



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 8 May 2024

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/K5600/W/23/3335804

2 Holland Park Mews, Kensington and Chelsea, London, W11 3SU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Nada Chaldecott against the decision of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref is PP/23/05864 dated 4 September 2023 was refused by notice dated 31 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is Internal alterations at ground and first floor levels including the replacement of the staircase, installation of a replacement garage door and replacement of roof lights.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/K5600/Y/23/3335803

2 Holland Park Mews, London W11 3SU

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Nada Chaldecott against the decision of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref is LB/23/05865.
 - The works proposed are Internal alterations at ground and first floor levels including the replacement of the staircase, installation of a replacement garage door and replacement of roof lights.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for Internal alterations at ground and first floor levels including the replacement of the staircase, installation of a replacement garage door and replacement of roof lights at Number 2 Holland Park Mews, Kensington and Chelsea, London, W11 3SU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PP/23/05864, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.
2. Appeal B is allowed and listed building consent is granted for Internal alterations at ground and first floor levels including the replacement of the staircase, installation of a replacement garage door and replacement of roof lights at 2 Holland Park Mews, Kensington and Chelsea, London W11 3SU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PP/23/05865, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeals concern works to Number 2 Holland Park Mews, a Grade II listed building which forms group listing as part of the Grade II listed buildings 1-34 Holland Park Mews (List entry 1191524, listed 14 April 1969). The mews were

originally built as the coach houses associated with the large villas of Holland Park.

4. The proposed internal works do not require planning permission. However, they form part of the proposed scheme as a whole. As such, in determining these appeals, I have had regard to the statutory duties imposed upon me within sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), which require that special regard is had to the desirability of preserving the building, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.
5. In addition, the site is located within the Holland Park Conservation Area (CA) and therefore section 72(1) of the Act requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
6. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated on 19 December 2023, and after the submission of the appeals. The historic environment policies have remained unchanged within the updated version of the Framework which is a material consideration.

Main Issue

7. The main issue for both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed Number 2 Holland Park Mews or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons – both appeals

Significance

8. Holland Park is characterised in part by its collection of well-planned, ornate and large Victorian villas. Holland Park Mews runs between two sections of Holland Park and contains the much more modest two storey mews properties at the back of the villas within a more intimate setting along a cobbled street. The appeal property is Grade II listed as is the whole of the rest of the mews and dates from 1862. Originally it was built in conjunction with the villas to function as a coach house, and likely for horse stabling, with the carriage man and groom's quarters located above. As a result, historically the ground floor layout would have been open plan and the first floor cellular.
9. I consider their significance and special interest derives from their architectural execution that reflects the Neo-Classical architectural aesthetics of the 19th Century. Number 2 in particular, despite external modifications, is a good example within the group. All the mews houses are converted to residential but from an external perspective they still retain the characteristics of their originally designed purpose. Despite their intended function as an ancillary building, they have an elegance to their exteriors that corresponds with the fine, decorated Victorian villas that they were once closely associated with. Their subservient relationship with these larger villas forms part of their significance/special interest.
10. The evidence before me points to No. 2 having undergone substantial internal alterations from around fifty years ago¹. The existing floor plans from the 1975

¹ Application T/75/974 Conversion of ground floor garage to provide kitchen, dining room bathroom and garage for residential use.

permission illustrate what appears to be an open plan ground floor layout and rooms above accessed from a central corridor leading to an external staircase to the front. The proposed plans of 1975 demonstrate a new connectivity between floors by inserting a spiral staircase, and a garage with bathroom behind separated by an adjacent space utilised as an open-plan kitchen and living space on the ground floor. To the second floor, the proposed plans of 1975 sought the removal of the corridor to create a large dining room to one side and bedrooms to the other. From my internal inspection the present layout differs slightly from these earlier approved floor plans, most notably the kitchen is located to the front of the ground floor space identified as a separate room.

11. Due to the earlier adaptation of the building, from my inspection, both floors have undergone significant modern intervention. The ground floor has been subdivided into three distinctive spaces using modern stud partitions or breeze block construction and the walls associated with the first-floor bedrooms also of a lightweight construction. This brings me to the view that I agree with the council that 'minimal fabric survives'.
12. The first floor has also been significantly altered by way of removal of the central corridor and the creation of a large open plan living space to one side. The new bedroom partition wall may run along the line of the old corridor wall. However, so much historic fabric has been removed, this space retains little semblance of how the historic floor plan was laid out.
13. Overall, I find that the historic legibility of the floorplans has been significantly eroded and there is little evidence of the original functional purpose of the building when viewed from the inside. Therefore, the existing plan form contributes little to the significance of the building.

