
Appeal Decisions

Site Visit made on 20 October 2021

by A Edgington BSc (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2021

Appeal A Ref: APP/K5600/W/21/3270833

2 Stanley Crescent, LONDON, W11 2NB

- 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 Eric Fellner against the decision of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref PP/20/05786, dated 15 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is Alter external mansard shape. Alter 2nd & 3rd floor plan, connecting stair & section. Remove Lower Ground Floor Utility Room. Replace chimney pots.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/K5600/Y/21/3270836

2 Stanley Crescent, LONDON, W11 2NB

- The appeal is made under sections 20 and 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant conservation area consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Eric Fellner against the decision of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. The application Ref LB/20/05788, dated 15 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2020.
 - The demolition proposed is Alter external mansard shape. Alter 2nd & 3rd floor plan, connecting stair & section. Remove Lower Ground Floor Utility Room. Replace chimney pots.
-

Decision – Appeal A

1. Appeal A is allowed insofar as it is concerned with removal of ground floor utility room and replacement of chimney pots at 2 Stanley Crescent, London W11 2NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PP/20/05786, dated 15 October 2020, subject to the conditions appended to this decision.
2. Appeal A is dismissed in respect of the alterations to external mansard shape, alterations to 2nd and 3rd floor plan, connecting stair and section.

Decision – Appeal B

3. Appeal B is allowed and listed building consent is granted in respect of the removal of ground floor utility room and replacement of chimney pots at 2 Stanley Crescent, London W11 2NB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref LB/20/05788 dated 15 October 2020, subject to the conditions appended to this decision.
4. Appeal B is dismissed and listed building consent is refused in respect of alterations to external mansard shape, alterations to 2nd and 3rd floor plan, connecting stair and section.

Preliminary Matters

5. To avoid duplication, I have considered the appeals together where appropriate.
6. The Council made an error on its decision for listed building consent. This was rectified at appeal stage. I see no reason not to consider the interior of the building in respect of listed building consent.
7. The appeal statement refers to the removal of a chimney piece in the first floor master bedroom. I have presumed that this should refer to the master bedroom on the second floor.
8. The appellant raised a concern during the appeal that the Council's statement was accepted despite it missing the procedural deadline. I am aware that councils have recently experienced difficult working conditions and I saw no reason to refuse the request to submit a late statement. Moreover, prejudice could only have arisen in this regard if the appellant was denied an opportunity to comment on the Council's statement, which was not the case.

Main Issues

9. The main issue is whether the development and works would preserve the Grade II listed 1–9 Stanley Crescent and the Park and Garden listed Grade II Ladbroke Estate or any features of special architectural or historic interest, including setting, and whether the development and works would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Ladbroke Conservation Area (LCA) (Appeals A and B).

Reasons

Heritage Assets

1-9 Stanley Gardens

10. Number 2 Stanley Crescent (No 2) is a mid-1850's terrace, comprising three storeys plus basement and attic, which forms part of the listed 1-9 Stanley Crescent (Nos 1–9). It occupies a prominent corner site near the end of an imposing curved terrace, set back from the footway by modest lightwells.
11. The listing notes that No 2 is paired with the adjoining 3 Stanley Gardens (No 3). It shares with No 3 features including stuccoed front and rear elevations, a channelled and rusticated ground floor, pedimented windows at first floor level, dentilled cornices and bottle balustrades, and bold doric porticos. Although individual dwellings in and around Stanley Crescent display a striking similarity in architectural style and a strong consistency of scale and detailing on both front and rear elevations, there is a conspicuous absence of symmetry or rigid repetition between individual dwellings.
12. As a consequence of its corner site, No 2 has a distinctive wedge shaped footprint, with a four-storey stair tower occupying the triangular space between No 2 and the adjoining dwelling. The stair tower's curved elevation, with its full height campanile style tower above the cornice, is highly prominent and distinctive. The wide and angled corner site, which facilitates the open-well staircase, was of sufficient note to be mentioned in the Survey of London at the time.

13. Stanley Crescent forms one half of the central circus designed to be the nucleus of the Ladbroke Estate, and it is regarded as one of the most accomplished set pieces of the wider development. The heritage statement notes that No 2 contributes to the *spectacular external effect* of Stanley Crescent and the similar terraces and houses nearby, and that it is characteristic of Thomas Allom's picturesque approach to urban design. I see no reason to disagree.
14. The listed building taken as a whole has a distinctive Italianate 'palace fronted' terrace appearance, which is as opulent at the rear as it is at the front. Number 2's external typology makes a highly positive individual and collective contribution to the remaining building, as well as to the street scene to the front and to the adjoining Ladbroke Estate gardens (the gardens) to the rear.
15. The evidence before me indicates that No 2 has undergone considerable internal and external alterations. A second floor rear bay and mansard roof extension were added in the late 20th century, and the plan form of both the first and second floors of the main house have also been significantly altered.
16. However, each floor of the main house is still accessed from the stair tower from what appears to be more or less the original opening in the internal stair tower wall. The mansard roof extension is accessed from a new staircase located within the main body of the house rather than the stair tower. The roof extension incorporates the original third floor room at the top of the stair tower.
17. The stair tower itself appears to be largely intact, with three sweeping staircases with original ironwork and timber balustrades connecting the lower ground, ground, first and second floors. The appeal statements suggest that No 2's original internal features were swept away in the 1980's, but it is unclear whether this included the timber and plaster moulding and ornamentation in the stair tower that I noticed at my visit.
18. I acknowledge that the original cast iron balustrade changes to timber for the final flight of the original staircase, but the evidence suggests that this is reflective of the stop-stop nature of No 2's development. It adds to the appreciation of No 2's chequered history and I see no reason why the change in balustrade should detract from the importance of the three original staircases as retained features. In any case, it could be reflective of the lesser status of a staircase to the second floor.
19. The plans show that chimney breasts are to be found on the party wall with No 3 on all floors except the roof extension, and on the party wall with No 1 on all floors except the roof extension and the lower ground floor.
20. Notwithstanding the 20th century alterations, authentic internal fabric is largely to be found in the stair tower and its graceful sweeping staircases, the largely intact plan forms of the lower ground and ground floors and retained chimney breasts and/or fireplaces.
21. I conclude that the significance of No 2 arises from its intact historic fabric, and its external stylistic relationship with the remaining parts of the terrace. There are also historic links arising from the listed building's association with the prominent architects and developers who planned and built the Ladbroke Estate.

22. As such, I agree with the appellant that the extent and condition of No 2's external fabric makes a substantial contribution to its appreciation as well as to an understanding of the socio-economic conditions that fuelled the speculative development of the Ladbroke Estate. However, I disagree that the extensive survival of mid-19th century interiors in the area should necessarily diminish the importance of No 2's remaining internal features, particularly in relation to the stair tower.

Ladbroke Estate

23. The Parks and Gardens listing comprises sixteen mid-19th century private gardens, laid out between the terraces as an integral part of the setting for the residential development. The D-shaped gardens behind No 2 follow the curve of Stanley Crescent on one side and the straight line of the Ladbroke Grove frontage on the other. The path layout has been simplified from its original layout, and the gardens were restored in the late 20th century.
24. The rear elevations of Stanley Crescent form a richly detailed and theatrical backdrop for the gardens. The terrace was clearly designed to be seen from the rear. Dwellings of a similar period line Ladbroke Grove, but these have rather more austere brick rear elevations, which lack the studied excess of Stanley Crescent.
25. The gardens are heavily populated with mature shrubs and trees which limit intervisibility between the terraces and the gardens. Nonetheless, I noticed that there are direct views of No 2's imposing rear elevation from within the gardens. I also concluded that there would be unobstructed and elevated views of No 2 in the context of the remaining listed building from within the dwellings on Ladbroke Grove.
26. The significance of the gardens is derived from its immediate spatial and visual relationship with the nearby building pattern, particularly Stanley Crescent, and its position within the central planned circus.

Ladbroke Conservation Area

27. The Ladbroke Estate was a large scale speculative development, based largely on plans drawn up by Thomas Allason. It combined large and elaborate residential terraces with long communal gardens, and a formal and highly structured street plan. Stanley Crescent's principal elevations face outwards to partially enclose the gardens to the rear, and it is the prime example of the underlying ethos to provide architectural set pieces and vistas within the Ladbroke Estate.
28. As such, in a conservation area with a wealth of well-maintained and impressive buildings, all dating from broadly the same period and using materials and detailing from a very limited palette, Stanley Crescent is one of the most important streets.
29. The significance of the LCA therefore derives from the sheer extent and exuberance of the built environment, which largely retains its original layout and drama. Significance also arises from the intimately scaled gardens glimpsed from the road, and whose full extent can only be appreciated from within or from the rear of the adjoining buildings.

Proposals and Effects – 1-9 Stanley Crescent

Lower Ground Floor

30. At lower ground floor level, a late 20th century cupboard that encloses the inner curve of the original staircase would be removed. The depth of the walls behind the staircase, together with recesses redolent of purpose-built storage areas, suggests that these walls date from No 2's original construction. The underlying plan form of this floor reflects its ancillary function.
31. Reconfiguration of the existing toilet and shower room would result in the opening up of what appears to be a doorway on the 1983 survey¹, and the creation of a partition across a void. There would be a very minor loss of fabric of what appears to be the original wall. However, it appears that the work undertaken in the 1980's diminished the integrity of the layout of this area, and I am satisfied that what is proposed here would not cause particular or further harm.
32. Moreover, the removal of the cupboard would open up the sweep of the staircase. The Council has argued that this staircase would not have been exposed historically but whilst I appreciate that argument in principle, there is very little evidence before me to indicate that this staircase has been enclosed at any point in the past. The 1983 survey indicates that at that time at least, the staircase was fully exposed and the current survey plans do not indicate areas of solid walls on its inner curve. I conclude that removing the cupboard and opening up the staircase would amount to a minor benefit to No 2 in heritage terms.

Second Floor

33. The second floor's layout has been considerably altered beyond the stair tower. There are remnants of pre-1935 partition walling between the two rear rooms, which together with the lobby entrance from the stair tower, appears to be all that remains of the former plan form. The rear bedroom has a broadly central chimney breast with fire surround, and the smaller study also has a chimney breast. Both appear to be continuations of chimney breasts on floors below.
34. A 20th century L-shaped staircase links the lobby to the third-floor roof extension. The removal and relocation of this staircase to a position where it is entered from the stair tower would free up space within the main body of the house, enabling the two rear rooms to be combined. However, notwithstanding that there has been a high level of 20th century intervention on this floor, the combining of the two rear rooms would detract from such character as remains from the remnants of the original plan form.
35. The evidence suggests that the study is a new room created when the staircase to the roof extension was added, but the pre-1935 partition and the 1983 survey appear to conflict with this argument. I appreciate that the study's dimensions may have altered to accommodate the staircase but there was clearly a separate room in this location in 1983, before the staircase was built.
36. It is also proposed to blank off the recesses on each side of the original chimney breast in the main bedroom and to remove the fireplace. A fireplace would be relocated where there is currently a chimney breast in the study. As

¹ Philip Mercer – Sketch Survey Basement

such, rather than being the main focal point of the room and on the longest wall, the fireplace would be located between two wardrobes on the shorter side wall. This would alter the dynamics of the underlying plan form which demonstrates the importance of the larger room and its key residual features. Relocating the fireplace within the combined room would not offset or compensate for removing the fireplace from its original location. Whilst the existing fire surround did not appear to be contemporaneous with No 2's origins, this does not alter my concerns in relation to the loss of the existing fireplace.

37. The evidence suggests that the recesses could be retained and it is the case that they could be blocked off with lightweight partitions. Conditions could also ensure the retention of the fireplace behind. However, this does not alter my reasoning with regard to the plan form and the incremental loss of such features and character as remains on this floor. There would be a minor adverse effect on the appreciation of No 2.

Roof alterations

38. The current mansard roof is a 20th addition. The front mansard would not increase in height at the front but there would be an additional knee which would effectively extend the central flatter section of roof with a much steeper section behind the parapet. The windows would not be altered.
39. The front mansard would be very slightly more prominent in the views from the street and from the upper floors of dwellings nearby. However, from the street the change would be minimal as the bottle balustrade effectively obscures views from below. At further distance the change would be more visible but views of No 2 are limited by the underlying building pattern. Even where there are longer views, the mansard is a very minor part of the overall vista. Furthermore, understated mansards are commonplace in the vicinity.
40. The combination of minor changes to the front mansard roof and its minimal impact on the appreciation of No 2 and the remaining listed building, as well as the LCA leads me to conclude that works to the front mansard would not be detrimental to the significance of Nos 1-9 or to the LCA. These works would have a largely neutral effect on the significance of Nos 1-9.
41. At the rear, the existing mansard windows line up with the extended chimney stack and are set back from the balustrade by about 2.5 metres. The window heads are about 600mm above the top of the balustrade. I noticed that from the path on the furthest side of the gardens, the balustrade obscures views of the mansard roof. Extending the mansard's front line beyond the stack would make the top of the proposed mansard prominent on the roofline when viewed from the gardens. This is confirmed by the visualisations. I appreciate that it would be a minor addition when viewed from the gardens but the rear of No 2 is also viewed from the rear of the Ladbroke Grove frontage.
42. The rear alterations would add additional bulk to No 2's at roof level and would not be as recessive as the mansards and other roof works on the remaining listed building. Moreover, there is nothing before me to indicate that curved mansard roofs are a feature of the terrace or the wider area. It would become a roof feature which would diminish the apparent hierarchy of successive floors at No 2 and also alter the dynamic of No 2 within the remaining listed building.

43. I appreciate that the second floor bay window is a 20th century addition but this does not necessarily justify continuing that theme to No 2's roof, particularly as it would be closer to the parapet than the existing mansard. The stucco finish would also draw attention to the rear face of the mansard and make it appear prominent and incongruous.
44. Moreover, the evidence before me states that the design of the rear elevations of Nos 1- 9 is as considered and important as the front. Alterations that appear to increase the prominence and importance of one dwelling within the terrace would be counter to the underlying ethos of the design. The fact that the roof itself is an addition and the broader roofscape of Nos 1-9 is in itself altered and varied, does not justify the inclusion of what would be a prominent and intrusive addition. Furthermore, Policy CL8 of the Local Plan (LP) sets out that the Council will resist roof level alterations on buildings or terraces that already have an additional storey or mansard.
45. Recent works at 50 Ladbroke Grove have been highlighted. This is a large, detached brick dwelling that also looks over the gardens at its rear. However, it is not listed, and it is not part of a terrace with architectural consistency and coherence. An additional storey has been added through the building of a crown roof with dormers. The Inspector for the appeal noted that some of the historic significance of the roof had already been lost, and that *the additional bulk arising from the proposal retains proportions which were capable of accommodating the roof extension without compromising its contribution to the character and appearance of its surroundings*. Number 50 is also *smaller in height and overall scale to the many other buildings nearby*.
46. No 2 is one part of a long terrace which has striking similarities of scale and height. Although almost all the roofs appear to have been altered, the alterations are to be recessive and do not dominate the host building or detract from the status of the floors beneath. Number 50 is also a very different building from No 2 architecturally and is also a non-designated rather than a designated heritage asset. I conclude that that appeal is not comparable to what is before me. In any case each appeal is determined on its merits.
47. I appreciate that views from the gardens are glimpsed between mature vegetation, but current best practice suggests that screening from vegetation should not be given particular weight, as it cannot be presumed that vegetation will remain in perpetuity. In any case harm to heritage assets is not necessarily predicated upon visibility from the public realm.
48. As the roof extension is a 20th century extension, the proposed internal alterations to the third floor plan form would have a neutral impact on the significance of No 2.
49. It is proposed to replace the current motley collection of chimney stacks with a uniform model. This would be a minor benefit to the appreciation of Nos 1-9.

Staircase

50. There is a plant room on the second floor landing, located where the diagonal flank wall meets the internal stair tower wall. There is evidence within the plant room of a former opening in the internal wall. This has been filled with 20th century brickwork below what looks to be an angled timber lintel of some age.

51. Although a concrete lintel above the door in the outer wall of the plant room is highlighted in the evidence, the lintel is surrounded by brickwork similar to that above the timber lintel on the internal wall. There is also a corbelled structure of newer bricks on the diagonal flank wall in the plant room ceiling. From the 1983 surveys it appears that the former narrow and L-shaped staircase to the third floor tower room was accessed from within the main house's second floor and followed the diagonal wall to the tower room. I conclude that the corbelled and infill brickwork represent making good when the staircase was removed.
52. The proposed staircase would be accessed from the stair tower on the second floor landing and located alongside the diagonal wall, largely on the footprint of the plant room.
53. The existing staircases have seemingly identical geometry and plan form on all floors up to the second floor. What is proposed would have a similar width and curvature as the original staircases but would be rather oddly located in the corner of the landing against the diagonal wall. This would set up competing geometry and undermine the original hierarchy of the house which diminished on successive floors. It would not be subservient to the original staircase and would have neither the dimensions nor the footprint of the original staircase to the tower room. As the stair tower appears to be the most authentic area of the house and the one that has had the least intervention, I conclude that this would detract from appreciation of No 2 and diminish its significance.
54. I appreciate that the existing staircase is a 20th century addition and also bears little relation to the original. However, it does not impinge upon appreciation of the original staircases and landings.

Proposals and effects – Gardens

55. As set out above, the proposed alterations to No 2's rear mansard roof would be apparent from the gardens. There would be a minor adverse effect to the setting of the gardens.

Proposals and effects – LCA

56. I appreciate that the listed building was not designed as a consistent terrace but there is coherence within the architectural style used. Subsequent alterations, particularly at roof level, appear to have been designed to effect minimal change in the external fabric of the buildings concerned, whether they are viewed from street level or in elevated views from nearby buildings. I conclude that there would be a minor adverse effect on the LCA in respect of the alterations to the rear mansard, as set out above.

Heritage balance and conclusion

57. I have reached different conclusions in respect of the different elements of works. With regard to the mansard roof, second and third floor works and the proposed staircase, I conclude that the development and works would amount to less than substantial harm to Nos 1-9, the gardens and the LCA.
58. Paragraph 202 of the Framework notes that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate securing its optimum viable use. In this case there would not be any public benefits to weigh against the harm so

identified and I see no reason why the proposals are essential to ensure No 2's continued residential use.

59. The appellant argues that the harm would sit at the lower end of the spectrum of less than substantial harm. However, the courts have found that there are no intermediate categories of harm². Even if I found that the degree of harm was at the lower end of a notional spectrum of less than substantial harm, Paragraph 199 of the Framework states that irrespective of the identified level of harm, great weight should be given to an asset's conservation and that any harm requires convincing justification.
60. I appreciate that there have been substantial alterations to No 2 in the past, but this does not necessarily justify further intervention, or the ongoing and incremental loss of such surviving features as currently exist.
61. Moreover, the adverse effects set out above would outweigh the far lesser benefits arising from the works on the lower ground floor and the replacement chimney pots. There would not be a net heritage benefit. However, as the works to the lower ground floor and the chimney pots would be severable from the other works it would be appropriate to issue a split decision.
62. In the light of the above I conclude that the development and works to the second floor, mansard roof and proposed staircase would fail to preserve Nos 1-9's features of special architectural or historic interest. They would also diminish the setting of the gardens and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the LCA.
63. As such those aforementioned development and works would be contrary to Sections 16 (2), 66 (1) and 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), and Section 16 of the Framework which is concerned with the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets.
64. The development and works would also fail to accord with LP Policy CL1 which requires development to respect its context, character and appearance, and LP Policy CL2 which requires development to be locally distinctive, amongst other considerations. They would be contrary to LP Policies CL3 and CL4 which taken together require development and works to preserve or enhance designated assets, and LP Policy CL8 as set out above.
65. Those development and works would also be contrary to LP Policy CL11 which states that views within conservation areas, and that affect the setting of listed buildings, are to be preserved or enhanced.
66. The development and works to the lower ground floor and the chimney pots would not be contrary to the provisions of Sections 16 (2), 66 (1) and 72 (1) of the Act, or Section 16 of the Framework. There would be no conflict with LP Policies CL1, CL2, CL3, CL4, CL8 or CL11.

Conditions

67. In respect of the lower ground floor and the chimney pots I have imposed the standard time condition for both appeals and I have listed the approved drawings, for the avoidance of doubt. I have also imposed a condition requiring that all work and making good is to match existing in all respects, to

² R (oao James Hall and Co Ltd) v City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council and Co-operative Group Ltd [2019] EWHC 2899

retain existing fabric and to use lightweight internal partitions only. This is to ensure that all works are appropriate and do not prejudice the heritage merits of Nos 1-9, the gardens or the LCA.

68. In respect of the works to the lower ground floor staircase, there is only a plan drawing and a sketch 3D view. As such, I have required further details to be submitted and approved to ensure that the works do not prejudice the heritage merits of the listed building.
69. The Council has suggested a condition in relation to a construction management plan in order to ensure development works do not inconvenience neighbours in respect of noise, vibration or traffic congestion. However, given the scale, nature and extent of the approved works as well as the very low levels of traffic and on street parking I observed at my visit, I have concluded that this condition is not necessary to make the development and works acceptable in planning terms.

Other Matters

70. The evidence indicates that the site lies close to an Archaeological Priority Area. However, there is no further information in this regard and there is nothing before me to suggest that the development and works would have an adverse effect on the asset concerned.
71. The appellant notes that there is no reference to heritage or internal features in the 1985 appeal decision which allowed the roof extension. However, I do not have the evidence available to that Inspector at the time. In any case, legislation and guidance has changed since that period and I see no reason to given particular weight to this omission.
72. The final comments suggest that the second floor chimney piece, which I presume to be the fire surround, could be retained in its original position. However, this is not what is shown on the plan or described in the evidence. To take this suggestion into account at appeal could be prejudicial to the Council and as such I have given it no weight.

Conclusions

73. Paragraph 200 of the Framework sets out that any harm to the significance of a heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Whilst I appreciate that the appellant wishes to alter No 2, it has already undergone substantial extension and alteration in the last 40 years. There is very little before me to provide the clear and convincing justification required to justify the harm arising from development and works associated with the second floor, mansard roof and staircase.
74. The works to the lower ground floor and replacement chimney pots would result in minor benefits to the significance of No 2. However, this minor benefit would not outweigh the harm identified above to Nos 1-9, the LCA and the gardens arising from the alterations to the mansard roof, second and third floor plan form and the staircase. The proposals giving rise to harm would therefore fail to accord with the Act, the Framework or relevant local policies. I conclude that they would be contrary to the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations of such weight to lead me to conclude otherwise.

Appeal A

- 75. Appeal A is allowed insofar as it relates to the lower ground floor works and chimney pots.
- 76. Appeal A is dismissed insofar as it relates to the second and third floor plan forms, connecting stair and section.

Appeal B

- 77. Appeal B is allowed insofar as it relates to the lower ground floor works and chimney pots and listed building consent is granted.
- 78. Appeal B is dismissed insofar as it relates to the second and third floor plan forms, connecting stair and section and listed building consent is refused.

A Edgington

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

APPEAL A

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted is for the removal of ground floor utility room and replacement chimney pots only.
- 3) Except as required by condition 4 the development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the following submitted plans only: Dwg. Nos: 363/P0, 010/P2, 011/P2, 012/P0, 013/P0, 014/P0, 015/P0, 016/P0, 020/P1, 021/P0, 040/P1, 042/P0, 044/P0, 310/P2, 315/P1, 365/P0 and 320/P1, 321/P0, and 340/P2, 342/P0 and 344/P1 in respect of chimney pots only.
- 4) All work and work of making good shall be finished to match the existing interior of the building in respect of materials, colours, texture and in the case of brickwork, facebond and pointing, and shall be so maintained.

APPEAL B

- 1) The works hereby granted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The works hereby granted are the removal of ground floor utility room and replacement chimney pots only.
- 3) Except as required by condition 4 the works hereby granted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the following submitted plans only: Dwg. Nos: 363/P0, 010/P2, 011/P2, 012/P0, 013/P0, 014/P0, 015/P0, 016/P0, 020/P1, 021/P0, 040/P1, 042/P0, 044/P0, 310/P2, 315/P1, 365/P0 and 320/P1, 321/P0, and 340/P2, 342/P0 and 344/P1 in respect of chimney pots only.
- 4) Notwithstanding the details on the approved drawings/documents, details of the proposed decorative cast iron handrail to the lower ground floor staircase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before installation.
- 5) All work and work of making good shall be finished to match the existing interior of the building in respect of materials, colours, texture and in the case of brickwork, facebond and pointing, and shall be so maintained.
- 6) All existing fabric including existing walls and ceiling plasterwork shall be retained unless notated otherwise on the drawings approved under this consent.
- 7) All new internal walls to be lightweight, plaster finished and so maintained.