

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

**by R Barrett BSc (Hons) MSc Dip UD Dip Hist Cons MRTPI IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 29<sup>th</sup> December 2016**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/W/16/3156068 (Appeal A)**

#### **11 Graham Terrace, London SW1W 8JE**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr P Nash against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
  - The application Ref 16/02045/FULL, dated 7 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2016.
  - The development proposed is described as 'alterations and additions as approved under reference 13/05064/FULL and 13/05065/LBC to include 2 storey rear extension'.
- 

### **Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/Y/16/3156072 (Appeal B)**

#### **11 Graham Terrace, London SW1W 8JE**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
  - The appeal is made by Mr P Nash against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
  - The application Ref 16/02046/LBC, dated 7 March 2016 was refused by notice dated 7 June 2016.
  - The works proposed are described as 'alterations and additions as approved under reference 13/05064/FULL and 13/05065/LBC to include 2 storey rear extension'.
- 

### **Decisions**

1. Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

### **Procedural Matters**

2. Appeal A and Appeal B relate to the same site. Whilst I have considered each proposal on its own merits, given that they are similar proposals, and in the interests of brevity, I have dealt with them in one document.
3. At the time of my site visit building works were underway at the appeal site. However, I am determining this appeal on the basis of the appeal plans before me.

### **Main Issues**

4. 11 Graham Terrace is a grade II listed building, which forms part of terrace of buildings which are all listed<sup>1</sup>. It is also located within the Belgravia Conservation Area (BCA). Having regard to the statutory requirements of sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the main issues in this case are:

---

<sup>1</sup> 5-17 Graham Terrace

---

- Whether the proposed works and development would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the grade II listed building, 11 Graham Terrace; and
- Whether they would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the BCA.

## **Reasons**

5. The appeal application is intended to amend an approved scheme for partial demolition of the existing closet wing and lean-to and construction of a rear extension and additional storey beneath the garden.<sup>2</sup> Works are underway on site and I am advised that they include those approved schemes. This appeal would include amendment to those schemes, including a small increase in the height of the rear kitchen extension, minor internal alterations and an extension which would increase the height of the existing closet wing at the rear of the property.
6. The extension to the closet wing at the rear is the matter in dispute between the two main parties. As those works would either not be visible above ground, or would blend in with the host dwelling and would not cause material harm to the living conditions of neighbours, I have no reason to take an alternative view to the Council on their acceptability.
7. The appeal site includes a three storey terraced property. It has a brick and white painted stucco front facade, with Classical detailing and a plainer rear elevation, which is a characteristic of these buildings. Even though not referred to in the listing description, which is for identification purposes, the significance of the listed building includes its plain rear elevation with closet wing, despite some alterations over time and its relationship to other properties in the terrace. Whilst the closet wing is a later addition, its secondary relationship to the listed house, in terms of its height and form and as an example of a traditional means of extending, contributes to the significance of the listed building.
8. The BCA is generally residential, comprised of terraces of similar eighteenth and early nineteenth century properties, set out in a formal grid pattern of streets and squares. Classical detailing, stucco front facades, raised stepped entrances, and their plainer rear elevations, some with closet wings added, all contribute to the character and appearance of the BCA. As the appeal building has these features, as a whole it contributes to the character and appearance of the BCA that I have identified. This is the case even though the rear elevation of property is not visible in street views. The appeal building also contributes to the cohesiveness of the terrace as a whole.
9. Even though its footprint, materials and appearance would match the existing closet wing, the proposed rear addition would extend the closet wing to the full height of the listed building. As the listed building is modest in scale, the proposed addition would be large in relation to it. It would significantly alter the proportions of the small closet wing, such that it would fail to read as secondary to the rear elevation. By extending its height, its three storey form would be prominent and would dominate the rear. It would diminish views of the existing butterfly roof and distort the traditional historic and secondary

---

<sup>2</sup> Ref 13/05064/FULL and 13/05065/LBC

relationship of the closet wing to the rear elevation. For these reasons it would be unacceptable. That the listed building has been significantly extended at the rear already, adds to my concern.

10. Whilst I note other rear additions, including full height closet wings in this terrace, most are lower than the main house and read as secondary to the main building. I have taken note of additions at No 5 and No 7 brought to my attention. However, these were built some time ago and do not provide the justification for this appeal proposal.
11. As full height closet wings are not the norm in this terrace, the proposed addition would materially diminish the cohesiveness of the terrace. Whilst it would not be visible from the street, it would be visible within the BCA, particularly from the private gardens of properties at its rear. For this reason, it would diminish the character and appearance of the BCA.
12. I note the proposed rooflight would be large in relation to the space in which it would sit. However, due to its discrete siting on the inner roof slope, as long as it would not protrude above the roof slope it would be acceptable. I consider that this matter could be dealt with by a suitably worded planning condition.
13. In accordance with paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I accord great weight to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. I consider that the harm to the significance of the listed building and the BCA identified would be less than substantial, a matter to which I attach considerable importance and weight. In this case, no public benefits, as identified in paragraph 134 of the Framework, are before me, which would outweigh that harm. In this regard, I have taken account of the limited contribution that the appeal proposal would have in extending the life of the listed house.
14. I conclude that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the grade II listed building, 11 Graham Terrace. It would also fail to preserve the character and appearance of the BCA. For these reasons it would generally be contrary to Policies S25 and S28 of Westminster's City Plan: Strategic Policies (2013) and Policy DES 1, DES 5 and DES 10 of the City of Westminster Unitary Development Plan (2007). Those policies, together, aim to recognise and conserve Westminster's heritage assets, including its listed buildings and conservation areas and to ensure that development incorporates exemplary standards of sustainable and inclusive urban design and architecture.

## **Conclusions**

15. For the above reasons, and taking all other matters raised into consideration, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

*R Barrett*

INSPECTOR