



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by G Rollings BA (Hons) MAUD MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/W/20/3250906

18 Warwick Square Mews, London, SW1V 2EL

- 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 Lynne O'Donnell against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref 19/08304/FULL, dated 4 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2020.
 - The development is the installation of a security door and windows into existing opening.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a security door and windows into existing opening at 18 Warwick Square Mews, London, SW1V 2EL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/08304/FULL, dated 4 October 2019, and the plans submitted with it: Site Plan; 001 rev. A.

Procedural Matter

2. The development was in place at the time of my visit. I am satisfied that the plans submitted with the appeal accurately reflect what has been installed and have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Pimlico Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a dwelling located at the end a cul-de-sac mews. The significance of this part of the Area derives from its clear street hierarchy with generally uniform buildings along thoroughfares, and away from these, mews streets with smaller, less uniform buildings. The Council's adopted *Pimlico Conservation Area Audit 27* Supplementary Planning Guidance (2006) (the SPG) recognises the small scale of these mews streets, and the intimate scale of the buildings that they serve.
5. The development comprises glazed windows and doors infilling a porch, with a canopy above. Buildings along the mews are not generally united in their appearance, and differences are more noticeable than any shared features. There is a variety of property openings and fenestration, with minimal

- commonality or patterns in voids and solidity of frontages, and this variety also extends to the ages of frontages and the types of materials used.
6. Photographs provided by the parties show the previous state of the front of the dwelling. These indicate that its appearance was unsympathetic to the significance of the Conservation Area prior to the development being undertaken, with an absence of original features of the type identified within the SPG.
 7. There are two distinct elements to the development, with the first being the aluminium glazed enclosure of the porch. The glazed area is less obtrusive than a similar example of modern glazing directly opposite the appeal site at 16 Warwick Square Mews, which is installed on both storeys of that façade and immediately noticeable on entry to the mews, in comparison with the appeal site. The second is the lightweight curved canopy, which is also unobtrusive and is partly covered by vines over a lattice installed around the structure. Neither element is particularly noticeable from most of the Mews, and proximate visibility is limited by the flush arrangement of the glazing and effect of the vegetation.
 8. I acknowledge the Council's concerns that the development's fenestration and appearance are at odds with surrounding development. I also appreciate that the modern materials at No. 16 may not benefit from planning permission, but nonetheless it is an established part of the appearance of the street. In any case, the aforementioned variation in materials and form on other properties in the mews present a strong case for the retention of the appeal development, as this is not at odds with these differences forming part of the mews' overall character.
 9. I have had regard to the appeal examples provided by the Council. However, these are not directly comparable to the appeal development, due to the particular locational circumstances that I have set out above.
 10. I therefore conclude that the development is not harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, it preserves the character and appearance of the Area, and does not conflict with *Westminster City Plan* (2016) Policies S25 and S28 and the *City of Westminster Unitary Development Plan* (2007) (the UDP) Policies DES 1 and DES 5. Together, these policies require development to incorporate sustainable, locally distinctive design and the conservation of heritage assets, amongst other considerations. I have also had regard to UDP paragraphs 10.108 to 10.128, including Policy DES 9, which was not specifically listed by the Council in its reason for refusal but is included within this text.

Conclusion and Conditions

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
12. The Council has provided a list of conditions to be applied to the permission. However, these apply to construction methods and the choice of materials and are not relevant to existing development. Given that the development is in place and the relevant plan details are included within the decision at paragraph 1, no conditions are required.

G Rollings INSPECTOR