Impact on significance

14. The proposal before me entails confining the sleeping quarters to the ground floor and the first floor used as the main living space by removing the existing internal walls to the ground floor in order to create a central corridor accessed from the front door, dividing the space into more or less two equal parts with bedrooms and bathroom either side and new staircase to the rear. The first floor would be retained as a large living space with existing walls partially opened.
15. I appreciate the advice note brought to my attention by the Council from Historic England's 'Making Changes to Heritage Assets' in relation to the importance of the plan form of a heritage asset. However, as I have concluded above, the historic plan form has already been severely compromised by earlier interventions.
16. The proposed first floor modifications are small in the overall scheme of things as the layout would remain largely as is, with only modern fabric of no historical significance to be removed to accommodate enlarged openings. The use of a sliding door to an opening would have the effect of being able to create the appearance of a more complete wall when closed, and therefore have a limiting effect upon the existing line of this partition wall. I find there would still be some division between rooms, but the alterations would not equate to a substantially greater effect upon the significance/special interest of the listed building that has already been substantially weakened by earlier

works. Therefore, the impact of these specific works would not materially erode the historic plan form that remains legible, and consequently would have a neutral effect upon the special interest of the listed building thus preserving its special interest.

17. The alterations to the ground floor would result in further enclosure, however not materially above that already displayed. Consequently, whilst the proposed works would result in a reversal of the historic plan form, given my findings regarding its already significant erosion, they would not materially reduce the legibility of the appeal building's historic plan form any further.
18. As part of the evidence submitted with the appeal, the Council point to an appeal decision at 51 Holland Park Mews. In this case, external and internal alterations were proposed. Although internal alterations seem similar, the Inspector also identified harm arising to its significance from both internal and external areas of the proposed works. The circumstances are not precisely the same, and as is my duty, I have considered the merits of the specific case before me and reached my own decision on the matter.
19. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposal would preserve the significance of the designated heritage asset and therefore comply with the Act, Policy CL4 of the Local Plan 2019 and the heritage protection aims of the Framework.

Other Matters

20. In addition to the building being Grade II listed, the site is situated within the Holland Park Conservation Area (CA). The significance of the CA derives from the mid-19th century houses built as a speculative development of high-quality housing and interspaced by green areas. Purpose-designed artist's studio houses intertwine with the highly decorated stuccoed and closely ordered houses seen within the CA, most specifically along Holland Park, with an overall unified and refined characteristics create themes of homogeneity to the CA.
21. Some external works are proposed to the building pertaining to replacing the garage door and new roof lights. These would be a small modification to the dwelling and would have little discernible effect upon the CA as a whole. Therefore, the proposal would meet the expectations of the Act and Policy CL3 of the Local Plan 2019 by preserving the character and appearance of the CA.
22. Other internal works to remove the modern fireplace and installation of a more traditional style fireplace would not diminish the special interest of the listed building.

Conditions

23. I have considered the suggested conditions from the Council in light of the Planning Practice Guidance and Paragraph 56 of the Framework. As planning permission for the proposal has also been appealed by the appellant, I have therefore imposed conditions relating to both planning permission and listed building consent schemes as detailed within the attached schedule.
24. Considering the conditions for both appeals collectively, in addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition relating to the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. Conditions in relation to details of the new fireplace, garage door, rooflights to ensure new works match existing, are

needed to preserve the special interest of the listed building. However, there is no requirement to impose a condition relating to details of the staircase as sections have been provided with the submission. Conditions relating to lighting runs, partitions, or the retention of fabric are either not necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted or otherwise reasonable, and have therefore not been included.

Conclusion – both appeals

25. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

Appeal A APP/K5600/W/23/3335804

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: HPM_06_000, HPM_06_100 P4, HPM_06_101 P4, HPM_06_300 P4, HPM_18_100 P3, HPM_18_101 P3, HPM_18_300 P2, HPM_24_240 P3.

Appeal B APP/K5600/Y/23/3335803

- 1) The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) Notwithstanding condition No.1 above, prior to stripping out works commencing, drawings at a scale of 1:5 section and 1:10 elevation showing the design of the new fireplace and garage door and detail of the new roof lights and profile within the roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.
- 3) All new external and internal works and finishes and works of making good shall match the existing adjacent work in respect of materials used, detailed execution and finished appearance.

END OF SCHEDULE