintained, by reference to the application drawings and by requiring the materials to be used in the construction of the new works to match those used in the existing building.
18. I accept that other conditions are necessary to regulate certain aspects of the proposed development. A Site Construction Management Plan is needed to ensure that disruption to nearby residents is minimised. It is necessary for the tree protection measures and precautions that were set out in the submitted Arboricultural Appraisal and Impact Assessment to be implemented in full. I note that the appellant has agreed to these suggested conditions, in e-mail correspondence. The conditions do not need to repeat advice that is available in the appeal submissions, however.
19. By contrast, it is not necessary for a formal Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Systems Strategy to be approved by the local planning authority, because the proposed development would have only a very minimal effect (if any) on water run-off, and would not have a material effect on flood risk in this particular instance.

20. Similarly, I am not persuaded that an additional condition is necessary to specify the details of proposed sash windows, bearing in mind that the appeal building is not a “listed” building and that overarching conditions are imposed to ensure that the approved drawings are to be adhered to and that matching materials are to be used.

Roger C. Shrimplin

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved proposal drawings:
 - drawing number 100 Revision P1 (Existing Lower Ground Floor Plan);
 - drawing number 101 Revision P1 (Existing Ground Floor Plan);
 - drawing number 102 Revision P1 (Existing First Floor Plan);
 - drawing number 103 Revision P1 (Existing Second Floor Plan);
 - drawing number 104 Revision P1 (Existing Roof Plan);
 - drawing number 105 Revision P1 (Proposed Site Plan);
 - drawing number 107 Revision P1 (Existing Site Location Plan);
 - drawing number 120 Revision P1 (Existing Front Elevation);
 - drawing number 121 Revision P1 (Existing Rear Elevation);
 - drawing number 122 Revision P1 (Existing North Elevation);
 - drawing number 123 Revision P1 (Existing South Elevation);
 - drawing number 130 Revision P1 (Existing Section A-A);
 - drawing number 300 Revision P1 (Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan);
 - drawing number 301 Revision P1 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan);
 - drawing number 302 Revision P1 (Proposed First Floor Plan);
 - drawing number 303 Revision P1 (Proposed Second Floor Plan);
 - drawing number 304 Revision P1 (Proposed Roof Plan);
 - drawing number 305 Revision P1 (Proposed Site Plan);
 - drawing number 320 Revision P1 (Proposed Front Elevation);
 - drawing number 321 Revision P1 (Proposed Rear Elevation);
 - drawing number 322 Revision P1 (Proposed North Elevation);
 - drawing number 323 Revision P1 (Proposed South Elevation);
 - drawing number 330 Revision P1 (Proposed Section A-A);
- 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) No development shall commence until:
 - A) An Appendix A Checklist and a Site Construction Management Plan (SCMP) for the development have both been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority, and
 - B) Copies of the approved Checklist and Plan, and their written approval, have been submitted to the local planning authority to be placed on the property record.The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Appendix A Checklist and SCMP as approved, or in accordance with a subsequent Checklist or SCMP as may be approved under this condition.
- 5) The tree protection measures and precautions that are set out in the submitted Arboricultural Appraisal and Impact Assessment dated 2 December 2024 shall be implemented in full.