



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/D/25/3373447

70 Hornton Street, London W8 4NU

- 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 Ms Makiya against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref is PP/25/00773.
 - The development proposed is the part demolition of the existing rear extension/outrigger at lower ground level and the erection of a rear and side wrap-around extension at lower ground level, infill glazed extension at ground level between outriggers of no. 68 and 70, external alterations to the garden and replacement of existing windows to the rear of the house and the alteration of window fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kensington Conservation Area, and (ii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 68 and 72 Hornton Street, with particular regard to outlook and natural light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of 4-storey houses of similar age and appearance. It is situated within a part of the Kensington Conservation Area (CA) that predominately comprises high quality terraced housing and relatively narrow streets. The terrace of which the appeal property forms part makes a clear positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
4. The appeal property and its immediate neighbours feature 4-storey outriggers to the rear, the top levels of which appear to be additions. At lower ground floor level there is a small single storey addition to the rear of the outrigger. The neighbouring house, No.72, includes a largely glazed double-storey infill addition with a mono-pitched roof between its outrigger and the outrigger at the rear of the appeal property.

5. The appeal proposal would include the part demolition of the lower ground level addition and the erection of a replacement extension at lower ground floor level that would wrap around 2 sides of the outrigger. Above this, within the space between outriggers, an upper ground element would be added. Both elements would have flat roofs and largely glazed elevations. The proposal would also involve the lowering of the rear garden level.
6. The lower ground floor addition would be only marginally taller than the boundary walls to either side and would extend a modest distance beyond the rear elevation of the outrigger resulting in an unassuming addition that would be in keeping with the appearance of the terrace.
7. The upper ground floor element would have a flat roof, the eaves of which would be a substantial distance above the eaves of the mono-pitched glazed roof at No.72, resulting in an elongated form by comparison to the more discrete addition next door. Due to its height, form and the large expanse of vertical glazing, this element of the proposal would be an overly prominent and incongruous addition that would jar with the appearance of the terrace and result in less than substantial harm to the appearance of the CA. In these circumstances Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposal simply provides extra private space for the property occupiers there would be no public benefits arising from it.
8. Due to its massing, height and design I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the host building and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such it fails to accord with Policies CD1, CD2, CD3, CD4, CD13 and CD15 of the New Local Plan Review 2024 (LP), which require development to respect existing context, character and appearance including historic characteristics, be locally distinctive, preserve or enhance the character or appearance and significance of conservation areas, and be appropriately designed to be in character with the existing building.

Living Conditions

9. Whilst the proposed lower ground floor addition would be full-width and extend beyond the rear building line of the outriggers to the rear of the appeal property and its neighbours it would only be marginally taller than the addition it would replace and the boundary walls shared with Nos 68 and 72. Due to its diminutive height this element would have a negligible effect on levels of natural light reaching, and outlook from, the lower ground floors of the neighbouring houses.
10. For these reasons I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in unacceptable effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of 68 and 72 Hornton Street. It therefore accords with LP Policy CD9 which requires all development to ensure good living conditions, including in respect of standards of daylight and sunlight and sense of enclosure.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out under the first main issue, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole INSPECTOR