
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/W/16/3161773
102 Queensway, London W2 3RR

- 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 Pacific Properties Holdings Ltd against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref 15/08783/FULL, dated 17 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is roof extension to form 1 x 1 bedroom flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in the Queensway Conservation Area (CA). The Council's Conservation Area Audit 2008 (CAA) describes the CA as linear focused on, and including, both sides of Queensway. It is a small conservation area, but has a mixed character, with a rich variety of building types, styles and uses that contribute to its vibrant atmosphere.
 4. The appeal site is located within Central Queensway (58 – 112 even) which consists of a relatively complete mid-Victorian terrace in yellow stock brick, with Italianate detail. The CAA states that most of Queensway would originally have had a similar appearance and that this stretch of buildings is therefore a particularly important reminder of how Queensway would have once looked. A stucco roof level parapet conceals, for the most part, the roof form of the terrace which is mainly unaltered butterfly roofs, although there are mansards to the corner buildings. The CAA states that the largely unbroken roofline of this terrace makes a valuable contribution to the character of the terrace.
 5. The CAA also states that roof profiles are fundamental to the architectural character of the CA and that alterations at roof level including extensions can have a negative impact on this. In the central section of Queensway terraces predominate and these have the most consistent roofline. The CAA identifies the appeal site and the remainder of the terrace to the south as being buildings where roof extensions are unlikely to be considered acceptable. The adjacent
-

building at 104 Queensway is identified as a building that may be suitable for a roof extension and its neighbours at 106 – 110 Queensway are identified as buildings with existing roof extensions. The host building together with a number of other buildings, including the remainder of the terrace within which it is located, are identified as unlisted buildings of merit in the CAA.

6. The host building is a traditional four storey terraced property located in a prominent position on Queensway. Though it is located centrally within a wider terrace, it forms one end of the slightly recessed terrace between 92 & 102 Queensway. The buildings between Nos 92 & 102 in the main display consistent architectural detailing including a deep projecting parapet with butterfly roofs behind. The parapet at Nos 92 to 102 forms a strong feature when the buildings are viewed from street level concealing the butterfly roofs from view. The proposed mansard roof extension would result in the loss of the original butterfly roof and whilst the parapet would remain, its visual impact would be diluted. This would significantly alter the appearance of and would be harmful to the character of the host building which is identified as an unlisted building of merit.
7. In addition despite its set back and particular design, the roof extension would be clearly visible from Queensway and consequently it would erode the strong coherence and uniformity of the terrace between Nos 92 & 102. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace, the skyline of this part of Queensway and the wider CA.
8. Though I note that the proposed extension would be similar in scale and detail to the roof extension on the adjoining building at 104 Queensway which I understand was approved by the Council in May 2015 (Ref 15/00494/FULL), No 104 forms part of a different terrace slightly forward of and displaying slightly different architectural detailing to the host building and the remainder of the terrace between Nos 92 & 102, including the existence of roof extensions.
9. I have been provided with a copy of the Council's committee report for application reference 15/00494/FULL and note that the mansard roof extension at No 104 formed part of a wider scheme of alterations to Nos 104 to 110. The mansard roof extension at No 104 appears to have been accepted on the basis of it being identified as a building capable of a roof extension in the CAA and it being the last building in a run of four buildings which step forward of the main terrace to Queensway, which all otherwise have extensions to roof level. Consequently I am satisfied that the roof extension at No 104 and the proposal are not directly comparable and in any event I must determine the proposal before me on its own merits.
10. I consider that the harm to the significance of the CA that would result from the proposal would be less than substantial. As such having regard to paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), this harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Whilst I note that the proposal would provide additional residential accommodation in an accessible location this does not equate to a public benefit that would outweigh the harm identified.
11. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and on the Conservation Area. It is therefore contrary to the

development plan and in particular policies S25 and S28 of the Westminster City Plan, policies DES1, DES6 and DES9 of the City of Westminster Unitary Development Plan and to relevant guidance contained within the CAA, the Development and Demolition in Conservation Areas SPG (1996) and Roofs A Guide to Alterations and Extensions on Domestic Buildings SPG (1995). These policies and guidance require, amongst other things, development including roof extensions to be of the highest standards of design and to conserve the historic environment and heritage assets including Conservation Areas.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR