



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/W/25/3372831

38B Bravington Road, City of Westminster, London W9 3AH

- 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 Athsham Ali against the decision of the City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02750/FULL.
 - The proposed development is a mansard roof conversion to create two additional bedrooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has advised that its draft City Plan Partial Review (CPPR) is currently being examined. I have not been made aware of any policies of the CPPR that are relevant to the appeal proposal, and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace it is part of, and the immediate area, with particular regard to its design and scale.

Reasons

4. The appeal site contains a mid-terraced property that has three storeys, it is currently split into 2 no. flats, the appeal is concerned with the upper floor flat. The roof of the appeal property has a characteristic 'V' shape, referred to as a butterfly roof form, that is behind a parapet wall to its front side that faces onto Bravington Road, opposite its junction with Coomassie Road. Most of the terraced properties along both sides of Bravington Road have the same butterfly roof form as the appeal property, as a result views up and down the road are mostly of uninterrupted front parapet walls of a similar height, which contributes positively to the area's character and appearance. Behind the appeal property is a small terrace of 11 no. mews properties (Octavia Mews), accessed via private gate underneath no. 42A Bravington Road, those terraced properties have mansard roofs, and although they are visible from the rear sides of adjoining properties, there are very limited public views of them.
5. The main objective of Westminster's Roofs, A Guide to Alterations and Extensions on Domestic Buildings, dated November 2004 (GAEDB) is for roof alterations and extensions to be designed to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of its buildings. It says that whilst mansard roof extensions, which are described

as having dormer windows within them, can be discreet and appropriate for some properties, they might not be so for others, particularly when there is a uniformity that exists in a terrace. It further states that in some terraces where the historic butterfly roof pattern is unaltered, roof extensions will normally be unacceptable. Although it adds that if the terrace has been altered and includes other roof extensions, a mansard extension may be acceptable, but the "V" shaped parapet wall should be retained.

6. The proposed mansard roof extension would add a top heavy, boxy addition onto this well-proportioned property. It would clearly be seen above the front parapet wall, and its appearance, including the proposed vertical upstands would be at odds with its simple form, and its characteristic unaltered parapet wall. Whilst it would retain the parapets, 'V' shaped roof form on its rear side, and chimneys, this would not outweigh the loss of the butterfly roof, its increased mass and its dominant appearance in this terrace.
7. Notwithstanding its setback and 70-degree angle, the proposed mansard roof extension would be visible from the road, including on the approach from Coomassie Road, and its appearance would be discordant when seen against most other unaltered parapet roofs, significantly disrupting the symmetry of their roof forms. Thereby creating an uncoordinated roofline and causing harm to the appearance of the host property, the terrace of properties, and the area.
8. In addition, the modern appearance of the proposed mansard roof profile, without dormer windows, would also add to this identified harm. The use of matching traditional materials and planning conditions in respect of window openings, would not be sufficient to address this harm.
9. It is understood the mansard roof extension at no.22 Bravington Road was granted planning permission in 1986, and that alterations including mansard roof extensions to no.42A and Octavia Mews were approved in 2001. Those permissions were all made many years before the current development plan was adopted, and the policies have most likely changed since those decisions were made. I saw that Octavia Mews is a different and modern type of development to the terraces on either side of Bravington Road, and due to its location behind properties, it is seen differently to them, and its presence has not led me to conclude differently in this case.
10. The mansard roof extension at no. 42A is set back from the front elevation, and it is much lower than the proposed dormer extension. Furthermore, its presence was not obvious when viewed from Bravington Road, and it did not disrupt the line of its front parapet wall. In terms of no. 22, its mansard roof extension does disrupt the symmetry of the terrace's roofline, in a marked contrast to the prevailing character and form along this road. However, its appearance above the parapet wall height is an isolated case in the terrace of properties on the road, and its existence does not justify further harm to the otherwise unaltered parapet roofs of the terrace.
11. My attention has also been drawn to mansard roof forms at no's 1 and 2 Coomassie Road, but they are located on a different road, and the design of those properties is distinctively different to the long terrace the appeal property is part of, they were not directly comparable to the appeal site. Similarly, the presence of the mansard roof forms at no's 52A and 54A Portnall Road, are noted, but they are some distance from the appeal property. They are also located at the end of a

terrace, any views of them together with the appeal site would be limited and they would not be sufficient justification to alter my findings. In addition, even taking the nearby examples together, I was not persuaded that there was a compelling group value to these nearby mansard roof alterations, given their differing locations, arrangements, and designs, which would outweigh the above identified harm.

12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace it is part of, and the immediate area, contrary to the relevant parts of Policies 38 and 40 of the City of Westminster, City Plan 2019 – 2040, adopted April 2021, which amongst other things require high quality urban design, and a scale and massing that positively contributes to Westminster's townscape and streetscape, and avoids disrupting the uniformity of terraces, and existing building lines. In addition, the proposal would also conflict with Policy 5 of the Queen's Park Community Council Neighbourhood Plan 2020—2040, made August 2021, insofar as it expects new developments to achieve an exemplary standard of urban design and architecture that respects the character of distinct areas. In view of the mainly unaltered butterfly roof forms within the terrace, the proposed development would also be inconsistent with GAEDB's main objective, and its requirements in respect of such roof forms, as set out above.
13. Although the proposed development would be an upward extension, that would utilise air space above it, and make a more effective use of land, it would be inconsistent with the prevailing form of properties nearby and the overall street scene. In this respect, it is not well-designed and would not add to the overall quality of the area. As a result, it would be contrary to paragraphs 125 e) and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

14. It is acknowledged that the appeal site is not listed nor is it within a conservation area; that there would be no harm identified to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers; it would add 2 no. bedrooms and a bathroom to the upper floor flat and improve its current accommodation that is part of Westminster's housing stock; and that it would incorporate sustainable design measures. However, these aspects, even taken collectively do not outweigh the identified harm above and the conflict with the development plan policies.
15. The references to parts of the Framework and other development plan policies that the proposed development may comply with are noted, but both the Framework and the development plan must be read as a whole. In this case the arguments raised do not outweigh my findings.

Conclusion

16. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no other material considerations, including the Framework and those raised by the appellant, that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR