
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th August 2025

Section 78 Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/D/24/3357163

Development: New internal arrangements and an extension to the roof matching the neighbouring properties at 40 Lancaster Mews, City of Westminster, London W2 3QF

Application Ref is 23/06583/FULL.

Decision- the appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

1. The appellant's statement of case includes some amended plans (Ext_Prp_Sec_A301 Rev 05, Ext_Prp_Rear-A202 Rev05, Ext_prp_Front-A202 Rev 05). These introduce some substantial changes to the proposal, and I cannot be certain that all interested parties have had the opportunity to consider them. As the appeal process should not be used to evolve the design of a scheme, and to avoid prejudicing other parties, I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the plans considered by the Council.

Reasons

Issue – effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area

2. The site comprises a mid-terraced mews building located within a row of mews buildings with mansard roofs and dormer windows set behind parapet walls. The site is located within the Bayswater Conservation Area (CA) which is characterised by largely residential terraced streets and squares lying to the north of Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens. Its significance principally derives from its 19th century origins and the fine examples of Georgian architecture found within it.
3. The appeal property is described by the Council as a 'building of merit'. The Bayswater Conservation Area Audit (2000) states that buildings of merit contribute materially to the character and appearance of the CA. The appeal property's attractive form, and the group value of the mews buildings within the row in which the appeal property is located, contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA.
4. The application is for the erection of an extension to the roof. The altered roof would appear bulkier than other roofs within the row, dominating and altering the proportions of the dwelling, detracting from its character and appearance and its positive contribution to the street scene. In private views, the proposed sheer roof to the rear elevation would be visible from properties at Craven Terrace. In these

views the altered roof form would appear as an uncharacteristic, visually intrusive feature which would detract from the appearance of the building.

5. The proposal would not preserve the character or appearance of the CA, resulting in less than substantial harm to its significance. I attach great weight to the desirability of avoiding such a harmful effect. Although some benefits would arise from the proposal, these would primarily be for the benefit of the appellant and would not outweigh the harm to the heritage asset.
6. In accordance with my statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area¹, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, and would fail to preserve or enhance the CA. In this respect, it would be contrary to the development plan policies cited in the decision notice for this issue.

Issue – effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

7. The proposal would increase the massing of the roof slope and bring it closer to the rear windows to 20 and 21 Craven Terrace. The altered roof form would sit directly in front of these windows. However, noting the existing separation between these windows and the roof, there would be very limited change to the outlook from these windows and thus the living conditions of the occupiers of these properties.
8. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 20 and 21 Craven Terrace with regards to outlook. It would therefore accord with the policies cited in the decision notice for this issue.

Other Matters

9. My attention has been drawn to applications nearby². The full details of these proposals are not before me. Nonetheless, there is no evidence that these proposals are comparable in form to the appeal proposal. Given this, I afford these decisions limited weight.

Conclusion

10. I have found no harm in relation to the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, the effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area and the harm to the CA is determinative. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and nothing outweighs this.

N Robinson

INSPECTOR

¹ S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

² Applications 14/11113/FUL, 96/03021/FUL and 02/01307/FUL