



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 17 August 2020

**by G D Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19 October 2020**

---

### **Appeal A - Ref: APP/X5990/Y/19/3237720**

#### **65-67 Belgrave Road, London SW1V 2BG**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Hirji of Ashley Hotels Victoria Limited against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
  - The application Ref 19/02606/LBC, dated 22 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2019.
  - The works proposed are described as a *rear ground floor extension*.
- 

### **Appeal B - Ref: APP/X5990/W/19/3237717**

#### **65-67 Belgrave Road, London SW1V 2BG**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Hirji of Ashley Hotels Victoria Limited against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
  - The application Ref 19/02185/FULL, dated 22 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2019.
  - The development proposed is described as a *rear ground floor extension*.
- 

### **Decisions**

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

### **Preliminary Matter**

3. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

### **Main Issue**

4. The main issue is the effect that the proposed works and development would have on 65-113 Belgrave Road as a Grade II listed building and on the character or appearance of the Pimlico Conservation Area.

### **Reasons**

5. The appeal site is occupied by a hotel, which extends across two former houses, Nos 65 and 67. It is located within a terrace of similar properties, 65-113 Belgrave Road, which is a Grade II listed building (the LB). The listing refers to its group value. The LB stands within the Pimlico Conservation Area (the PCA).

6. Many of the properties in the vicinity have also been converted from their original residential use to commercial premises, including several other hotels. The townscape of the area predominantly features imposing terraced rows, finished with cream stucco, arranged along broad avenues. These features and characteristics contribute significantly to the character and appearance of the PCA and it is in large part from these that its significance derives. The LB dates from the mid-19th Century. Its significance and special interest stem primarily from its architectural quality and from it being a good example of the terraces that are typical of the PCA.
7. It is proposed to erect a single storey extension to the rear of both Nos 65 and 67 at lower ground floor level, which would replace a much smaller plant room which stands to the rear of part of No 67 only. Taken in isolation, the proposed removal of the plant room structure would represent an improvement, due largely to its unsympathetic, functional design. However, any such benefits would be modest given its very limited scale and as it clearly reads as a modern addition.
8. In any event, the plant room structure would be replaced by the proposed extension, which would be considerably larger, occupying the entire space to the rear of No 67 and much of the remaining space to the rear of No 65. It appears that a significant proportion of the properties in the vicinity maintain traditional closet wing outriggers with courtyard gardens, notwithstanding that many have been extended. Due to its siting and overall size, particularly its footprint, the proposed extension would significantly undermine the traditional composition of the LB, particularly No 67, diminishing its legibility as a historic terrace.
9. Consequently, the extension would harm the significance and special interest of the LB. The harm to the LB, as a terrace that is typical of the historic development of the area, would also detrimentally affect the significance of the PCA. The resulting harm to the LB's and to the PCA's significance would both be less than substantial in the terms of para 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. Given the statutory duties outlined above regarding listed buildings and conservation areas, the identified harm to the two heritage assets each carry substantial weight against the proposed development, such that they comfortably outweigh the relatively modest identified and potential public benefits. These include those associated with improving the hotel's facilities, and the replacement of some existing rainwater goods and windows with more sympathetic equivalents. In coming to this conclusion, I have been mindful that there is no clear evidence that any such benefits could not be achieved by other, less harmful means.
11. Therefore, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the PCA, thus failing to satisfy the requirements of the Act and para 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It would also conflict with Policies S25 (Heritage) and S28 (Design) of the Westminster City Plan, November 2016, and Policies DES 1 (Urban Design and Conservation), DES 5 (Alterations and Extensions) and DES 10 (A) (Listed Buildings) of the City of Westminster Unitary Development Plan, January 2007.

## **Conclusions**

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

*G D Jones*

INSPECTOR