
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 20 January 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/W/19/3240928

24 Blomfield Road, London W9 1AD

- 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 Arabella Duffield against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02763/FULL, dated 11 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is the addition of external awnings to the existing windows to the south and west elevations and the glazed corner extension to the south-west corner.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/Y/19/3237876

24 Blomfield Road, London W9 1AD

- 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 Ms Arabella Duffield against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02764/LBC, dated 11 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2019.
 - The works proposed are the addition of external awnings to the existing windows to the south and west elevations and the glazed corner extension to the south-west corner.
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in these appeals is the effects of the proposal on the significance of the listed building and conservation area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this detached house which is located within the Maida Vale Conservation Area. The house is an attractive, mid-19th Century building built with Italianate styling with brick elevations and gabled bay projections. Stucco features decorate the elevations with window architraves, door surrounds and brackets under the eaves. The building is grade II listed.
4. The proposal seeks to install awnings on the south and west elevations on a total of 7 windows and also on the glazed corner extension. The original windows are typically proportioned sashes. The windows in question have the

remnants of a fascia panel at their head which appear to have been reduced and modified. The evidence strongly suggests that these once retained awnings and metal brackets survive in places. It is indicated that these fascia panels would have been larger in their original form. There is no evidence submitted which gives certainty about whether the fascia panels (and so the previous awnings) would have been original or not; the appellant refers to them as being 'original' and the Council refers to them having been installed at some time in the past. Therefore, I cannot conclude with any certainty that there were original features of the house.

5. The proposal would add larger and more decorative fascia panels which would extend further down in front of the windows, with curved elements at each side. It would also add the awnings, which when extended would be an obvious new feature. The glazed corner extension is an attractive feature of the existing house, although it is not original to it. The awnings proposed would span the entirety of the width of both elevations and, from what details have been submitted, would be retained within wall mounted boxes above the windows.
6. The appellant and the Council differ starkly in their respective views of the proposal. The appellant considers that it would reinstate an attractive (original) feature of the property and the Council consider that it would considerably clutter the attractive and simple elevations, obscuring the form and proportions of the original windows.
7. Whilst it seems clear that such features have been present at some time at this property, the exact form of the fascia panels and awnings is not certain; nor is the stage at which they were present in the history of the property. Although there are other examples locally of more extensive fascia panels, there are many properties within the area that have none. In my consideration, the proposed size of the panels would dilute and obscure the definition of the windows on these principal elevations to a far greater degree than the existing panels and I consider that this would be harmful to the appearance of the building. In addition, when the awnings would be in use, they would add stark and visually disruptive elements to the building, which, apart from one small isolated example, is unprecedented in the area on residential properties.
8. In relation to the corner extension, the visual effects of the awnings would be considerably greater due to their extent. In addition, I consider that the proposed boxes to house the awnings would be an unfortunate addition which would disrupt the clean lines of this part of the building. I consider that this part of the proposal would also harm the appearance of the listed building. As a whole, the proposal would reduce the positive contribution that the building makes to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Therefore, it would fail to preserve or enhance that character and appearance.
9. The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that, when assessing proposals that may affect heritage assets varying levels of harm should be weighed against other factors. I consider that the level of harm arising from the proposal would be 'less than substantial', as referred to in the Framework. This should be balanced against any public benefits arising from the proposal. The appellant indicates that the proposal would be of benefit by reducing solar gain within the property. Whilst I have no reason to doubt this, I consider that the harmful effects on the building and area would not be outweighed. In

addition, I consider that there are no other public benefits which would arise from the proposal.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons set out, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the significance of the listed building and conservation area, contrary to Policies S25 and S28 of Westminster's City Plan and Policies DES 1, DES 5, DES 9 and DES 10 of the Unitary Development Plan. There are no other material considerations which outweigh this conflict. As a consequence, the appeals are dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR