

17

ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON & CHELSEA

REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLANNING & CONSERVATION

MEMBERS' PANEL APP NO. PP/99/02479/ MIND/49 AGENDA ITEM NO. 446

ADDRESS 128/130 Walton Street, Chelsea, SW3 2JJ

APPLICATION DATED 01/12/1999

Handwritten signatures and dates: 17/3 + [signature]

APPLICATION COMPLETE 08/12/1999

APPLICATION REVISED N/A

APPLICANT/AGENT ADDRESS: Timson Garah, Nielsen Architects, 32 New Kent Road, London, SE1 6TJ

CONSERVATION AREA Chelsea CAPS Yes

ARTICLE '4' No WARD Hans Town

LISTED BUILDING NO

HBMC DIRECTION N/A

CONSULTED 12 OBJECTIONS 0

SUPPORT 0 PETITION 0

Applicant Mr & Mrs A. Linton

PROPOSAL:

Conversion of three flats to two town houses together with the erection of rear extensions and roof alterations and addition to No. 130.

RBK&C Drawing No(s): PP/99/02479 Applicant's drawing(s) No(s). 9913/P/1, P/2, S/1, S/2

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Refuse planning permission

DELEGATED 17 MAR 2000 REFUSAL

18

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

You are advised that the Council would consider more favourably an application for the conversion to two town houses, which omitted the rear extension and roof addition.

1. **The proposed three storey rear extension by reason of its height and width would cause harm to the character and appearance of the building, the terrace, and the conservation area and would be contrary to the Council's policies as contained within the Conservation and Development Chapter of the Unitary Development Plan, in particular Policies CD41, CD52 and CD53.**

2. **The proposed roof extension in principle and by reason of its design would be harmful to the character and appearance of the building, the terrace and the Conservation Area contrary to the Council's Polices as contained within the Conservation and Development Chapter of the Unitary Development Plan, in particular Policies CD38, CD39, CD52 and CD53 .**

INFORMATIVE

You are advised that the Council would consider more favourably an application for the conversion to two town houses, which omitted the rear extension and roof addition.

1.0 SITE

- 1.1 The application relates to two properties on the western side of Walton Street. Each comprises basement and two upper floors. The properties have been laterally converted to form three self contained residential flats.
- 1.2 The property is not listed but it is situated within the Chelsea Conservation Area.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for a full width basement floor rear extension and a part width ground and first floor rear extension to each property and roof alterations including a small roof extension to no. 130.
- 2.2 Permission is also sought to carry out external alterations to the front elevation. This is in association with the reversion of the properties back to two single family dwelling houses.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 Planning permission was granted on 19th October 1965 for the conversion of the property into three self contained flats.
- 3.2 On the 19th March 1998 planning permission was granted for the erection of a rear extension at basement and ground floor level with conservatory extension at basement level.

4.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The principal consideration in this case is the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building, the terrace in which it is situated and the Chelsea Conservation Area. Consideration must also be given to any loss of amenity to adjoining residential properties.
- 4.2 The relevant policies relating to this application are as follows:

- CD25 (High standard of design);
- CD28 (Sunlight and daylight);
- CD41 (Rear extensions);
- CD38 and 39 (Additional storeys and roof level alterations);
- CD48 (Preserving and enhancing the character of Conservation Areas);
- CD52 (Preserving and enhancing the character of Conservation Areas);
- CD53 (High standard of design within Conservation Areas);

- 4.3 With regard to the proposed rear extensions, Policy CD41 is to resist proposals for rear extensions if the extension would rise above the general height of neighbouring and nearby extensions or if the extension would not be visually subordinate to the parent building.
- 4.5 There are a number of rear extensions on the terrace (Nos 114 to 144 Walton Street). These vary in age, with planning permission being granted for a two storey extensions at no. 114 (TP/98/1004), 116 (TP/84/0418), 118 (TP/94/1077), 122 (TP/85/2467), 132 and 134 (TP/94/2078), 136 (TP/85/1827) and 144 (TP/95/2442). Planning permission has also been granted for a two storey rear extension and ground floor infill conservatory to these two properties in 1998 (TP/97/0821). In comparison, this application seeks permission for a three storey rather than two storey extension and a solid infill rather than conservatory at ground floor level.
- 4.6 The general height of nearby extensions are two storey or lower. The proposed three storey extension will extend above the general height of neighbouring extensions and is contrary to Policy CD41(c).
- 4.7 The proposed extension will be 8.3 metres high on a building 9.7 metres high and the width of the extension will cover more than two thirds of the rear elevation. The result is an extension which is not considered to be visually subordinate to the parent building and in this respect, the extension is considered to be contrary to Policy CD41(d).
- 4.8 It is considered that the excessive height and bulk of the extension will cause harm to the terrace and to the character and appearance of the conservation area. A similar three storey extension at no. 144 was dismissed on appeal in 1997 (ref, 97/2352). The Inspector noted that:

"Although your clients' proposal would be some 1.3 m lower than the original parapet height.....the increased mass at first floor level, would in my opinion, result in the extension dominating the rear elevation of the building, causing unacceptable erosion of the architectural integrity of the relatively unspoilt rear elevations of the terrace...if this proposal were to be allowed it could lead to pressure for three storey extensions which would, both individually and cumulatively, cause further damage to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area".

It is considered that the proposed three storey extensions that are subject of this application would cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the building and the Conservation Area, contrary to Policies CD52 and CD53.

- 4.9 With regard to the ground floor extension, the previous permission was for a small scale conservatory in the rear basement lightwell. The scale of the proposed ground floor extension is similar. This is considered to be acceptable

in principle, and whilst a lightweight conservatory extension would be more appropriate, it is not considered that the full width solid extension at basement level would cause harm to the building or the terrace.

- 4.10 Policy CD39 normally permits roof level alterations where the character of a terrace or group of buildings has been severely compromised by a variety of extensions and where infilling between them would help to re-unite the group, and where the alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building.
- 4.11 These properties are designated as Category 1 in the Chelsea Conservation Area Proposals statement in which it is specified that absolutely no change to the roof will be permitted, except for the removal of isolated roof additions.
- 4.12 No. 128 has an existing small addition to the rear of the roof. It projects 0.6 metres above the parapet and is 2.1 metres wide. It is proposed to replicate this extension at 130. The roofline of the terrace is relatively unaltered and it is considered that any addition to the roof is unacceptable in principle. In addition, it is considered that the design of the proposed roof addition is architecturally unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the building and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposed roof extension is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies CD38, CD39, CD52 and CD53.
- 4.12 Minor works are also proposed to the front elevation in connection with the conversion of the property back into two houses. This involves the restoration of the front entrance door which is welcomed.
- 4.13 With regard to any loss of amenity as a result of the proposal, it is not considered that the proposal will cause any significant loss of light or outlook to the adjoining properties in accordance with the Council's daylighting standards as set out in the Planning Standards Chapter in the Council's Unitary Development Plan.

5.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Eleven letters were sent in Walton Street and Egerton Crescent. No responses have been received.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 Refuse planning permission.

M. J. FRENCH
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND CONSERVATION