



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22nd July 2025

by Simon J Cater MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/Z/25/3366787

422 Edgware Road, London W2 1EG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Viva Enterprises Limited against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01880/FULL.
 - The development proposed is alterations to shopfront and relocation of the primary entrance door on Edgware Road
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I noted during my site visit that works had already been carried out. Nonetheless, my assessment is based on the submitted plans and supporting documents, which form the basis of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to No. 422 Edgware Road, a mid to late 19th century end-of-terrace building occupying a prominent corner position at the junction with Boscobel Street. Originally constructed as a public house, the building retains elements of its traditional Victorian shopfront, including timber framing, fascia, cornicing, corbels, stall riser, and pilasters.
5. The works subject to this appeal involved the removal of original timber-framed doors, panelling, and windows, replaced with modern aluminium-framed units. In addition, the entrance was relocated from its original corner position to a flat alignment along Edgware Road. This reconfiguration disrupts the architectural rhythm of the façade and introduces a discordant element into the street scene.
6. Corner entrances are a defining feature of buildings of this type and era, designed to engage with both street frontages and reinforce their prominence. The loss of this feature, combined with the replacement of refined timber detailing with standard aluminium framing, has undermined the building's architectural coherence and diminished its contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

7. While some original detailing has been retained, the cumulative impact of the alterations, particularly the relocation of the entrance and loss of original joinery, results in a level of harm that is not offset by the surviving elements. The development fails to respond appropriately to its context and detracts from the established character of the building and its surroundings.
8. While the appellant refers to similar developments elsewhere as justification for the appeal proposal, the existence of such examples does not warrant the introduction of further harm. Each case must be assessed on its own merits, and in this instance, the works have resulted in clear harm to the character and appearance of the host building.
9. The Council has referred to Policy 39 and asserts that the appeal property constitutes a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). While Planning Practice Guidance allows for such determinations to be made as part of the decision-making process, including by officers acting under delegated authority, the Council has not provided any substantive evidence of the building's heritage significance or assessed it against any established criteria for identifying NDHAs. In the absence of such evidence, I am unable to reach a definitive conclusion on its heritage status.
10. Nevertheless, I have found through my site visit that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, particularly due to the building's contribution to the townscape and the unsympathetic nature of the proposed development. Even if the appeal property were to be considered a non-designated heritage asset, the public benefits of the proposal, including any optimal viable use, would not outweigh the harm identified, as required by paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal does not comply with Policies 38 and 40 of the Westminster City Plan 2019–2040 (2021), which require high-quality design that respects existing buildings and the wider townscape. It also conflicts with the Council's adopted Shopfronts, Blinds and Signs Supplementary Planning Guidance, which promotes the retention of traditional features and materials.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Simon J Cater

INSPECTOR