



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

Decision by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/D/21/3289424

1 Hall Gate, London NW8 9PG

- 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 Mrs Julie Slater against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref 21/05391/FULL, dated 5 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is Erection of single storey extension to the side of main entrance, erection of single storey extension at rear projecting approx 0.5m from original house, raising of parapet in dormer style rooftop extension and installation of new windows to match existing style of house.
-

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 local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling within a modern courtyard development. The terrace is similar in its design characteristics with parapet wall and dormer windows to the front and rear elevations. It was originally designed as a modern Georgian style interpretation. The dwelling has been extended by virtue of a single storey side extension. The rear elevation follows the pattern of other houses along the terrace and despite alterations, reads as was originally designed.
4. There are a number of dimensions proposed as part of the scheme although the Council raise no objections to the proposed front extension. I have no reason to disagree with their findings on this matter.
5. With regards to the rear single storey extension, it would span the full width of the dwelling as well as the existing side extension. The projection of such onto the patio area may be limited. However, the width that would be created with the use of extensive glazing and its massing broken up by one structural pillar, would substantially alter the proportions of the main dwelling. Consequently, the wide expanse of proposed extension would not complement the architectural composition of the host dwelling. It would thus not appear as a subordinate extension to it.

6. There may be examples of other low level rear extensions along the terrace that incorporate significant glazing. However, these are smaller in scale and massing to the proposal before me and do not compare.
7. The examples of extensions to other dwellings located beyond the appeal site are to different dwellings in different locations. The glazing used in those examples may be appropriate to that particular circumstance. Nevertheless, they do not compare to the appeal proposal before me and I apply limited weight to them.
8. The appellant refers to a fall-back position to build a rear extension. However, there are no details of this before me to consider, or that it is indeed a real possibility for the appellant to pursue. Therefore, I also apply limited weight to the possibility of this fall-back position.
9. Turning to the proposed increase height to the parapet wall, this would subsume the existing rear dormer.
10. To significantly alter the original characteristics of the host dwelling by increasing the height of the parapet, would distort the character of the host dwelling. Even though there may be evidence of roof alterations along the terrace since the original build, these are modest, subservient additions. They do not compare to this proposal before me. In addition, creating a bookend style dwelling would not be characteristic of the terrace of houses.
11. The appellant refers to the fall-back position of a certificate of lawfulness that has been granted recently for a rear dormer window that can be implemented. This is a real prospect for the appellant to pursue. However, the proposal before me cannot be reasonably compared to the fall-back position. The fall-back position would appear more appropriate in design terms than the proposal before me.
12. I appreciate the appeal site does not form part of a designated conservation area. The extensions may be built to a high design standard, and whilst they may be of the view that the housing development is of limited design, this is their personal perspective. The development was nonetheless designed to a specific character. Despite extensions and alterations to these dwellings, it retains this modern Georgian character.
13. The proposals would be seen in private views from the rear elevation of other dwellings along the terrace. It would create a discordant and detrimentally harmful effect to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the terrace as a whole.
14. Whilst the outlook from the existing dormer windows may be onto the parapet, this is a design feature of the original build. I did not find this to be sufficiently poor an outlook to justify the harm that would arise as a consequence of the inappropriate design. Increased light levels into the dwelling would not persuade me to support the scheme.
15. To conclude, I have found that the proposal would not respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and as a consequence, the character of the terrace as a whole where it would be experienced in private views. Therefore, it would not meet the expectations of Policies 38 and 40 of the City of Westminster City Plan 2019 - 2040 April 2021 in their combined design and character aims and objectives.

Conclusion

16. In light of my assessment of the main issue, I conclude that the appeal proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no other material considerations that suggest the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR