



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/Y/25/3362333

42-43 Egerton Crescent, London SW3 2ED

- 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 Mr Mark Stolkin against the decision of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref is LB/24/06529.
 - The works proposed are the relocation of kitchen to the raised ground floor front room within No.42, internal connection between the first floor front rooms of Nos. 42 & 43 and the provision of new spine walls and double doors to separate the front and rear rooms at the first floor level of both Nos. 42 & 43 in addition to all extension and alteration works previously approved under consents PP/23/06019 & LB/23/06020 which comprise the removal of poor quality security bars to lower ground floor front windows, removal of rear spiral staircase behind No.43 and connection of upper ground floor terraces, new connection between existing and consented basements, alteration to fenestration in approved lower ground rear extension at No.42, demolition of infill at rear lower ground and ground floor levels and construction of part brick and part glazed replacement infill extension together with single storey basement beneath part of the new extension and rear garden, internal works to all floors including installation of passenger lift; lowering and waterproofing of vaults; and creation of additional openings to vaults.(Resubmission of Applications PP/24/02641 & LB/24/02642).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal relates to the Grade II listed building known as '31-54, Egerton Crescent SW3', which is located within the Thurloe Estate and Smiths Charity Conservation Area (CA). In reaching my decision, I have considered the statutory duties under sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act).
3. Planning permission and listed building consent¹ have previously been granted by the Council for a similar scheme to the appeal proposals, which seek to introduce additional changes. No concerns have been raised by the Council regarding the proposed relocation of the kitchen to the front room within No.42, or the provision of new walls, double doors and a single door between the front and rear rooms at first floor level at both Nos.42 & 43. Whilst I note the objection raised by a third party in respect of the kitchen relocation, I see no reason to reach alternative views in these respects, particularly as the Council set out that this element has been previously consented.
4. The Council has however raised concerns regarding the creation of two doorways at first floor level to connect the living rooms of nos 42 and 43. My findings shall

¹ Application references P/23/06019 & LB/23/06020.

therefore focus on this element of additional work and the effects which it would have on the special interest of designated heritage assets.

Main Issues

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, in addition to whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Thurloe Estate and Smiths Charity CA.

Reasons

6. Nos 42 and 43 Egerton Crescent form part of a wider terrace of townhouses which were constructed circa 1830 and are collectively Grade II listed (31-54, Egerton Crescent SW3). The terrace was added to the list in 1969 and is made up of 3 storey 2 window properties with basements and mansard, with 4 storey group to the centre and end. The full stuccoed frontages of the Crescent as a whole are elegantly simple, and complimented by Ionic pilastered doorways and individual railings to the first floor. The listing description² notes the terrace was probably designed by George Basevi, consisting of a curved centre and two detached wings set in a crescent around a communal garden.
7. Given the above, I find that the special interest and significance of the listed building to be primarily associated with its historic and architectural interests as a fine illustration of mid-19th century domestic architecture. Important contributors in these regards which are pertinent to the appeals are its architectural detailing, consistency, symmetry and group value.
8. Despite its conversion to one dwelling, in addition to alterations to the rear, Nos 42 and 43 retains these external architectural qualities. As a central dwelling, Nos 42 and 43 make a valuable contribution to the architectural consistency of the rest of the listed terrace and is integral to the special architectural and historic interest, and group value, of Nos 31-54, Egerton Crescent SW3 as an entity.
9. I observed other connections between the two properties which have been previously consented, and further openings are also consented. However, these are in discreet unobtrusive locations such as within the closet wing addition or between the second floor master bedroom suites, and as such, whilst working as one larger property, the two dwellings retain a distinct separation and legibility as two separate buildings.
10. The conversion to one dwelling and extensions to the rear has however resulted in some comprising of the historic plan form, and furthermore I observed that the principal first floor rooms in both Nos 42 and 43 have opened up with the historic dividing walls between the front and rear rooms removed. This does weaken and compromise the historic layout to some extent. Nevertheless, the characteristic general layout of main front and rear rooms on all levels with a hallway and stair core to the left or right side with closet wing addition beyond remains legible. As such, the internal layout contributes to the special interest of the listed building, as it contributes to the understanding of the original houses' design.
11. The character and appearance and therefore the special interest and significance of the Thurloe Estate and Smith's Charity CA are mainly derived from its consistent

² List Entry Number: 1190582

and coherent high quality historic architectural form. The Thurloe Estate and Smiths Charity Conservation Area Statement (2016) describes the CA as a '*remarkable slice of South Kensington's architectural history from the elegance and restraint of the Georgian period, through late Regency designs and Italianate pomp to the red brick Queen Anne style at the end of the Victorian period*'.

