
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 8 October 2025

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th November 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/X5990/W/25/3359769

33 Craven Road, City of Westminster, London W2 3QA

- 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 Mr Tom Leeman against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01907/FULL.
 - The development proposed comprises internal alterations, partial infill of existing lightwell and first floor extension to rear.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/X5990/Y/25/3359773

33 Craven Road, City of Westminster, London W2 3QA

- 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 Tom Leeman against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01908/LBC.
 - The works proposed are as per Appeal A.
-

Decisions

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

Applications for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Mr Tom Leeman against the City of Westminster Council, relating to both appeals. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

4. As the site comprises part of a listed building, I have had regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act). I have also had regard to section 72(1) of the Act as the site is located within a conservation area.
5. Although the Council is in the process of undertaking a partial review of the City of Westminster City Plan 2019-2040 (City Plan), no policies therein have been presented as relevant to this appeal. I have, therefore, determined this case in accordance with the extant City Plan.

Main Issue

6. The main issue of both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building known as 29-45 Craven Road W2¹, or its setting, or any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses; and the extent to which the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bayswater Conservation Area (BCA).

Reasons

7. The site comprises a studio apartment within 33 Craven Road (No.33) which, together with properties at 29-45 Craven Road (odd numbers only), forms one listed building entry. Constructed during the mid nineteenth century, the listed building comprises a terrace of four storeys with various shops, restaurants/cafes and other retail units at ground floor level and residential uses above. Each of the former townhouses within the terrace have two bays of symmetrically arranged classically inspired square headed architrave windows. At first floor level, the tall sash windows behind continuous bombé (bulging) balcony railings together with the main cornice above the third floor, unify the properties within the listed building.
8. The studio apartment is located at ground floor level at the rear of No.33, behind the restaurant, within a two-storey addition that extends beyond a shallow half width closet wing and next to a lightwell. This arrangement of a closet wing and two storey addition are features of other parts of the rear of the listed building and other terraces in the block, thereby creating an undulating rear building line. The special interest of the listed building, therefore, is derived from its age, classical architectural features and fenestration arrangement. While the rear elevation of No.33 may rank below the façade of the terrace in terms of its special interest, nonetheless, the closet wing and lightwell do contribute positively to the special interest of the listed building.
9. Brook Mews North is located to the rear of the terrace, accessed from Craven Street via an arched gap at street level, and comprises modest two storey forms plus a mansard roof extension floor, that front onto a paved street. Being sited at a lower level than the street and having smaller floor to ceiling heights, the mews dwellings are demonstrably subservient to the tall, formal terrace forms which surround them, including No.33. This hierarchical relationship between the formal streets lined by tall, terraced townhouses, such as the listed building, within rectangular blocks of built form and centrally located intimate mews streets is a key element that contributes to the significance of the BCA as a whole. In addition, the BCA's hierarchy of spaces contributes positively to the setting of the listed building.
10. The proposal comprises the enlargement of the studio flat through an extension across a significant proportion of the existing lightwell at both ground and first floor levels, with further accommodation above the two-storey addition, currently used as a terrace. The provision of an additional storey above the existing rear projection would result in a bulky form that disrupts the undulating rhythm of the rear building line, despite the design intent aim to echo the existing stepped rear elevation.

¹ List Entry Number: 1220842, date first listing 10 April 1975

11. Although there are no internal architectural features of merit within the studio, the proposal would lead to a significant reduction in the size of the lightwell. Given the full width of the extension, the degree to which the lightwell and the closet wing would be appreciated, particularly from the mews street, would be vastly reduced. Furthermore, little substantive detail has been provided regarding where the existing plant equipment associated with the restaurant, currently located within the lightwell, would be relocated to, nor the effect this would have on the listed building. The additional bulk would also intrude into the centre of the block and be located close to neighbouring mews dwellings, resulting in a dilution in the distinction between the formal block and the intimate mews spaces, significant elements of the BCA.
12. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not preserve the Grade II listed building, or its setting, or the features of special or historic interest it possesses. Nor would it preserve the character or appearance of the BCA. Therefore, it would conflict with policies 38, 39 and 40 of the City Plan insofar as they require development to contribute positively to Westminster's townscape and streetscape.
13. The proposal also fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act. The level of harm in this case would be less than substantial. Taking into account the proposal would result in the partial loss of elements of the listed building which positively contribute to its special interest, the magnitude of this harm would be towards the upper end of the less than substantial scale. In respect to the BCA, the level of harm would be moderate given the diminishment in the distinction between different spaces. While other design options have been considered by the appellant, as shown within the Design Development Sketches², including those which may result in less sensitive schemes, this does not alter the harm which would result from the appeal scheme I have identified above.
14. In these circumstances the Framework states that harm to or loss of the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification and should be weighed against the public benefits which would be derived from it, including securing its optimum viable use, where appropriate.
15. The proposal would increase the internal floorspace of the existing studio flat which currently falls well below the Government's Technical Housing Standards³, thereby creating a one-bedroom dwelling and making a positive contribution to the range of dwelling typologies within the area, albeit at a small scale. It would also lead to an improvement in the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of the flat.
16. Similarly, the provision of private outdoor space, albeit on a small scale in the form of a small terrace, would also be beneficial to any occupiers of the enlarged flat. However, as the proposed open plan kitchen, living and dining space would be built over the existing terrace currently accessed off the closet wing, the communal external space currently available to the existing occupiers of other properties within No.33 would be lost. Therefore, this would be detrimental to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
17. Some economic benefits would be derived from the construction and renovation works. Again, the size of the proposal restricts the scale of such benefits. Little

² Prepared by Pencil and Brick, dated June 2024

³ Nationally Described Space Standard

evidence has been advanced regarding any environmental benefits which would be derived from the proposal aside from the intensification of built form within an urban environment, as supported by the Framework.

18. Even if I were to conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, this would not weigh in favour of the appeal scheme.
19. Consequently, whilst some public benefits would be derived from the proposal, the totality of those outlined above do not outweigh the level of harm identified to the special interest of the listed building or the significance of the BCA. Additionally, I have no substantive reason to conclude that the continued residential use of the studio is dependent upon the appeal scheme. As such, clear and convincing justification for the less than substantial harm I have identified above has not been demonstrated. The proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building and the character or appearance of the BCA would be neither conserved nor enhanced. This carries considerable importance and weight, consistent with the statutory duty in the Act and reiterated within the Framework.
20. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not preserve the Grade II listed 29-45 Craven Road W2 or its setting or any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses. Nor would it preserve the character or appearance of the BCA.

Other Matters

21. The Council's behaviour during the determination of the planning application and listed building consent is not a matter for this decision.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR