



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 03 December 2025

by V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/X5990/W/25/3371397

18 Loudoun Road, City of Westminster, London NW8 0LT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs G & M Stowe against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref 25/00805/ADFULL sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 3 of planning permission Ref 23/08905/FULL granted on 2 May 2024.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 10 July 2025.
 - The development proposed is Alterations to front boundary walls & front garden, replacement fencing & gate to side of principal elevation, replacement glazed doorsets & insertion of skylights into south facing roof slope of single storey rear outrigger. (Linked to 23/08882/LBC).
 - The details for which approval is sought are details of railings and gates, brickwork methodology, works to stucco lattice mouldings and landscaping works to front garden.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/X5990/Y/25/3371398

18 Loudoun Road, City of Westminster, London NW8 0LT

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against the refusal of details of works required by a condition of a listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs G & M Stowe against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref 25/00806/ADLBC sought approval of details of railings and gates, brickwork methodology, works to stucco lattice mouldings and landscaping works pursuant to condition No 3 of listed building consent Ref 23/08882/LBC granted on 2 May 2024.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 10 July 2025.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeals relate to the same site and the same proposed details. Unless stated otherwise, I have dealt with both appeals together. This is to avoid unnecessary repetition.
4. The appeal site contains the Grade II listed building known as 18 Loudoun Road¹ (the listed building). It also forms part of a row of other Grade II listed buildings that

¹ Official List Entry Number: 1274706

includes numbers 20, 22, 24, and 26 Loudoun Road (the neighbouring listed buildings), and it is within the St John's Wood Conservation Area (the CA). That being the case, in reaching these decisions, I have exercised my statutory duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

5. These appeals follow the Council's refusal to approve details required by conditions 3 of planning permission ref 23/08905/FULL (the planning permission) and listed building consent ref 23/08882/LBC (the listed building consent). Amongst other things, these conditions require detailed drawings/ samples / specs of; railings and gates; brickwork methodology and sample to new wall; details of works to stucco lattice mouldings, and landscaping works to front garden - including materials, to be submitted to and approved by the Council. According to the decision notices, these conditions were imposed to, amongst other things, protect the special architectural or historic interest of the building and to ensure the scheme contributes to the character and appearance of the CA.
6. I understand that the Council has been subject of a cyber-incident, and as a result, it has been unable to provide copies of the plans listed on the planning permission and the listed building consent. However, the Council has advised that these plans are available to view on its external website. Therefore, in determining these appeals, I have considered the evidence before me and the associated plans that are publicly available to view on the Council's website. I have also accessed and reviewed the publicly available official list entries for numbers 20, 22, 24, and 26 Loudoun Road. As the main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the effect of the proposed details on nearby listed buildings, they would not be prejudiced by this.
7. In respect of appeal A, I proceed on the basis that the planning permission includes the formation of a sizable expanse of paving within the front garden, as indicated in the details submitted in support of these appeals. It is not within the scope of appeal A to vary the development authorised by the planning permission. Moreover, condition 3 did not require that an amended layout for the front garden be provided to and approved by the Council. Therefore, in determining appeal A, it is not necessary to consider the effects of the extent of paving, as this has already been approved.
8. Excluding the Council's second reason for refusal in appeal A, which relates to the extent of hardstanding, the applications were only refused due to concerns related to the design of the proposed gates and supports. That being the case, and based on the evidence and my observations on site, I am satisfied that the implementation of the other proposed details, i.e. the brickwork methodology and sample to new wall; details of works to stucco lattice mouldings, and landscaping works to front garden - including materials, would comply with the requirements of conditions 3, and they would preserve the listed building and its setting; the settings of adjacent LBs; and the character and appearance of the CA. That being the case, these other elements would not harm the significance of these designated heritage assets.