12. As an integral part of a coherent focal point of planned 19th century residential townscape, 31-54, Egerton Crescent SW3 contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
13. In addition to the other works identified, as set out above, the proposals seek to introduce a single door opening between the party walls at first floor level to connect the front reception rooms.
14. The proposed opening would be in the principal first floor rooms. These rooms possess high ceilings and taller windows, befitting and indicating the grand importance of these spaces, and separating them from the more (comparatively) utilitarian and service-oriented lower floors and the more private bedrooms on the upper floors.
15. The existing opening up of these rooms in both Nos 42 and 43 does weaken and compromise the historic layout to some extent. As such, the rooms are sensitive to further alteration.
16. The proposed opening would be set within a jib door, in order to reduce its prominence. When closed it would be difficult to notice an opening, however it would be apparent when open. Whilst much of the existing material would be reused and the bricks are not rare or a key aspect of significance, the works would also result in the loss of historic fabric and intrusively erode the layout of these principal rooms. This would have a detrimental effect on the significance of the appeal premises as two separate buildings. It is noteworthy that a previous Inspector³ found similarly in terms of this matter.
17. Whilst this additional opening would no doubt be helpful to efficient circulation between the two houses, the existing and approved openings, including on the first floor, enable the property to comfortably function as a single family dwellinghouse.
18. Given the specifics of what I observed at the appeal property, the examples provided by the appellant of works consented to different buildings⁴ would be seen in differing contexts, for example in terms of the significance of the buildings, the policy context, other openings and the effect of the proposals. It is not demonstrated therefore that these consents are directly comparable to the proposal before me.
19. This includes the original appeal for the amalgamation of Nos 42 and 43⁵, where the Inspector considered openings between the properties at ground and lower ground floor. This is not comparable to the proposal before me in term of the importance of the location of works, the weight given to the justification of the proposal given the existing and consented openings, and the works required to reverse all openings. There is no guarantee that future works to close the openings so that the houses can be sold separately would be undertaken, and in any case it

³ Appeal references APP/K5600/W/22/3297935 & APP/K5600/Y/22/3297936

⁴ Nos 1 & 2 Pembroke Cottages, 61 and 62 Cadogan Place & No 29 – 31 Egerton Terrace

⁵ Application references PP/15/00303 & LB/15/00304 and PP/15/00313 & LB/15/00314

would not alter the impact of the proposed works, such as the loss of historic fabric, before me.

20. I conclude that the proposed development and works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building '31-54, Egerton Crescent SW3' and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
21. The above harm to significance would result in some residual harmful effect to the character and appearance of the CA. It would not therefore preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
22. Given the fairly localised nature of the development and works relative to the building and CA as a whole, I find the harm to both heritage assets to be, individually and cumulatively, at a minor level of 'less than substantial' but nevertheless is of considerable importance and weight.
23. There are aspects of the scheme that would undoubtedly be positive and of public benefit. Heritage benefits would accrue from the reinstatement of the new walls, down stands and doors between the front and rear rooms at first floor level, as this would reverse some of the harm to the plan-form and room proportions that has previously been carried out to each individual dwelling.
24. Additionally, the removal of security bars to the front elevation lower ground floor and their replacement with frameless glazing would be an improvement visually to the frontage, as would the replacement of the existing door to No 42 with a more traditional design to match No 43, the removal of the existing spiral staircase at rear of No 43 and the alterations to fenestration at lower ground rear extension at No 42.
25. These would, of themselves, sustain and enhance the listed building and preserve the character and appearance of the CA in which it sits. Given their scale, and the fact that, other than the first floor works these elements have previously been consented, moderate weight is given to the heritage benefits of the proposals.
26. There would be some economic benefits brought about through the investment into the property and the construction phase. Also, social benefits would be gained through improvements to the local housing stock. Again, given the scale of development, these benefits would be small. There is no substantive evidence before me that the development and works are required to secure the optimum viable use of the listed building.
27. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that, when considering the impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of whether any harm amounts to less than substantial harm to significance. Overall, the weight I ascribe to the public benefits is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight I attach to the harm to significance I have found.
28. Consequently, the harm identified to the significance of the designated heritage assets has not been supported by clear and convincing justification. The works and development therefore would conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in

sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Act and fail to satisfy the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework. There is also conflict with Policy CD5 of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Local Plan (2024), which amongst other matters, requires any works for alterations or extensions related to listed buildings to preserve the significance of the building, or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.

Conclusion

29. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR