

Address: 182-184 Edgware Road London W2 2DS **BRYANSTON & DORSET
SQUARE WARD**

Description: Use of the basement and ground floor as an adult gaming centre (sui generis).

Appellant: Cashino Gaming Ltd, c/o agent, c/o agent, c/o agent, c/o agent, c/o agent, c/o agent

Agent: Planning Potential, Magdalen House, 148 Tooley Street, London, SE1 2TU, United Kingdom

Decision Date: 30 September 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 30 September 2021

Procedure: Written Representations **PINS Reference:** W/21/3266795

Decision: **Allowed** **Case Number:** 20/05549/FULL

Officer: Rupert Handley **Telephone:** 07866036401

Comments: The inspector decided that due to the existing use as a Betting Office, and given the granting of the license, that the proposed Casino would not cause undue harm to the surrounding environment or shopping district.

Address: 31 Linhope Street London NW1 6HU **BRYANSTON & DORSET
SQUARE WARD**

Description: Erection of single storey rear extension at ground floor, installation of new rooflights to ground floor rear extension and second floor butterfly roof and installation of new window to rear elevation.

Appellant: F Koumbarji, 31, Linhope Street, London, NW1 6HU

Agent: Mr Tim Waters,

Decision Date: 27 September 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 27 September 2021

Procedure: **PINS Reference:** D/21/3275042

Decision: **Allowed** **Case Number:** 21/00419/FULL

Officer: Shui-Fung Siu **Telephone:** 07866036318

Comments: Main issue relates to the erection of a single storey rear extension and the effect on the character and appearance of the building and conservation area (CA). The Inspector considered the rear elevations not to positively contribute to the CA given the wide variety of modifications and lack of public intervisibility and therefore considered the proposed rear extension acceptable in design and relationship with the building and context.

Address: 92 Mount Street London W1K 2SX WEST END WARD

Description: Variation of Conditions 1 and 4 of listed building consent dated 01 February 2018 (RN: 17/10854/LBC) for, 'Installation of replacement windows on the front and rear elevations at second floor level'; NAMELY, to vary the drawing relating to chimney pieces FP02 and FP03 to be changed from 'fireplace to be restored' to 'fireplace to be renewed'.

Appellant: Mr. Richard Pierce, Flat 2, 92, Mount Street, London, W1K 2SX

Agent: Mr Richard Pierce, Flat 2, 92, Mount Street, London, W1K 2SX

Decision Date: 20 September 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 20 September 2021

Procedure: Written Representations **PINS Reference:** Y/20/3261046

Decision: **Dismissed** **Case Number:** 20/04664/LBC

Officer: Holly Sharpley **Telephone:** 07779431074

Address: 5 Newport Place London WC2H 7JN ST JAMES'S WARD

Description: Enforcement Appeal - Installation of LED lights on the shopfront

Appellant: Mr John Leung, 5 Newport Place, London, WC2H 7JN

Agent: Mr Calvin Ho, 5 Tanner Street, London, London, SE1 3LE

Decision Date: 22 September 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 22 September 2021

Procedure: Written Representations **PINS Reference:** C/20/3263569

Decision: **Dismissed** **Case Number:** 20/72623/E

Officer: Stephen Pavett **Telephone:** 07866034463

Address: 68 Queensway London W2 3RL LANCASTER GATE WARD

Description: Enforcement Appeal - Display of advertisements on railings

Appellant: Asad Shaidy, 68 Queensway, London, W2 3RL

Agent: , No Agent

Decision Date: 01 September 2021 **WCC Resolution:** 01 September 2021

Procedure: Written Representations **PINS Reference:** G/21/3271552

Decision: **Allowed** **Case Number:** 12/49498/F

Officer: Karen Ball **Telephone:** 07800721130

Comments: The complaint regarded four advertisements attached to railings perpendicular to the shopfront. The advertisements had deemed consent under Class 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 but were considered to be causing substantial harm to the amenity of the local area. Following a long history of trying to have the advertisements removed, a discontinuance notice was issued on 18 January 2021. The decision to pursue discontinuance action was consistent with a previous investigation at 104 Queensway, where a discontinuance notice successfully secured the removal of two large advertisements attached to railings which were perpendicular to the shopfront. However, an appeal against our notice was lodged and the appeal was successful; the Inspector concluded that Queensway is visually cluttered at ground floor level and there is a lack of cohesion in the design of property frontages and advertisements. In this context, the Inspector concluded the advertisements were not causing substantial harm to the amenity of the local area. The Inspector also found that the special interest of the Conservation Area was not diminished by the advertisements. Therefore, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area was preserved. Accordingly, the appeal was allowed.

Address:	Flat 22 29 Westbourne Terrace London W2 3UN	HYDE PARK WARD
Description:	Erection of single storey full width rear extension, installation of new and replacement windows and rooflights. Internal alterations including the addition and removal of partitions and replacement of floor coverings (LINKED TO 20/03218/FULL).	
Appellant:	Gillian Hardy, Flat 22, 29, Westbourne Terrace, London, W2 3UN	
Agent:	Ms Kate Matthews, Firstplan, Broadwall House, 21 Broadwall, LONDON, SE1 9PL	
Decision Date:	28 September 2021	WCC Resolution: 28 September 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: Y/20/3260318
Decision:	Allowed	Case Number: 20/03219/LBC
Officer:	Shui-Fung Siu	Telephone: 07866036318
Comments:	<p>The main issues are the effect of the proposal on i) the special interest of the Grade II listed building, Nos 1 – 31 Westbourne Terrace (odd) and 196B and C Craven Road, and its setting; and ii) the character or appearance of the Bayswater Conservation Area. The Inspector considered the special interest and significance of the listed building are largely derived from its historic and architectural interests. Its historic interest principally relates to its age and fine illustration of mid-19th century domestic architecture, being part of the Tyburnia area. The building's architectural interest mainly relates to the grand proportions and satisfying symmetry of its handsome frontage as well as the notable contribution it makes to the composition of the surrounding townscape. Also the relationship between the imposing principal buildings and the smaller mews properties in Conduit Mews positively contributes to the setting and significance of the building.</p> <p>Officers argued a visible consistent rear building line in the immediate vicinity, however the Inspector considered Flat 22 was of no architectural merit and a large number of buildings in the terrace as a whole had changed with incremental additions and alteration. It was acknowledged the proposal would effect the setting, however the Inspector was satisfied that the proposal would retain a sufficient amount of space and division to allow the historic pattern of the development and the relationship between the two buildings to be sensed and understood. The extension was acceptable in design terms with a neutral effect on its setting and no harm to the CA.</p>	

Address:	Flat 22 29 Westbourne Terrace London W2 3UN	HYDE PARK WARD
Description:	Erection of single storey full width rear extension, installation of new and replacement windows and rooflights (LINKED TO 20/03219/LBC).	
Appellant:	Gillian Hardy, Flat 22, 29, Westbourne Terrace, London, W2 3UN	
Agent:	Ms Kate Matthews, Firstplan, Broadwall House, 21 Broadwall, LONDON, SE1 9PL	
Decision Date:	28 September 2021	WCC Resolution: 28 September 2021
Procedure:	Written Representations	PINS Reference: W/20/3260315
Decision:	Allowed	Case Number: 20/03218/FULL
Officer:	Shui-Fung Siu	Telephone: 07866036318
Comments:	<p>The main issues are the effect of the proposal on i) the special interest of the Grade II listed building, Nos 1 – 31 Westbourne Terrace (odd) and 196B and C Craven Road, and its setting; and ii) the character or appearance of the Bayswater Conservation Area. The Inspector considered the special interest and significance of the listed building are largely derived from its historic and architectural interests. Its historic interest principally relates to its age and fine illustration of mid-19th century domestic architecture, being part of the Tyburnia area. The building's architectural interest mainly relates to the grand proportions and satisfying symmetry of its handsome frontage as well as the notable contribution it makes to the composition of the surrounding townscape. Also the relationship between the imposing principal buildings and the smaller mews properties in Conduit Mews positively contributes to the setting and significance of the building.</p> <p>Officers argued a visible consistent rear building line in the immediate vicinity, however the Inspector considered Flat 22 was of no architectural merit and a large number of buildings in the terrace as a whole had changed with incremental additions and alteration. It was acknowledged the proposal would effect the setting, however the Inspector was satisfied that the proposal would retain a sufficient amount of space and division to allow the historic pattern of the development and the relationship between the two buildings to be sensed and understood. The extension was acceptable in design terms with a neutral effect on its setting and no harm to the CA.</p>	
