



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2024

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/W/23/3321191

Eagle House, St John's Wood Terrace, Westminster, London NW8 6JJ

- 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 Sophie Hamilton-Grey against the decision of the Council of the City of Westminster.
 - The application Ref 22/01815/FULL, dated 17 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension including increase in roof height to provide a self-contained studio flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof extension including increase in roof height to provide a self-contained studio flat at Eagle House, St John's Wood Terrace, Westminster, London NW8 6JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01815/FULL, dated 17 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block and Location Plans (4D-220 E00), Proposed Drawings Floor Plans (4D-220 P01), Proposed Drawings Floor Plan (4D-220 P02), Proposed Drawings Elevations (4D-220 P03), Proposed Drawings Elevations (4D-220 P04), Proposed Drawings Elevations (4D-220 P05) and Proposed Drawings Sections (4D-220 P06).
 3. Prior to their installation, details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted, including the windows and glazing, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development above is taken from the decision notice and appeal form as this is a more succinct version than that provided in the planning application form.
3. The Government published on 19 December 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The main parties were provided with an opportunity to make submissions on the revised Framework. I

am therefore satisfied that no party has been disadvantaged by me proceeding on the basis of the revised Framework.

Main Issue

4. Whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the St John's Wood Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal building, Eagle House, is a large 3 storey building, with further non-original mansard storey. It occupies a corner position within a high street setting. The building is a prominent feature in the street scene by virtue of its scale and positioning.
6. The significance of the CA is derived from its suburban character created by the predominant residential development of villas and terraced properties. Materials and the design of buildings in this locality vary somewhat, however there remains a uniform and pleasing character by virtue of blocks of properties of consistent appearance and the grandeur of the buildings.
7. The good condition and ornate architectural detailing present in Eagle House, which is noted as being a building of merit, causes it to contribute positively towards the character and appearance of the CA.
8. The proposal would further extend the building at roof level, above the existing mansard storey, which currently contains storage, water tanks and a lift. It would be taller and wider than the previously approved development. Nevertheless, the modest size of the proposed extension would ensure it integrates well with the host building and would remain a subservient addition to the existing mansard storey. It would not appear as a full, additional storey.
9. The increased bulk and mass to the appeal building would not be readily apparent from street level, due to the substantial height and massing of the host building and the tight urban form. I nevertheless acknowledge that there would be some views of the proposal from neighbouring properties and streets.
10. However, given its small scale and set-back positioning, the proposal would not significantly interrupt the composition and architectural quality of the host building or over dominate it. Whilst one chimney stack would be subsumed, those positioned towards the front of the roof would remain as prominent features of the building. As such, the integrity of the roofscape would be preserved and, although the host building would be taller than adjacent buildings as a result, the proposal would nevertheless not result in harm as it would not interrupt historic rooflines or the character of the townscape.
11. I note the advice in Supplementary Planning Document: Roofs, A Guide to Alterations and Extensions on Domestic Buildings, and the St John's Wood Conservation Area Audit, however, for the reasons given, I do not consider this proposal to represent a case where roof extensions would be unacceptable.
12. Accordingly, the proposal would not harm the host building or undermine its contribution to the CA, and it would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Therefore, it would accord with policies 38, 39 and 40 of the City Plan 2019-2040 (April 2021) which collectively aim for high quality, sensitively designed developments which ensure heritage assets are conserved. In

accordance with paragraph 124 of the Framework, for the reasons given the proposal has been well-designed and harmonises with the host building.

Other Matters

13. Given the scale of the existing building and the design and positioning of the proposal, I am satisfied that the appeal development would not further exacerbate any existing loss of light to neighbouring properties.
14. There are a number of listed buildings within close proximity to the appeal site. Nevertheless, given the tight urban form of the locality, the scale of the host building and the relationship between the proposal and heritage assets, I am satisfied that it would preserve the setting of nearby listed buildings.

Conditions

15. I have attached the standard time limit and plans list conditions in the interest of certainty. A condition requiring details of materials to be submitted is necessary in the interests of design quality and the significance of the CA. I have consolidated the Council's suggested conditions in this regard.

Conclusion

16. The proposal accords with the development plan thus the appeal should be allowed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR