
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 11 September 2025

by **L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/E5900/W/25/3364760

Queens Head, 8 Flamborough Street, London, E14 7LS

- 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 Mr Thomas Jeffries against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref is PA/24/02031.
The development proposed is erection of a mansard roof extension to the existing 1-bed self-contained flat at the rear of the site. Installation of two dormer windows to the existing mansard.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/E5900/Y/25/3364763

Queens Head, 8 Flamborough Street, London, E14 7LS

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Thomas Jeffries against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref is PA/24/02032.
 - The works proposed are erection of a mansard roof extension to the existing 1-bed self-contained flat at the rear of the site. Installation of two dormer windows to the existing mansard.
-

Appeal A Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. Both appeals relate to The Queens Head Public House, 8 Flamborough Street which is a Grade II listed building¹ located within the York Square Conservation Area (CA). The descriptions of development and works are the same for both proposals and the issues within the appeals are similar. As such I have dealt with them within the same Decision Letter. I have, however, set out two separate formal Decisions.
4. As required by sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses and paid special attention to the

¹ National Heritage List for England Entry Number: 1065192

desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in these appeals is whether the proposals would preserve the listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses and, linked to that, whether the proposals would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

6. The Queens Head Public House is a Grade II listed building dating from the late 18th/ early 19th Century. The property occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction of Flamborough Street and Chaseley Street and is highly visible from the surrounding area.
7. The Flamborough Street elevation of the building has detailing which would suggest that it is the principal elevation of the building. Indeed, the evidence before me indicates that the parties to the appeals also consider this to be the case. This elevation comprises three first-floor windows above the commercial ground floor and three dormer windows within the mansard roof above. The first-floor windows are set within detailed archways of brick with contrasting central keystones.
8. The Chaseley Street elevation is of a simpler composition. The building has been extended at first floor level along this elevation² and, with four first-floor windows, now represents the larger of the elevations. However, the architectural detailing is more modest; the first-floor sash windows, for example, have simple brick surrounds unlike the detailing which characterises the Flamborough Street elevation. Furthermore, the step-down to the extension and its flat roof ensure that it is visibly an addition to the building which does not dominate this elevation.
9. The special interest and significance of the listed building stems, in part, from its attractive architectural detailing which is of a modest scale, the composition of the two-principal street facing elevations and ground floor façade and its appearance as an example of a classically detailed corner pub. The historic interest of the subject property is largely derived from it forming part of a planned early 19th century estate designed on behalf of the Mercers company.
10. The roads which surround the property comprise terraces of modest dwellings, some of which are Grade II listed and some are locally listed. The site, therefore, also possesses group value as it forms part of a group surrounding York Square comprising Nos 3 – 8, Nos 17 to 31 Barnes Street and Nos 1 to 16 York Square.
11. The appeal site is situated within the York Square Conservation Area (CA). The York Square Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) sets out that the CA is largely composed of a series of earlier 19th Century residential terraces which are elegantly proportioned, although modestly scaled. The CAA states that though the Conservation Area is predominantly residential there are also dispersed ancillary commercial uses, notably corner public houses at 17 Barnes Street, 49 Bromley Street, 1 Durham Row, 8 Flamborough Street and 94 White Horse Road.

² Planning application ref PA/20/02390

12. As such, the CA can be said to derive its special interest and significance, in part, from its architectural and historic interest, including from the listed buildings which are included within the CA. The appeal property possesses positive qualities which contribute to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and thus to its significance as a designated heritage asset.

Effects of the proposals

13. The proposals are for a mansard roof extension to the recently permitted one-bedroom self-contained flat which occupies the new first-floor extension at the rear of the site. The proposal would include reconfiguration of the existing first-floor through moving the bathroom into bedroom two and placing a staircase within the existing bathroom space. Two additional bedrooms, a WC and an ensuite bathroom would be added at second-floor level.
14. The proposals also include the enabling removal of two of the three existing second-floor dormers to the rear elevation of the property and the installation of two dormer windows to the existing mansard, which would serve the living room and a bedroom of the first- and second-floor flat.
15. The proposed mansard would match the height of, and attach to, the existing mansard roof of the main building, creating an 'L' shaped mansard which would cover the entire building. Though the property already has a mansard roof, the proposal would increase the size of that which currently exists significantly creating a large expanse of roof, albeit somewhat screened behind a parapet wall.
16. The proposal would also include the addition of three brick courses to the first-floor extension to remove the set down of the extension and create a consistent parapet wall height across the entire elevation. Whilst I accept that the existing set-down is minimal, it nevertheless serves to highlight the phasing of the building. The proposed consistent building line, in combination with the extended mansard roof, would lead to the first-floor extension no longer appearing as a secondary addition but would rather lead to an extension which would amalgamate with the host building. Consequently, the proposals would impede the ability for the phasing of the building to be read and understood.
17. Due to its size and width, the proposed roof form as altered would appear excessively bulky and would fail to respect, or appear subordinate to, the host building. Despite their reasonably discreet positioning within the roof profile the additional dormer windows would exacerbate this by adding visual clutter and additional built form. The proposals would alter the Chaseley Street elevation such that it would appear as a large, bulky elevation which would no longer appear clearly as the secondary elevation of the building. The proposal would visually compete with, and thus erode the primacy of, the principal elevation. Cumulatively the proposal, along with previously approved alterations, would also detrimentally alter the building's identified relatively modest architectural scale.
18. I note the appellant's view that raising the parapet wall and creating a single consistent building line would enhance the cohesiveness and symmetry of the building as a whole. However, as I have set out above, whilst this may indeed be the case the resultant building would be overly large and the ability to read the phases of the building's development would be irretrievably diminished.

19. Additionally, the plans before me show that the window serving the second-floor bathroom of the first- and second-floor flat would be removed and would not be replaced. The plans indicate that the fixtures within that bathroom would consequently sit awkwardly away from the newly moved wall serving the room, details regarding any changes in this regard are limited, and the arrangements for ventilation are unclear. The specific details in this respect are not sufficient to enable a robust judgement to be reached regarding the potential effect of this reconfiguration on the heritage asset, including any unintended consequences of a poorly ventilated bathroom space, and, consequently, I cannot be certain that these works would preserve the listed building and not cause harm to its significance.
20. Additionally, the proposed demolition works would themselves result in the loss of some of the historic fabric of the building. The limited visibility of this part of the building is not a sufficient reason to justify its loss.
21. Furthermore, due to its size and layout the proposed second-floor would not sit comfortably with the configuration of the building. Despite the removal of two of the existing dormer windows, the proposed extension would encroach on and partially block the remaining dormer window serving a bedroom of the first- and second-floor flat and would result in an awkward arrangement which would not be cohesive or sympathetic to the host building.
22. The proposals would also result in some limited alterations to the plan form within the building. However, the evidence before me indicates that these alterations would largely be to the recently added sections of the building. I am, therefore, satisfied that these internal works would not harm the significance of the listed building considered as a whole.
23. The proposals would cause harm to an asset which adds positively to the significance of the CA. The proposals would be highly conspicuous from a number of viewpoints within the CA. Though I accept that the Public House is, by design, of greater scale and proportions than the neighbouring terraced houses, the building has been designed in such a way that its height steps down along its secondary elevation to more closely match the neighbouring terrace, physically demonstrating the hierarchy of the built form. The proposals would be such that this transition would be lost and the visual dominance of the Public House would be increased significantly such that it would appear bulky within the street scene and would unacceptably dwarf the surrounding buildings. It follows that it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
24. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would weaken the architectural interest of the listed building overall, thereby undermining an important contributor to the significance of this designated heritage asset. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building. Furthermore, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
25. In finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) requires the category of harm to be identified. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) expands upon this by requiring the extent of harm within that category to be clearly articulated. In this instance, given the limited extent and nature of the proposed development and works, the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets would, individually and

cumulatively, be at the lower end of less than substantial. Nevertheless, this harm is of considerable importance and weight.

26. The approach set out in paragraph 215 of the Framework is that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, as in this case, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Public benefits and heritage balance

27. It is not unreasonable to conclude that the proposals would lead to economic, social and environmental benefits. Amongst other things, these would stem from engaging local professionals, trades and suppliers and improvement to the local housing stock. Notwithstanding this, there is no substantive evidence before me which demonstrates that the proposed development and works are necessary to secure the ongoing use of the heritage asset.
28. Whilst a number of these benefits would be private, they would also be such that they could be considered to be of broader benefit to the public. These benefits are, however, limited by the small scale of the proposals and must be considered in that context.
29. Conversely, on the other side of the balance, I have found that the proposals would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA as a whole. The Framework indicates that great weight should be given to the conservation of these heritage assets. Consequently, the public benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the harm identified.
30. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with the statutory presumptions of s.16(2), s.66(1) and s.72(1) of the Act. The proposal would also fail to comply with Policy S.DH1 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031, adopted January 2020 (LP). Amongst other things, this policy requires development to meet the highest standards of design by, for example, providing coherent building lines and roof lines, complementing streetscape rhythm and ensuring the scale, composition and articulation of building form complements and enhances their immediate and wider settings. The proposals would also fail to accord with LP Policy S.DH3 which is clear that proposals must preserve or, where appropriate, enhance the borough's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.
31. The proposals would also conflict with Policy HC1 of The London Plan, 2021 (The London Plan) which, in part, states that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance.

Other Matters

32. Grade II listed buildings lie near to the site. The special interest and significance of these assets are mainly derived from their architectural and historic interest, but also in part, from their planned urban settings. Given the nature of the proposal, I find that the settings of these listed buildings would be preserved and their significance not harmed. The Council raised no concerns in this regard either. This is a neutral consideration.

33. I have noted a number of other issues raised including the potential for the proposal to harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents; however, as this proposal is to be dismissed for other reasons and the other concerns expressed do not have a direct bearing on the main issue, it is not necessary for these to be explored further as part of Appeal A.

Conclusion

34. For the reasons set out above the appeals are dismissed.

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR