
Address:	87 Ashmill Street London NW1 6RA	CHURCH STREET WARD
Description:	Installation of Juliet balcony and change window to door at rear first floor level.	
Appellant:	Ms Mary Power, 87, Ashmill Street, London, NW1 6RA	
Agent:	, No Agent	
Decision Date:	04 March 2021	WCC Resolution: 04 March 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: W/20/3262595
Decision:	Allowed	Case Number: 20/03604/FULL
Officer:	Richard Langston	Telephone: 07866036470
Comments:	Appal related to the installation of Juliet balcony and change of window to door at rear first floor level. Refused on design and overlooking grounds. Inspector concluded the proposed development would not have an overall harmful effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 13 – 17 Shroton Street and Nos 85, 88 and 91 Ashmill Street with particular reference to privacy and overlooking nor would it be unacceptable in design terms	

Address:	Flat 14 Belgrave House 92-94 Belgrave Road London SW1V 2BJ	TACHBROOK WARD
Description:	Replacement of existing timber windows with double glazed UPVC windows and the installation of additional window to the rear elevation at third floor level (Flat 14).	
Appellant:	Ms. Daria Fomina, C/O Agent MZA Planning, 14 Devonshire Mews, W4 2HA	
Agent:	The Practice Manager, 14 Devonshire Mews, LONDON, W4 2HA	
Decision Date:	05 March 2021	WCC Resolution: 05 March 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: W/20/3262538
Decision:	No further action by PINS	Case Number: 20/03086/FULL
Officer:	Jonathon Metcalfe	Telephone: 07866038118

Address:	77 Chester Row London SW1W 8JL	KNIGHTSBRIDGE AND BELGRAVIA WARD
Description:	Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension.	
Appellant:	Mr Man Yuk Lai, C/O Agent's Address, 17 Garvin Avenue, Beaconsfield, HP91RD, Bucks	
Agent:	Mr Sammy Chan, 17 Garvin Avenue, Beaconsfield, HP9 1RD	
Decision Date:	22 March 2021	WCC Resolution: 22 March 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: W/20/3258559
Decision:	Allowed	Case Number: 20/03518/FULL
Officer:	Nosheen Javed	Telephone: 07866037836
Comments:	<p>The Inspector considered that No. 77 Chester Row makes a neutral contribution to the Belgravia Conservation Area. The decision further notes that the extension would be modest and subservient on a similar alignment as the closet wing and would not increase the built footprint and as such would not have a harmful effect of in respect of its bulk, scale, or over-development of the site.</p> <p>The Inspector did not consider that the extension would have a harmful impact on the amenities of the adjoining properties Nos. 75 and 79 as it would be only a limited amount higher than the party wall with No 75 and the existing extension which separates it from No 79 along its depth. Given the distance from the nearest windows, the highly limited visibility, height and depth, screening from the existing projection and the orientation of the properties, there would be no harmful effect in respect of a loss of outlook, daylight to internal rooms or the garden or related concerns in respect of health and safety. The rooflight would be of an angle and a sufficient distance from No 79 so as not to have any significant effect in respect of light pollution.</p> <p>In light of the above, the inspector allowed the appeal.</p>	

Address:	92 Gloucester Mews West London W2 6DY	LANCASTER GATE WARD
Description:	Erection of roof extensions to four terraced mews houses at 92 - 95 Gloucester Mews West	
Appellant:	Mr Magid, 93, Gloucester Mews West, London, W2 6DY	
Agent:	Mr Ben Smith, 106 Grand Union Studios, 332 Ladbroke Grove, London, W10 5AD	
Decision Date:	03 March 2021	WCC Resolution: 03 March 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: W/20/3252583
Decision:	Dismissed	Case Number: 20/01827/FULL
Officer:	Avani Raven	Telephone: 07866037313

Address:	2 Godson Yard London NW6 5FE		MAIDA VALE WARD
Description:	Continued use of part of flat roof at rear raised ground level of property as a roof terrace, installation of obscure glazing and retention of timber decking and doorway onto the terrace (Option Two - a larger size in terrace).		
Appellant:	Mrs Nazma Nielsen, 2, Godson Yard, London, NW6 5FE		
Agent:	Monica Mehmi, 14 Devonshire Mews, LONDON, W4 2HA		
Decision Date:	16 March 2021	WCC Resolution:	16 March 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference:	D/20/3253583
Decision:	Allowed	Case Number:	19/09127/FULL
Officer:	Frederica Cooney	Telephone:	07866037206
Comments:	<p>Both appeals relate to a roof terrace serving a residential unit that is split over lower and upper ground floor levels. The roof terrace is located on the flat roof of the lower ground floor accommodation and is accessed via a UPVC door at upper ground floor level. The proposal under Appeal A seeks to retain a reduced area of about 19.2sqm of the roof terrace along with obscure glazed screens. Under Appeal B the proposal retains a smaller area of 8.1sqm of the roof terrace with obscure glazed screens. The proposed obscure glazed screens due to their lightweight construction and simple form would not detract from the subordinate nature of the existing flat roofed section of the host property and would complement the contemporary style of the Godson Yard development. These screens would also largely conceal the timber decking and any paraphernalia associated with the roof terrace. As such, the proposal would not result in any unacceptable visual clutter. Furthermore, the overall extent of the roof terraces as proposed under Appeal A and Appeal B would be modest, relative to the scale and massing of nearby buildings. UPVC doors are not uncommon to the Godson Yard development and due to its recessed location along the rear of a building, the existing UPVC door does not compromise its appearance. In respect of both proposals, although views towards the upper floor rear facing windows of the host building are available from the roof terrace, these are not direct due to the higher levels of these windows, and this arrangement does not cause any unacceptable loss of privacy. In respect of Appeal A, the installation of the obscure glazed screens around the proposed roof terrace would eliminate any overlooking of other neighbouring properties and their amenity areas. However, the proposal under Appeal B does not incorporate any screening along part of the shared boundary with No 237. Consequently, the use of this area to access the roof terrace would result in overlooking of a rear facing window and amenity areas associated with No 237, resulting in the unacceptable loss of privacy for its occupants. In respect of Appeal A, I also find no conflict with policies ENV 13 of the UDP and S29 of the WCP. Together, these policies aim to protect the amenities of neighbours with regard to daylight and sunlight and require that developments should not result in a significant increase in the sense of enclosure or overlooking. Nevertheless, for the above reasons, the proposal under Appeal B would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 237 with regard to overlooking and loss of privacy. This is in conflict with policies ENV 13 of the UDP and S29 of the WCP. Appeal B was dismissed</p>		

Address: 2 Godson Yard London NW6 5FE MAIDA VALE WARD

Description: Continued use of part of flat roof at rear raised ground level of property as a roof terrace, installation of obscure glazing and retention of timber decking and doorway onto the terrace.

Appellant: Mrs Nazma Nielsen, 2, Godson Yard, London, NW6 5FE

Agent: Monica Mehmi, 14 Devonshire Mews, LONDON, W4 2HA

Decision Date: 16 March 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 16 March 2021

Procedure: Written Representations **PINS Reference:** D/20/3253582

Decision: **Dismissed** **Case Number:** 19/09384/FULL

Officer: Frederica Cooney **Telephone:** 07866037206

Address: Basement And Ground Floor 16 Irving Street London WC2H 7AU ST JAMES'S WARD

Description: Enforcement Appeal - Unauthorised shopfront

Appellant: Mr Charanjit Singh, Woodblox Limited , 16 Irving Street , Leicester Square , London, WC2H 7AU

Agent: Mr K Kara, 352 GREEN LANES, , PALMAS GREEN , London N13 5TJ

Decision Date: 10 March 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 06 March 2020

Procedure: Written Representations **PINS Reference:** C/20/3263115

Decision: **Dismissed** **Case Number:** 19/69703/E

Officer: Nse Inyang **Telephone:** 07866034925

Address: **Basement And Ground Floor Seaford House 105** **MARYLEBONE HIGH STREET**
Marylebone High Street London W1U 4RS **WARD**

Description: Installation of service hatch within the pavement.

Appellant: Mr Avron Alhadeff, 239 Pavilion Road, LONDON, SW1X 0BP

Agent: Mr Clive Cunio, 6 The Downs, ALTRINCHAM, WA14 2PU

Decision Date: 03 March 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 03 March 2021

Procedure: Written Representations **PINS Reference:** W/20/3261481

Decision: **Allowed** **Case Number:** 20/01028/FULL

Officer: Shaun Retzback **Telephone:** 07866039589

Comments: The application for the installation of service hatch within the pavement had been refused on the grounds that it would create disruption to the pedestrian pavement and degrade the quality of the public realm, contrary to the Council's relevant planning policies.

The Inspector noted that surveys (prior to Covid-19 restrictions) showed relatively low pedestrian flows past the appeal premises; he also noted that the hatch would be installed on the pavement closest to the premise's frontage - the pavement is approximately 3.89m wide and 2.6m width would be available when the hatch is open, which in his opinion could comfortably accommodate the volumes of pedestrian traffic measured during the survey.

Deliveries would take approximately 15 minutes between 07:00 – 10:30hrs, prior to the busiest periods of pedestrian traffic. Given the limited duration of use at a less busy part of the day, when open the hatch would not be likely to have a material adverse effect upon pedestrian movement. The appellant had submitted an Operational Management Plan (OMP) but the Inspector acknowledged that it requires further precision and clarification in respect of matters such as the type and extent of barriers and the duration over which staff would supervise deliveries. A revised OMP to ensure safe supervised operation and the hours of use was secured by planning condition. The hatch would be constructed of robust materials and it being maintained as such thereafter is also secured by planning condition.

The appellant is required to obtain consent from the Highway Authority (HA) under section 180 of the Highways Act 1980 prior to any works commencing. Although the Council as HA had indicated it would not be supportive of an application for consent, the Inspector stated that this is a different consenting regime with different processes under different legislation and was not relevant as far as his consideration of the land use matters were concerned.

The Inspector thus concluded that the development would not have a harmful effect upon pedestrian movement, convenience, or safety, and therefore would not create a disruption to the use of the pedestrian pavement. He also considered that the hatch would not degrade the public realm and therefore would preserve the character and appearance of the Harley Street Conservation Area.

Address:	87 Morshead Mansions Morshead Road London W9 1LG	MAIDA VALE WARD
Description:	Loft conversion and new roof lights to top floor flat.	
Appellant:	Angelique Schmitt, 87 Morshead Mansions, Morshead Road, London, W9 1LG	
Agent:	Mr Denis Balent, 96 Westbourne Terrace , 4 , LONDON , W2 6QE,	
Decision Date:	02 March 2021	WCC Resolution: 02 March 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: W/20/3253872
Decision:	Dismissed	Case Number: 20/02454/FULL
Officer:	Alistair Taylor	Telephone: 07866037603

Address:	18 Queen Anne's Gate London SW1H 9AA	ST JAMES'S WARD
Description:	Internal alterations to add fabric wall lining to reception and front room at ground floor level and reception at first floor level.	
Appellant:	Lady - The Dowager Viscountess Rothermere, c/o Agent, London, SW8 1NZ	
Agent:	Mr Mark Rattue, Old Church Court, Claylands Road, Oval, London, SW8 1NZ	
Decision Date:	18 March 2021	WCC Resolution: 18 March 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: Y/20/3257178
Decision:	Allowed	Case Number: 20/02180/LBC
Officer:	Allison Borden	Telephone: 07971093106
Comments:	Listed building consent was sought for new fabric wall lining in 3 principle rooms, which would be held in place by a grid of approx. 6mm timber battens fixed by staples to the walls. Where the lining would come up against internal architectural features, the battens would sit against these. For example, a batten supporting the lining would be fixed parallel and adjacent to the top face of the dado rail.	

No evidence was submitted to show that the walls in this grade I listed building were ever lined with fabric and the available information about interior decoration of the period indicates that fabric wall hangings were generally unfashionable and declining significantly in popularity after 1760 and that they were displaced by wallpapers apart from the largest country houses. This was particularly the case in London where fabric wall hangings were even less fashionable than they were elsewhere.

The application documents included an image of an interior at 14 Queen Anne's Gate showing an example of blue damask hangings. However, 14 Queen Anne's Gate exhibited a markedly different (probably unique) interior decorative scheme. It appears this image was copied from the book devoted to 14, "The Museum by the Park: 14 Queen Anne's Gate". 14, and to a lesser extent 16 Queen Anne's Gate, would be considered the grandest houses in the terrace of which 18 is a part. 18 effectively acts as a transition between these grand houses and the more modest houses at 20-24.

Although examples of other houses from the C18 that feature hanging wall fabric were submitted as part of the application, including Castle Howard, Osterley Park, Shugborough Hall, Spencer House, Apsley House, Buckingham Palace and Hertford House (The Wallace Collection), these are all very grand houses. In some instances, it appears that fabric wall hangings in these houses were introduced as part of C19 decorative schemes.

The applicant also argued that the fabric wall hangings would be fully reversible, this is not the only consideration that needs to be taken into account in assessing the impact of work on the listed building. The framework of battens would effectively move the wall surface into the room and reduce the projection of architectural features, including the skirting in the park-facing room and the dado rail, cornice and architraves in the reception rooms. Although the projections of these features would still be legible, this would be to a much lesser degree due to the depth of the battens and upholstery.

The application was refused for lack of sufficient justification and unsuitability for a townhouse of this age and type and harmful to the character of this highly significant interior / the building's architectural and historic significance.

The Inspector disagreed with our assessment of:
- the difference in the type of property between 14 Queen Anne's Gate and the subject property stating that they "continue to share a relative grandeur of scale and location, being

prestigiously situated in Westminster, close to St James's Palace and parliament, with views over St James's Park."

- the conclusions we drew from specialist publications on wall coverings/ interior wall decoration during the Georgian period (referred to in the delegated report) stating that "fabric wall hangings were used in 'grander' Georgian properties."
- the impact of the works on the spatial character of these rooms and the appreciation of their existing architectural features based on a condition being attached "to ensure that it is authentic to the Georgian period and respects the prominence of the retained historic interior features described above." and on the fact that "The proposed wall decor would be reversible." However, Condition 3 attached to the Inspector's decision makes no reference to the relationship of the new wall upholstery to retained features it just requires details [drawn to no specified scale] and material samples.

Another comment was made in the Inspector's report that "Prestigious vistas would continue to contribute to how the historic character of the building is appreciated from within the appeal rooms." But is unclear to what 'prestigious vistas' the Inspector refers (I consider this a term that applies to views out of doors).

Address:	22 - 32 Shaftesbury Avenue London W1D 7EJ	ST JAMES'S WARD
Description:	Display of illuminated projecting sign measuring 1400 mm x 1800 mm at first floor level.	
Appellant:	Little Lion Entertainment Ltd, 22-32, Shaftesbury Avenue, London, W1D 7EU	
Agent:	Mr Jon Payne, The Old Counting House, 82E High Street, Wallingford, OX10 0BS	
Decision Date:	23 March 2021	WCC Resolution: 23 March 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: Y/20/3254987
Decision:	Dismissed	Case Number: 20/02190/LBC
Officer:	Holly Sharpley	Telephone: 07779431074

Address:	55A St John's Wood High Street London NW8 7NL	REGENT'S PARK WARD
Description:	Glazed door and fixed light to ground floor level front elevation .	
Appellant:	Mr Ahmad Mehri, 55A St Johns Wood High Street, London, NW8 7NL	
Agent:	Miss Mitra Nia, 39 Staveley Road, ASHFORD, TW15 1TF	
Decision Date:	30 March 2021	WCC Resolution: 30 March 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: W/20/3261086
Decision:	No further action by PINS	Case Number: 20/05129/FULL
Officer:	Alistair Taylor	Telephone: 07866037603

Address: 108 Star Street London W2 1QF HYDE PARK WARD

Description: Use of an area of the public highway measuring 4.11m x 1.66m for placing of three tables and six chairs in connection with the ground floor use.

Appellant: Mr Mikaeel Dada, HADSON HOUSE, 432 EDGWARE ROAD, LONDON, W2 1EG

Agent: , No Agent

Decision Date: 31 March 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 31 March 2021

Procedure: Written Representations **PINS Reference:** W/20/3252883

Decision: **Dismissed** **Case Number:** 20/01116/TCH

Officer: Harry Berks **Telephone:** 07866037030

Address: 48-50 Warrington Crescent London W9 1EP LITTLE VENICE WARD

Description: Erection of roof extension to 48 and 50 Warrington Crescent to provide additional accommodation for the existing single family dwelling at No 48 and in association with the use of the third and fourth floors of No 50 as two self contained residential units (Class C3).

Appellant: Mr Herman, C/o Agent, Reigate, RH2 0EQ

Agent: Mr Kevin Goodwin, Birdhurst Lodge , 77 Wray Park Road, REIGATE, RH2 0EQ

Decision Date: 05 March 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 05 March 2021

Procedure: Written Representations **PINS Reference:** W/20/3261746

Decision: **Dismissed** **Case Number:** 20/04125/FULL

Officer: Alistair Taylor **Telephone:** 07866037603

Address:	48 Westbourne Terrace London W2 3UH	HYDE PARK WARD
Description:	Variation of condition 1 of listed building consent dated 03 December 2014 (RN: 14/08445/LBC) for the installation of boilers and vents to vault wall with associated pipework and repair of existing skylight to rear of property (Flat C). NAMELY, to vary approved plans to amend design of flue system.	
Appellant:	Mark Defoe, 141A, Stamford Hill, LONDON, N16 5LG	
Agent:	Mr Mark Defoe, 16 Chester Row, LONDON, SW1W 9JH	
Decision Date:	15 March 2021	WCC Resolution: 15 March 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: Y/20/3260137
Decision:	No further action by PINS	Case Number: 19/09617/LBC
Officer:	Alistair Taylor	Telephone: 07866037603
