



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by Simon Hand MA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/F/23/3320221

55 Inverness Terrace, LONDON, W2 3JN

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by New Kent Management Ltd against a listed building enforcement notice issued by the City of Westminster Council.
 - The enforcement notice was issued on 9 March 2023
 - The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is: without listed building consent the erection of a single storey rear extension that covers the majority of the rear garden.
 - The requirements of the notice are: 1. Remove the unauthorised rear extension, as shown outlined and hatched in yellow, in Plan A and outlined in blue in Photograph A. 2. Remove all resulting debris and repair and 'make good' in materials to match the existing any damage to the Property, either caused by the construction of the unauthorised rear extension and/or as a result of compliance with Step 1 and return the Property to its former condition.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.
 - The appeal is made on the ground set out in section 39(1) (e) and (g) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and the listed building enforcement notice is upheld. Listed building consent is refused for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

The Appeal on Ground (e)

2. Inverness Terrace consists of handsome early Victorian houses forming a coherently designed terrace, which is listed as a whole. Many of the houses have been amalgamated and turned into hotels. No55 is also a hotel. Behind the southern end of the terrace where it meets Inverness Place is a mews development which has left the buildings fronting Inverness Terrace with truncated rear yards. As the appellant suggests they are bounded by high walls and are of little practical use. However, it does not follow they are of no significance nor that they can be developed without any thought as to the qualities of the listed building.
3. The back yard is covered by a cobbled together hodgepodge of wooden and plastic structures used for storage. It is unsightly and wholly incongruous. These small rear yards are typical of the grand villas to the front of the terrace and play a part in their historical significance through the development of this part of London. That does not mean they cannot be repurposed, but that to do so must be done with sensitivity. As part of the ground (g) appeal the appellant has suggested that the extension could be redesigned, but no suggestion as to exactly how has been made.

4. I note the storage is useful for the operation of the hotel, but there is no suggestion that it could not be accommodated within the building itself even at the expense of a single room. Consequently, I find the works to harm the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building and consent should not be granted. In terms of the NPPF the harm is less than substantial, but there are no overriding public benefits. I shall dismiss the appeal and uphold the notice.

Simon Hand

INSPECTOR