

Address:	49-50 Chagford Street London NW1 6EB	BRYANSTON & DORSET SQUARE WARD
Description:	Retention and alterations to uPVC windows to the front elevation of an existing building and the removal of existing external plastic waste pipework, soil stacks repositioned and vented through roof and retrofit glazing bars.	
Appellant:	Abrar Islamic Foundation Al-Jawad, 45 Crawford Place, London, W1H 4LP	
Agent:	Martin Pottinger, 11 Eton Garages, London, NW3 4PE	
Decision Date:	26 April 2021	WCC Resolution: 26 April 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: W/20/3262105
Decision:	Part Allowed:Part Dismissed	Case Number: 20/04851/FULL
Officer:	Max Jones	Telephone: 07866036849

Address:	23 Grafton Street London W1S 4EY	WEST END WARD
Description:	Demolition of rear single storey basement extension, rear ground floor toilet block and rear external fire escape stairs at ground and first floor levels including those with 22 Grafton Street and erection of new rear two storey extension at basement and ground floor levels. Use of the existing basement and the new extension at basement and ground floor as retail (Class A1). Replacement of front railings and plant installations located under the proposed walk on grille at the rear of the extension.	
Appellant:	Mr Adam Wiles, 3rd Floor, 22 Charing Cross Road, London, WC2H 0HS	
Agent:	Mr Jonathan Bainbridge, Bidwells LLP, Old Burlington Street, LONDON, W1S 3AN	
Decision Date:	26 April 2021	WCC Resolution: 26 April 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: Y/20/3256672
Decision:	Allowed	Case Number: 19/05568/LBC
Officer:	Rattan Sehra	Telephone: 07866039814
Comments:	The applications had been refused on the grounds that the proposed extension, because of its height, bulk, location and design would harm the special interest of this listed building and the Mayfair Conservation Area. There was also considered to be insufficient acoustic information to accurately assess the acoustic performance of the proposed plant.	

The Inspector noted that the building dates from the late eighteenth century but that it, and the adjoining properties, have been subject to a number of alterations in the past that have compromised its historical character and appearance. Within this context, the proposed removal of existing elements at the rear would declutter the rear yard space, and better reveal the historic rear building line and elevation. In the Inspector's opinion, this would have a positive impact on the special interest of the listed building (as would replacement of the non-original front railings with a design sympathetic to the Georgian character of the building). Use of glass in the roof of the extension would substantially retain visibility of the building's rear external walls and windows, and the roof's modern materials would differentiate the proposed extension from the historic architecture. As such, the proposal would not dominate or obscure the rear elevation of the building, and the legibility of the rear building line of the townhouses would be preserved and would not compromise the integrity of the building's original plan form.

However, the Inspector acknowledged that the enclosure of the appeal building's rear yard by the glass roof would change the nature of the space from an external yard that is unenclosed above, and open to the elements, to an enclosed extension. This would result in loss of the substantive surviving remnant of uncovered yard at the rear of the listed building and host terrace, and internalise the exterior face of the ground floor sash windows. Moreover, the glass roofed enclosure of the yard would diminish the original character of the building and authenticity of relationship between its internal and rear external space. The Inspector thus agreed with Council officers that the proposal would have a negative impact on the special interest of the listed building, but given the overall positive impact, he was satisfied that the proposal was acceptable.

The Inspector considered that the harm to the listed building to be less than substantial in this instance. In his opinion this harm could be weighed against public benefits of the proposal: in this case the creation of 199 sq.m of retail floorspace would provide positive economic stimulus to Mayfair's status as an internationally important centre for the art trade, contributing to the viable future use and upkeep of the listed building. In addition, the proposed replacement of modern front railings with historically sympathetic railings would enhance the character and appearance of the front of the building, the street scene of Grafton Street and the conservation area. The Inspector concluded that these benefits carry

significant weight that outweigh the harm that would be caused to the heritage asset.

With regard to the proposed plant, the appellant had submitted a revised Acoustic Consultancy Report with the appeal [which should have been submitted with the application]. In the light of this evidence and its assessment by the Council's Environmental Health Officer, the Council considered that noise and vibration control and management is capable of being secured by planning condition. The Inspector agreed and attached a condition covering these matters to protect the living and working conditions of neighbours, as well as a number of other conditions.

Address:	23 Grafton Street London W1S 4EY	WEST END WARD
Description:	Demolition of rear single storey basement extension, rear ground floor toilet block and rear external fire escape stairs at ground and first floor levels including those with 22 Grafton Street and erection of new rear two storey extension at basement and ground floor levels. Use of the existing basement and the new extension at basement and ground floor as retail (Class A1). Replacement of front railings and plant installations located under the proposed walk on grille at the rear of the extension.	
Appellant:	Mr Adam Wiles, 3rd Floor, 22 Charing Cross Road, London, WC2H 0HS	
Agent:	Mr Jonathan Bainbridge, Bidwells LLP, Old Burlington Street, LONDON, W1S 3AN	
Decision Date:	26 April 2021	WCC Resolution: 26 April 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: W/20/3256674
Decision:	Allowed	Case Number: 19/05567/FULL
Officer:	Rattan Sehra	Telephone: 07866039814
Comments:	The applications had been refused on the grounds that the proposed extension, because of its height, bulk, location and design would harm the special interest of this listed building and the Mayfair Conservation Area. There was also considered to be insufficient acoustic information to accurately assess the acoustic performance of the proposed plant.	

The Inspector noted that the building dates from the late eighteenth century but that it, and the adjoining properties, have been subject to a number of alterations in the past that have compromised its historical character and appearance. Within this context, the proposed removal of existing elements at the rear would declutter the rear yard space, and better reveal the historic rear building line and elevation. In the Inspector's opinion, this would have a positive impact on the special interest of the listed building (as would replacement of the non-original front railings with a design sympathetic to the Georgian character of the building). Use of glass in the roof of the extension would substantially retain visibility of the building's rear external walls and windows, and the roof's modern materials would differentiate the proposed extension from the historic architecture. As such, the proposal would not dominate or obscure the rear elevation of the building, and the legibility of the rear building line of the townhouses would be preserved and would not compromise the integrity of the building's original plan form.

However, the Inspector acknowledged that the enclosure of the appeal building's rear yard by the glass roof would change the nature of the space from an external yard that is unenclosed above, and open to the elements, to an enclosed extension. This would result in loss of the substantive surviving remnant of uncovered yard at the rear of the listed building and host terrace, and internalise the exterior face of the ground floor sash windows. Moreover, the glass roofed enclosure of the yard would diminish the original character of the building and authenticity of relationship between its internal and rear external space. The Inspector thus agreed with Council officers that the proposal would have a negative impact on the special interest of the listed building, but given the overall positive impact, he was satisfied that the proposal was acceptable.

The Inspector considered that the harm to the listed building to be less than substantial in this instance. In his opinion this harm could be weighed against public benefits of the proposal: in this case the creation of 199 sq.m of retail floorspace would provide positive economic stimulus to Mayfair's status as an internationally important centre for the art trade, contributing to the viable future use and upkeep of the listed building. In addition, the proposed replacement of modern front railings with historically sympathetic railings would enhance the character and appearance of the front of the building, the street scene of Grafton Street and the conservation area. The Inspector concluded that these benefits carry

significant weight that outweigh the harm that would be caused to the heritage asset.

With regard to the proposed plant, the appellant had submitted a revised Acoustic Consultancy Report with the appeal [which should have been submitted with the application]. In the light of this evidence and its assessment by the Council's Environmental Health Officer, the Council considered that noise and vibration control and management is capable of being secured by planning condition. The Inspector agreed and attached a condition covering these matters to protect the living and working conditions of neighbours, as well as a number of other conditions.

Address:	17 Hanover Terrace London NW1 4RJ	REGENT'S PARK WARD
Description:	Removal of existing doors and pilasters to rear ground floor level and replacement with new door opening and timber doors (LINKED TO 20/03375/LBC).	
Appellant:	Mr Russell Jacobs, 17, Hanover Terrace, London, NW1 4RJ	
Agent:	Mr Warren Martin, 94 Ulverscroft Road, LONDON, SE22 9HG	
Decision Date:	22 April 2021	WCC Resolution: 22 April 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: D/20/3260201
Decision:	Dismissed	Case Number: 20/03374/FULL
Officer:	Alistair Taylor	Telephone: 07866037603

Address:	16 Hugh Street London SW1V 1RP	WARWICK WARD
Description:	Erection of a mansard roof extension incorporating front and rear dormers, rear extension at second floor level and new wall, door and window in the basement light-well.	
Appellant:	Mr Luke Blaxhill, 16, Hugh Street, London, SW1V 1RP	
Agent:	, No Agent	
Decision Date:	28 April 2021	WCC Resolution: 28 April 2021
Procedure:		PINS Reference: D/21/3268250
Decision:	Withdrawn	Case Number: 20/06410/FULL
Officer:	Heidi Pearce	Telephone: 07779431272

Address:	12 Marylebone Mews London W1G 8PX	MARYLEBONE HIGH STREET WARD
Description:	Installation of an acoustic enclosure containing two air conditioning condensers to rear of existing modern mansard roof and replacement window at rear roof level.	
Appellant:	Putney Estates Limited, 9 Golden Square, London, W1F 9HZ	
Agent:	Robert Winkley, Rolfe Judd Planning, Old Church Court, Claylands Road, LONDON, SW8 1NZ	
Decision Date:	27 April 2021	WCC Resolution: 27 April 2021
Procedure:		PINS Reference: D/21/3273463
Decision:	No further action by PINS	Case Number: 20/06911/FULL
Officer:	Toby Cuthbertson	Telephone: 07866039110

Address:	Rossmore Court Park Road London NW1 6XX	REGENT'S PARK WARD
Description:	Variation of condition 1 of planning permission dated 10 October 2019 (RN 19/04696/FULL) for use of the ground floor and basement for self-storage purposes (Class B8). NAMELY, alteration comprises the replacement of the entrance/exit gates on the southern and eastern elevations, at ground floor, with roller shutter security entrance doors.	
Appellant:	Loft Land Holdings Ltd, C/O Agent	
Agent:	Miss Katy Mourant, 10 Albemarle Street, London, W1S 4HH	
Decision Date:	26 April 2021	WCC Resolution: 26 April 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: W/20/3254906
Decision:	Allowed	Case Number: 20/00349/FULL
Officer:	Kimberley Davies	Telephone: 07866036948
Comments:	The roller shutters were refused by the City Council on the grounds of detailed design and materials and that the roller shutter and louvred panels, would harm the appearance of this building and this part of the City.	

At the time of the appeal submission, the roller shutters had been installed unauthorised.

The Inspector argues that given the overall scale of the building, the dominating impact of the canopy and the scale and prominence of the flower shop and display area at ground floor level that the vehicle entrance and pedestrian access points to the self storage unit (appeal site), where the roller shutters have been installed are not substantial or significantly visible features of the building. The inspector reiterates further in his findings that the exit to the storage units forms neither a substantial or prominent feature of this frontage which is dominated by service type activities at ground floor level. He concluded the transparent panels in the roller shutter security doors, which account for the majority of the surface area of each door, would allow clear views into the facility and, during hours of darkness, light to escape into the surrounding area and that these shutters are only visible for part of the date that given their lack of prominence and small scale nature in the context of the building as a whole, their impact on the architectural character of the building would be minimal. And so to would the impact on the character and appearance on the wider area.

Address: 25A Westbourne Terrace Road London W2 6NF WESTBOURNE WARD

Description: Replacement of the existing rear glazed extension at basement level with a new single storey rear extension. (Linked to 20/03739/FULL)

Appellant: Mr Justin Cavell, 25A Westbourne Terrace Road, Waterloo Street, London, W2 6NF

Agent: Mr Mandip Sahota, Nicholas Taylor + Associates, 46 James Street, LONDON, W1U 1EZ

Decision Date: 21 April 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 21 April 2021

Procedure: Written Representations **PINS Reference:** Y/20/3258246

Decision: **Dismissed** **Case Number:** 20/03740/LBC

Officer: Alistair Taylor **Telephone:** 07866037603

Address: 25A Westbourne Terrace Road London W2 6NF WESTBOURNE WARD

Description: Replacement of the existing rear glazed extension at basement level with a new single storey rear extension. (Linked to 20/03740/LBC)

Appellant: Mr Justin Cavell, 25A Westbourne Terrace Road, Waterloo Street, London, W2 6NF

Agent: Mr Mandip Sahota, Nicholas Taylor + Associates, 46 James Street, LONDON, W1U 1EZ

Decision Date: 21 April 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 21 April 2021

Procedure: Written Representations **PINS Reference:** W/20/3258244

Decision: **Dismissed** **Case Number:** 20/03739/FULL

Officer: Alistair Taylor **Telephone:** 07866037603