Main Issue

9. The main issue is whether the details submitted comply with the requirements of Conditions 3 and the development and works subject of them would preserve the listed building and its setting; preserve the settings of the listed buildings at 18, 20,

22, 24, and 26 Loudoun Road; and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

10. The house on the appeal site is a good example of a high-quality Gothic revival style detached house that is thought to date from circa the middle of the 19th century, and which includes many features that are characteristic of this style and period. These features include steep roof pitches, tall vertically emphasised windows, and elements of intricate design detailing. That being the case, the significance of the listed building is mainly derived from its historic and architectural interest.
11. The house on the appeal site has a front garden that is separated from the adjacent pavement by low sections of London stock brick walling - with stucco lattice work detailing above, and taller cap-topped brick piers adjacent to openings in the wall - much of which appears to be historic. Therefore, and even if parts of the front boundary wall on the appeal site have been partially re-built and/or re-pointed, this boundary wall continues to make a small positive contribution to the significance of the listed building.
12. When viewed from Loudoun Road, the listed building and the neighbouring listed buildings have similar appearances, and I do not doubt that they were all built together as part of a single development scheme. Consequently, they also have a collective group value that adds their significance. Moreover, because each of these listed buildings forms part of the setting of the others, the part of their settings that contains these other listed buildings also contributes to their significance.
13. The sizable CA is largely built-up. Based on the CA audit², this area appears to have been subject of a large amount of development in the early to mid-19th century. Despite much redevelopment since that time, the CA retains many historic buildings and associated infrastructure - including brick and stucco lattice boundary walls with tall gateposts, as well as high-quality wrought iron and cast-iron railings and gates. Many of which, contribute to the special interest of this area. The appeal site, which contains a well-maintained circa mid-19th century detached house with front boundary walls of brick and latticed stucco, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.

Details submitted pursuant to conditions 3

14. The 'flat' horizontal cross bars and the vertical hollow round bars that would be used in the gates would have a somewhat delicate appearance. This would be at odds with the chunky square profile framework that would support them. It would also be incongruous with the bulky supports that would be installed to either side of the pedestrian gate. Moreover, and although there has been some attempt to reflect a 'historic' style, the frames to both gates as well as the supports to the pedestrian gate are crude in form and heavy in appearance, and as such they have a diminished architectural authenticity. For these reasons, the gates and the

² City of Westminster - St John's Wood Conservation Area Audit – published 2008

associated supports for the pedestrian gate would be of a low-quality design, which would not reflect the special interest and quality of the listed building as a whole.

15. Furthermore, given the importance of the listed building as a designated heritage asset, it is especially sensitive to harm that may be caused from even small changes. That being the case, and given my previous findings regarding the quality of the design of the proposed gates and supports, their installation would lead to the harmful incremental erosion of the significance of the listed building. A small amount of residual harm would also be caused to the significance of the nearby listed buildings, from the poorly designed gates and gateposts, which would be within their settings.
16. I observed railings and gates within the front boundaries of some of the neighbouring listed buildings. However, their design and/or the relationship between them and the adjoining boundary walls is materially different from that proposed as part of these appeals. Moreover, no compelling evidence has been provided from which to understand the basis for their presence. As such, they do not sway me away from my previous findings.
17. Many other properties in the area have gates and railings of various designs, and not all of these contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA. However, I accept that these now form part of the established character and appearance of the area. Nevertheless, this does not justify the insertion of additional gates and supports of a poor-quality and incoherent design - such as those proposed. Instead, such gates and supports, which would be clearly visible from within the nearby street scene, would erode the contribution that high-quality metal gates and railings - which are a distinctive characteristic of the CA, make to the character and appearance of the area. That being the case, a small amount of harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the CA, and to its special interest as a whole.
18. Although the planning statement submitted in support of the applications shows an intricate and detailed finial would be used in the gates, this differs from the finial type identified on the plans that are before me - which show very crude finials that lack finesse. As such, and on the basis that these latter finials would be used, the previously identified harms to the listed building, the settings of the neighbouring listed buildings, and the CA would be increased.
19. For these reasons, the submitted details would not comply with the requirements of Conditions 3 and the development and works subject of them would not preserve the listed building and its setting or the settings of the listed buildings at 18, 20, 22, 24, and 26 Loudoun Road. Nor would they preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Consequently, they would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, and they would conflict with policies 38, 39 and 40 of the City of Westminster City Plan 2019-2049 – adopted 2021. Collectively, and amongst other things, these require development to be of a high quality of design, that preserves the special interest of listed buildings and preserves or enhances the character and appearance of CA's. That being the case, these details should not be approved.

Conclusion

20. The details subject of appeal A would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations - either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. I therefore conclude that appeal A should be dismissed.
21. Moreover, and for the reasons previously given, I also conclude that appeal B should be dismissed.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR