

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2017

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/D/17/3180388

7 Edbrooke Road, London W9 2DE

- 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 Ms Annie Olejnik against the decision of Westminster City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01423/FULL, dated 20 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a mansard roof extension and rear extension at old roof level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a rear extension to the property and the addition of a mansard roof. The Council have raised no objection to the rear extension. I am satisfied that it would be of a form that would be in keeping with the existing design of the property. The Council have produced guidance entitled *Roofs: A Guide to Alterations and Extensions on Domestic Buildings*. This provides advice on the detailed design of mansards which has been followed. The Council's concern therefore relates to the wider impact of the structure and the loss of the traditional butterfly roof behind the parapet of the building.
 4. I have had regard to the appellants' analysis of the character of the area. This highlights the loss of the central area of this terrace which is now used as a park. Reference is also made to the lack of uniformity with regard to the detailing of the remaining properties that make up this short section of original buildings. Although the buildings have clear differences, I found there to be a high level of general uniformity within the Victorian terraced properties on Edbrooke Road, Goldney Road and Marylands Road. The historic loss of original properties, both in the area of the park and those that have been replaced, do not significantly alter the overriding characteristics or unity of those that remain. The differences in detailing adds interest without detracting from the elements that do unify them. The generally unbroken parapets and the
-

butterfly roofs represent strong architectural features that are important to the historic character of the Victorian properties in the area.

5. There are some examples of mansard roofs in the vicinity. Although I do not have details of the exact design of each, the two at 34 and 38 Edbrooke Road, are visible and relatively prominent above the parapets. Although fuller views of these are possible from within the park opposite, they remain clearly evident in longer views along the opposite pavement. The proposed mansard would be at least equally visible and prominent in longer views from the opposite side of the road.
6. The mansard at 1 Edbrooke Road is less prominent in views from the west than the mansards referred to above as it benefits from screening provided by the neighbouring property, number 3, due to both of them having a higher parapet than number 5. The mansard is however evident in views from the east. The lower, less ornate parapet of 9 Edbrooke Road, which adjoins the appeal property, would allow for clearer views of the proposed structure from within the street from the west.
7. I understand that the existing mansards in Edbrooke Road do not benefit from planning permission. They also do not make a positive contribution to the street scene. Their impact is increased by their relative isolation given the predominantly unchanged roof lines and unbroken silhouettes of the parapets from street level. This proposal would similarly sit in relative isolation despite the nearby position of the development at 1 Edbrooke Road. I find that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of this terrace and the wider area.
8. With regard to the butterfly roof structures, I accept that their lack of visual prominence results in the frontages having a greater public significance. However, this does not indicate that this design detail should be considered as unimportant to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the detail of the proposed design would retain evidence of the form of the rear butterfly roof, the structure would be a dominant new feature and the character of the original roof would be lost. This would not be a positive feature of the development.
9. Policy DES 6 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007 (UDP) advises that roof level alterations may be refused where any additional floors, installations or enclosures would adversely affect either the architectural character or unity of a building or group of buildings. Despite this property being part of only a short section of terrace, the proposal would nevertheless result in harm to the architectural character of the building and this group of buildings. As the mansard roof would be evident above the parapet, it would be at odds with the general character of the terrace and it would be visually intrusive. I am not satisfied that the requirements, that are set out in the policy, to allow for such structures in certain circumstances, would be met.
10. Overall, in these particular circumstances, the addition of a single mansard roof structure within this terrace, given the particular characteristics of the area, would represent poor design in this context. As such, the proposal would not meet the more general design aspirations of UDP Policy DES 1 or Policy S28 of the Westminster City Plan 2016 as these seek the highest standards of design

and architectural quality. As the Council's policies generally accord with the design requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them considerable weight.

11. Reference has been made to a number of previously dismissed appeals. The appellant suggests that with regard to 4D Goldney Road there was greater unity within the group of properties and the structure would have been more prominent in longer views. In relation to appeals at 42 Edbrooke Road, the concern related to the retention of the unity of a complete run of twenty-one houses. The completeness of the terrace was considered to be important when considering unity. Although I acknowledge that this terrace has been disrupted by the loss of its central section and that the detailing of the properties differ in a number of respects, they nevertheless have a high level of unity and they retain defining characteristics which would be harmed by the proposal.
12. The previous appeal decisions do not indicate that an alternative conclusion should be reached in this case and to a large extent, they support a similar conclusion to the one I have reached. I am mindful that permission was granted in 1984 for mansard roofs to the rear of these properties in Goldney Road but I have to consider this proposal on its own merits, having regard to the current development plan policies.
13. I have considered all the matters put forward by the appellant and I acknowledge that the works would result in improved accommodation and a more efficient use of the property. However, the matters in favour of the proposal are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR