



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/25/3373642

14 Clifton Road, London W9 1SS

- 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 Chesterman Holdings Ltd against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03869/FULL.
 - The development proposed is the creation of a roof terrace with associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I saw on my site inspection that there were construction works taking place at the appeal property, although I was not certain that these related to this proposal. Nevertheless, I have assessed the appeal as a proposed development based on the plans before me.
3. 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. Consequently, I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. 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 Maida Vale Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires when determining proposals in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. At paragraph 210, the Framework sets out matters which should be considered, including sustaining, and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

6. The CA contains a variety of buildings, and architectural styles, including many rows of well-design terraced properties. The appeal site contains a 4-storey, mid-terraced property facing onto Clifton Road, with a retail unit at ground floor and flats on the upper floors, part of its rear side and rear roof profile is visible from neighbouring Lanark Road, due to a small gap between buildings. The appeal property, like other properties in the same terrace, have 'V' shaped butterfly roof forms, hidden by a front parapet wall, along with a rear 'V' shaped parapet to reflect their inverted roof slopes. The appearance of this terrace of properties, particularly their collective and distinctive butterfly roof forms positively contribute to the significance of the CA.
7. The proposed development seeks to remove the butterfly roof to allow private amenity space on the roof of the appeal property, accessed via an electrically operated rectangular shaped roof light. There would also be balustrading to the front side, setback from the parapet wall by some 1.3 metres or so, along with balustrading to the rear side immediately behind and mostly above the rear parapet wall. The Council has questioned whether the rear parapet wall could be retained when the roof is removed. However, I have no substantive evidence that it could not be retained as proposed, and I have assessed the proposed development on this basis.
8. Notwithstanding whether the rear parapet wall would be retained and the screening provided by the front parapet wall, the loss of the characteristic butterfly roof form would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property. Its replacement with a flat roof, regardless as to how much of it would be seen from public viewpoints, would not respect the form and character of the appeal property, the terrace it is part of, and the significance of this part of the CA.
9. The proposed slim-lined balustrading to the rear side would be seen from Lanark Road, against the retained 'V' shaped parapet. It would appear discordant and illegible, particularly when seen in the context of the roofscape of the terrace of properties it is part of. Thereby also harming the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace it is part of, and the CA.
10. Furthermore, the proposed rooflight, although said to be of a conservation style and not be upstanding, given its unusual elongated rectangular shape, along with the activity associated with the use of the roof terrace at such a high level, would add to the harm already identified.
11. Even though there would be limited public views of the proposed development, and taking into account the appeal property's position within the terrace and in relation to other nearby properties, there would still be some private views of the proposed development from the rear sides and gardens of nearby properties. Furthermore, the lack of views of the proposed development would not be a reason to justify its poor design, particularly within the CA.
12. I note the comments about there being other roof terraces said to be within Westminster, including at no. 2 Lanark Road. However, I do not have any details to properly compare them to the appeal proposals, including their planning history and reasons why they were granted planning permission, if indeed they were. I therefore attach limited weight to that argument.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not preserve the character or appearance of the CA, contrary to the duty in the Act. The proposed

development would also be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace it is part of, and the CA, and conflict with the relevant parts of Policies 38, 39 and 40 of the City of Westminster, City Plan 2019 – 2040, adopted April 2021, which amongst other things require the design and scale of development to positively contribute to the townscape and streetscape, and ensure the significance of heritage assets are conserved.

Other Matters

14. I have also had regard to objections from local residents received in addition to the issues above, including but not limited to, the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in terms of their privacy. Whilst I can understand the concerns, I note that the Council has not identified any harmful effects arising in this respect, given the existing arrangement of windows on neighbouring properties, and there is no compelling evidence before me that would lead me to come to a different conclusion to the Council on this matter.
15. It is acknowledged that the appeal property is not listed and that planning permission¹ was granted in 2025 for the conversion of 2 no. flats at the appeal property into a three-bedroom family sized flat, and that the proposed development would provide its occupiers with private amenity space. Nevertheless, planning permission has already been granted for that conversion, and no unacceptable harm must have been identified in respect of private amenity space provision, and this proposal has not been presented on the basis that the conversion would not proceed without this proposed development. These points have not altered my findings on the appeal.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

16. For the reasons outlined above, I find that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. There would also be conflict with policies of the development plan, I give this harm significant weight in the planning balance of this appeal.
17. I find the harm to constitute less than substantial harm owing to its effect being localised. Although, I consider the harm to the CA would be less than substantial, it is nonetheless a level of harm to which significant weight should be attached. Paragraph 214 of the Framework requires public benefits to outweigh such harm.
18. The proposed development would create outdoor private amenity space for the future occupiers of the newly created flat by using the appeal property's roof space. However, these would be private benefits for the occupiers of the host property. It is acknowledged that there would likely be some contribution to the local economy from the associated construction works but given the small scale of the proposal, I attach limited weight to these public benefits at most.
19. Against this background, the public benefits are very limited, and they do not outweigh the harm identified above to the significance of the heritage asset. Accordingly, there is conflict with the heritage protection policies of the Framework.
20. There would be conflict with the development plan, and there are no material considerations, including the Framework and those points raised by the appellant,

¹ Ref. 25/03912/FULL

which indicate that 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