
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 February 2026

by **Ann Veevers BA(Hons) PGDip(BCon) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 March 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/X5990/W/25/3374054

Warwick House, Stable Yard Road, London SW1A 1BD

- 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 James Bell of MSMR Architects against the decision of the City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03444/FULL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'installation of orangery at first floor level above the entrance hall on the east elevation, roof strengthening works and associated works'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/X5990/Y/25/3374056

Warwick House, Stable Yard Road, London SW1A 1BD

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr James Bell of MSMR Architects against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03445/LBC.
 - The development proposed is described as 'installation of orangery at first floor level above the entrance hall on the east elevation, roof strengthening works and associated works'.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The descriptions of development and works in the headings above have been taken from the application forms. However, in Part E of the appeal forms it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development and works has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the descriptions given on the original application forms.
4. The appeals concern the same site and the same scheme. Although the remit of planning permission (Appeal A) and listed building consent (Appeal B) regimes are different, to reduce repetition, I have dealt with both appeals together in a single decision letter.
5. The Council's reason for refusal for both appeals specifies harm to the appeal building, a Grade II listed building known as Warwick House¹ and the character

¹ National Heritage List for England, List Entry Number: 1236545

and appearance of the St James's Conservation Area. It also refers to the setting of 'neighbouring heritage assets' without explicitly identifying the assets. Sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), require me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed buildings or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

6. I have focused my considerations of heritage matters on the designated heritage assets of the Grade II listed appeal building of Warwick House; the Grade I listed buildings known as Apartment 5, St James' Palace² (Apartment 5), St James's Palace, St James's Palace Garden Walls, Marlborough Gate Etc³ (the Palace), Lancaster House⁴, and Clarence House⁵; and the St James's Conservation Area. I have dealt with other designated heritage assets in proximity to the appeal site under Other Matters below. As these are the buildings referred to in the Council's Officer Report and which have been considered by the appellant, I am satisfied that the main party's interests are not prejudiced by this approach.
7. Since the appeal was submitted, the Council adopted the Westminster City Plan 2019-2040 in January 2026 (WCP). The Council has confirmed that this supersedes the policies of the City Plan 2019–2040, adopted April 2021 (CP). The Council now relies upon policies 42, 44 and 45 of the WCP rather than policies 38,39 and 40 of the CP which are referred to in the decision notices. The appellant has had an opportunity to comment on this change. I have therefore determined the appeals on the basis of the WCP which is afforded full weight.
8. At the time of my site visit, the building was undergoing extensive renovations and was covered in a scaffolding shroud. However, I was able to access relevant parts of the building. Together with the photographic evidence and plans submitted with the appeal, this means that I am able to undertake a full assessment of the proposal.

Main Issues

9. The main issues to consider in both schemes are whether the proposal would (i) preserve the Grade II listed building known as Warwick House or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; (ii) preserve the setting of the Grade I listed buildings Apartment 5, the Palace, Lancaster House and Clarence House; and (iii) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the St James's Conservation Area.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

Warwick House

10. The appeal site and surrounding area are undoubtedly complex in heritage terms and thus highly sensitive to change. In considering any effects of the proposal, I have had regard to the definition of significance and the setting of a heritage asset

² National Heritage List for England, List Entry Number: 1264511, listed 5 February 1970

³ National Heritage List for England, List Entry Number: 1264851, listed 5 February 1970

⁴ National Heritage List for England, List Entry Number: 1236546, listed 5 February 1970

⁵ National Heritage List for England, List Entry Number: 1236580, listed 5 February 1970

in the glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework); as well as relevant guidance by Historic England cited by the appellant⁶.

11. Warwick House is a Grade II listed six-storey plus basement townhouse dating from the 1770's that sits on the corner of Green Park and Stable Yard. It was first constructed as a smaller three-storey plus attic prestigious residence, between the former Queen's Library and Grenville's House, from a design by the Neo-classical architect, William Chambers. According to the appellant's Heritage Statement (HS)⁷, many of the buildings surrounding Warwick House were demolished in the early 19th century and at a similar time, a single storey entrance hall was constructed on the east, more restrained, elevation of the building.
12. Further, significant extensions and alterations were made to Warwick House during the 19th century. These included the addition of bay windows and an additional storey designed by the architect Anthony Salvin, on the Gothic Revival style. Towards the end of the 19th century, the building was fully rendered in stucco and there is evidence in the HS that a conservatory was added above the entrance hall at this time⁸ which was removed in 1964. In 1911, Salvin's attic storey was removed and re-built as a tall mansard roof with two floors of attic rooms behind a parapet along with distinctively tall and sculptured chimney breasts. Extensive internal alterations were also made at a similar time.
13. From the evidence before me, the building's special interest and significance are mainly derived from its historic interest in illustrating a prestigious townhouse in proximity to the Royal Court and residences; its architectural interest; and its group value. Important contributors in these regards which are pertinent to the appeals are its use of traditional materials; surviving historic external and internal fabric; legibility of its historic proportions and plan-form as an exemplar of a grand residence designed and remodelled for aristocratic occupants by influential architects of the time. It also makes a prominent contribution to the composition of the Palace enclave. These key factors have not been unduly diminished by the changes to the building over time. Indeed, I find the status and significance of Warwick House is still very much apparent, and this is reinforced by its context.
14. This context is largely defined by the relatively open and verdant setting facing Green Park to the west, and the more enclosed historic courtyard space of Stable Yard to the east, from which the building can be experienced and its heritage merit appreciated. This, together with its proximity to surviving high-status listed buildings, positively contributes to its special interest and significance.

Apartment 5

15. The eastern elevation of Warwick House abuts the two-storey brown and red brick Grade 1 listed Apartment 5. Evidence before me suggests this building was constructed as part of the Palace's stables in 1661. It was altered in the early 18th century to incorporate a ground floor 'arcade', a low mansard attic roof set back behind a parapet, and the end bays emphasised as square towers with concave-

⁶ Historic England: Advice Note 12: Statements of Heritage Significance 2019; Historic England; Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance, 2008; Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets 2017 (2nd Edition); Historic England Listing Selection Guide, Domestic 2: Town Houses, December 2017; Historic England, Advice Note 1: Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management, 2019 (2nd edn); Historic England, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment 2015; Historic England: Advice Note 2: Making Changes to Heritage Assets 2025.

⁷ Heritage Statement: Orangery, Turley Heritage, May 2025

⁸ Fig 3.11, 3.12 and 3.13

pyramid leaded cupolas. It is no longer used for stabling, but as a 'grace-and-favour' residence to accommodate royal staff and other persons associated with the royal complex and, from the information before me, its interior is said to be largely modern.

16. Insofar as relevant to the appeals, the building's special interest and significance primarily stem from its historic and architectural interest from, amongst other things, its former purpose-built use as stables, the use of traditional materials, high-quality craftsmanship, and its balanced and harmonious composition. Special interest is also derived in part from the building's association with the prominent architect Nicholas Hawksmoor and its group value as part of the Palace complex.
17. Warwick House, Lancaster House, buildings to the rear along Cleveland Row and the southern part of the Palace are all part of the immediate setting to Apartment 5. Other historic and prominent buildings, Green Park and St James' Park sit within its wider setting. Whilst this setting has changed considerably over time, mainly due to the growth of impressive mansions in the area during the 19th century, the historic functional relationship between Apartment 5, the Palace, and the shared space in-between remains legible. This space, Stable Yard courtyard, provides a critical element of Apartment 5's setting and contributes in a decidedly positive way to an appreciation of its special interest and significance. The space allows the architectural composition and historic function of Apartment 5 to be experienced and appreciated.

The Palace

18. The Palace is a Tudor building constructed for Henry VIII between 1533 and 1535 which is currently in use for ceremonial functions and state visits. It incorporates many state rooms and historic Tudor features, including brickwork, windows, gatehouse, corner turrets, a Chapel, and courtyards. Later ranges include state apartments, state kitchen and a banqueting room, many of which were designed by notable architects including Christopher Wren. The north-west wing of the Palace, closest to Stable Yard, is known as York House and is of Georgian origin. The Palace's special interest and significance mainly stem from its unique historic and architectural interest as a symbol of royal importance. The use of traditional materials, quality workmanship, the outstanding design by eminent architects, and its intricate layout as a complex of buildings and courtyards have exceptional evidential value that contributes to the significance of the building befitting its high-grade listed status.
19. As is the case with Apartment 5 above, the setting within which the Palace sits has evolved over many years, most notably in the 19th century. Nevertheless, the Palace retains group value with the immediately surrounding historic buildings and spaces. These include Warwick House, which faces towards the western elevation of the Palace. Whilst these buildings are separated by Apartment 5, and despite being faced by the less ornate eastern elevation of Warwick House, this building contributes positively to its significance insofar as it epitomises the grandeur of the surrounding townscape.

Lancaster House

20. Grade I listed Lancaster House sits to the south of Warwick House, directly fronting Stable Yard courtyard at the corner of Green Park and The Mall. Now a government building, it was constructed in 1820 for the Duke of York. It is an

imposing bath-stone mansion with huge Corinthian porticoes and has a grand interior with impressive state rooms, reportedly inspired by Versailles. From the evidence before me, it's special interest and significance are predominantly attributed to its historic and architectural interest. Important factors in this regard are the exceptional exterior and interior quality of materials, its robust design, and its association with high-profile occupants and architects.

21. Relevant to the appeals is the dominant contribution of Lancaster House to the composition of the historic buildings surrounding Stable Yard courtyard. The courtyard allows the grandeur and high-quality heritage value of this building to be experienced and makes an important positive contribution to the immediate setting of the building. Insofar as Warwick House is one of several historic buildings fronting Stable Yard, it also positively contributes to Lancaster House' significance and the ability to appreciate that significance.

Clarence House

22. Clarence House is a stucco-faced Grade I listed mansion built between 1825 and 1827 on to the west side of the Palace. It was enlarged in 1873 and there have been subsequent 20th century alterations with the interior described in the List Entry as much altered. From the evidence, its special interest and significance are derived in part from its historic interest due to its age, traditional materials, and its royal patronage. Significance also lies in part in its architectural interests being associated with leading architect John Nash and because of its lavish proportions and architectural detailing.
23. Insofar as it relates to this appeal, the contribution of Clarence House to the collective composition of the royal enclave of the Palace is a highly important element of its immediate setting. It also sits at the corner of the Stable Yard courtyard where the courtyard's open aspect allows Clarence House and its heritage value to be experienced. Due to the distance from Clarence House and its weaker direct functional association with the royal buildings in the locality, Warwick House has less of a connection with Clarence House than the other listed buildings mentioned above. Nevertheless, as one of several historic buildings fronting Stable Yard, it makes some positive contribution to the setting of Clarence House and thus its significance and the ability to appreciate that significance.

St James's Conservation Area (SJCA)

24. Turning to the SJCA, from the information available to me and what I saw, the SJCA historically centred around St James's Palace and St James's Square. It includes a variety of set-piece architecturally designed residential and commercial properties, many of which are specialist retailers with surviving historic shopfronts, galleries, cultural institutions, restaurants and private members clubs. The historic importance and architectural quality of buildings, monuments and statues in the area, together with their varied age add to the richness and charm of the area, which conveys a strong sense of place. Green Park and St James's Park form an attractive backdrop to the southern and western sides of the built-up SJCA.
25. Given the above, I find that the significance of the SJCA, insofar as it relates to these appeals to be, in part, associated with the Palace and St James's Square, along with the architectural integrity of high-status buildings that remain substantially intact as a valuable component within a wider historic streetscape. As eminent architecturally designed buildings set around the Palace complex,

Warwick House, Apartment 5, Lancaster House and Clarence House display many of the characteristic qualities of the SJCA and thus positively contribute to the character and appearance of the SJCA as a whole, and thereby to its significance as a designated heritage asset.

Proposals and effects

Warwick House

26. Paragraph 212 of the Framework sets out, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to state that, significance can be harmed or lost through the asset's alteration or destruction or from development within its setting and that this should have clear and convincing justification.
27. The proposal includes the addition of a metal and glazed extension on top of the existing flat roof entrance hall on the east elevation of the building. To facilitate and access the extension, external and internal alterations are proposed to open up a former blocked door opening on this elevation at first floor level, undertake roof strengthening works / replacement roof coverings to the entrance hall and to remove external decorative stucco details.
28. Evidence suggests the east elevation of Warwick House was historically largely hidden from public view behind former stable buildings and the entrance to the building was through a narrow passageway. Following the removal of part of the stable building and the Queens Library in the early 19th century to make room for the construction of what is now known as Lancaster House, the single storey curved entrance hall was constructed, protruding into Stable Yard and obscuring part of the remaining stable buildings. While somewhat unusual due to its single storey form on such a tall building, the entrance hall has significance as an important element in the evolution of the building which remains largely authentic.
29. Although extensive alterations and additions were also made to the building in the mid-19th century that also have special interest, such as raising the height of the building and the addition of bays, there is no compelling evidence that the part glazed first floor 'orangery' structure shown on drawings from that period of time was ever constructed. However, what is apparent from the evidence, is that a 'conservatory' shown on later plans was installed close to the turn of the 20th century, along with rendered stucco on all unattached elevations, including decorative panels on the east elevation. Evidence indicates the 'conservatory' was removed in 1964.
30. It is argued by the appellant that the proposal would 'restore' this previous conservatory-style addition to the building. While changes made to the building are part of its evolution and significance, the 'conservatory' addition itself was clearly a relatively fleeting modification in response to the changing needs of the occupants of the building at the time. Although it is unfortunate this historic element of the building's fabric was removed, and even if it was only removed for structural reasons, from the information before me, it was not a fundamental part of the significance of the building, that being the 'solidity' in its classical proportions, hierarchical plan form and proximity to the Palace. Even though a structure existed above the entrance hall for a considerable period of time, I find that its absence has not harmed the significance of the building. The proposal would not therefore,

in my view and on the evidence before me, recover fabric of significance that has been previously removed.

31. The form and design of the previous 'conservatory' have informed the proposed scheme. It would be of a similar height to this previous structure; result in a relatively modest increase in internal floor area; and would be likely to be of high quality in terms of its construction and materials. I also acknowledge that the east elevation of Warwick House includes large areas of blank facade and the entrance hall, with its somewhat mismatched portico, lacks the grandeur of an imposing entrance generally found on such high-status buildings.
32. Be that as it may, the restrained appearance and absence of window openings on the east elevation reflect that of the south elevation. With this in mind, because of its position, design and use of distinctive materials and embellishments, the proposal would draw the eye and appear as an incongruous adjunct to this elevation. It would be highly visible when viewed from Stable Yard courtyard. Rather than remedy the less harmonious aspects of this elevation relating to scale, balance and composition, it would result in a prominent and jarring structure, the position of which would further dilute the fundamental Classical proportions, character and appearance of the building.
33. I recognise not all parts of the building are of equal significance. The aesthetic value of the east elevation is more modest than that of the west elevation and in this respect could potentially accommodate change. However, I find the change wrought by the proposed extension in this appeal would be harmful for the reasons given above.
34. In terms of the existing external decorative stucco and the blocked-up doorway at first floor level, both of these features are evidenced to be from the 1960's when the previous 'conservatory' was removed. The proposed removal of the stucco details and the re-opening of the doorway are only necessary as a result of the proposed extension. In and of themselves, their aesthetic and evidential value are of low importance to the special interest of the building and were I to find the first-floor extension otherwise acceptable, these aspects of the proposal would not harm the special qualities of the listed building.
35. Similarly, from the evidence before me, including the structural report⁹, the proposed roof alterations are only required to support the load of the proposed extension. New steel beams would sit alongside historic main timber beams which would be removed and re-instated in the same positions once the steel has been installed. Timber rafters and ceiling joists would remain in situ. Evidence also suggests the existing flat roof covering is relatively modern and therefore its replacement would not harm any historic elements of significance. From the information available, the proposed alterations to the roof of the entrance hall in and of themselves would not harm any elements of the building's fabric that contribute to its significance. I note the Council raise no objection in this regard.
36. Nevertheless, I find the proposal as a whole would harmfully erode the historic and architectural integrity of the listed building and would not conserve it in a manner appropriate to its significance. In addition, there is some deficiency of detail pertaining to internal works, notably details relating to the proposed 'corridor'

⁹ Alan Baxter Limited - Warwick House, 1 Stable Yard, London: Structural Engineering Notes on Orangery Proposals on Top of the Entrance Hall ref: 1741/30/RA Rev C, 16 May 2025

between the existing first floor room and the extension. This omission is a concern when assessing the effects of the proposal on the special interest and significance of this designated heritage asset, and compound my concerns set out above.

Apartment 5, the Palace, Lancaster House and Clarence House

37. Turning to the effect of the proposal on the setting of other nearby listed buildings, the Framework defines the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. It explains that its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. I recognise that a large part of the special interest and significance of Apartment 5, the Palace, Lancaster House, and Clarence House stem from their physical presence, architectural detailing and historic fabric, which would remain unaffected by the proposal. Furthermore, that some of the immediate setting and most of the wider setting that contribute to the special interest and significance of these assets would remain undisturbed by the proposal.
38. Nonetheless, given its position, scale and form, the proposed extension would be a prominent visual distractor when viewed from Stable Yard courtyard. Importantly, despite its abutment to Apartment 5, the less striking yet imposing east elevation of Warwick House still allows the special features and legibility of Apartment 5, particularly the upper parts of its west tower and cupola, to be seen, even if they were substantially restored in the 1980's. In this regard, it is key that this elevation maintains its recessive appearance within the courtyard in order for this element of Apartment 5's significance to be appreciated. The proposed extension would not do this. At first floor level, the proposed extension would project towards the open courtyard space. It would be a dominant feature that would obscure much of the western tower of Apartment 5 when viewed from the courtyard. This would notably lessen the positive contribution that its immediate setting makes to its significance, as well as reduce the ability to appreciate that significance.
39. With regards to the Palace, part of its western elevation fronts Stable Yard. In views across the courtyard space from the Palace, the proposed extension would appear conspicuous. While it would be further away than Apartment 5 and would be a relatively small addition in the context of Warwick House as a whole, due to its design and position at first floor level, it would nonetheless be eye-catching. In an attempt to elevate the grandeur of Warwick House's east elevation and entrance, it would disrupt the hierarchy of buildings that enclose the courtyard, a setting that is highly sensitive to change. In so doing, it would detract from the significance of the Grade I listed Palace as an asset of the highest importance.
40. While the appellant argues the proposal would ensure that the significance of Lancaster House would be preserved, I find otherwise. As a Grade I listed building with a prominent frontage onto Stable Yard courtyard directly facing the entrance to Warwick House, the proposed extension would be clearly perceptible. Due to its prominent location facing the courtyard, together with its design and materials, it would introduce a visually discordant element within the immediate setting of Lancaster House that would harmfully compete with the architectural primacy of its principal entrance. As such, the physical form of the proposed extension would be harmful to its setting, diminishing the positive contribution the setting makes to its significance.

41. The Council's officer report sets out that, as well as the designated heritage assets referred to above, the proposal would harm the setting of Clarence House. While Clarence House has group value with the listed buildings that surround Stable Yard, including Warwick House, only a relatively small part of the building faces the courtyard. Warwick House and Clarence House are seen in the same views from some areas of the courtyard and along Stable Yard when approaching from the north. However, given the recessed corner location of Clarence House in relation to the courtyard and the distance between the buildings, there would be limited direct visibility between Clarence House and the proposed extension. As such, its setting would be preserved. This does not alter the harm I have found in respect of the setting of the high grade designated assets Apartment 5, the Palace and Lancaster House.
42. I acknowledge that change to the setting of a heritage asset does not automatically result in harm to its significance and change can also be positive or neutral. It only becomes harmful if the identified special interest is eroded, which I find to be the case in relation to the heritage assets above. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, whilst the setting of Clarence House would be preserved, I find that the proposal would not preserve the settings of Grade I listed Apartment 5, the Palace and Lancaster House.

SJCA

43. These harmful effects would feed through to the character and appearance of the SJCA. Indeed, notwithstanding the variance of development within the conservation area, the proposed extension's form and location above the entrance hall of Warwick House would be wholly out of keeping with the predominant unifying natural materials and characteristics of the area.
44. I acknowledge the proposal would be largely concealed when viewed from outside Stable Yard courtyard. Nonetheless, views do not need to be appreciated along formal vistas or walks, or axial views to make an important contribution to the character and appearance of a conservation area. The proposal would be clearly seen from the courtyard and buildings that surround it, as well as in glimpsed views from Green Park through the gap between Lancaster House and Warwick House.
45. Historically, buildings and land within the SJCA have changed and evolved over many years. I accept that change is inevitable, and that conservation is a process of managing that change, not preventing it. However, of itself, previous change does not justify the proposal. By adversely affecting a building that contributes positively to SJCA, and would be highly apparent within the courtyard, the proposal would cause harm to the significance of the SJCA and would fail to preserve its character and appearance.

Conclusion on effects

46. Drawing all of the above together, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the Grade II listed building, Warwick House, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; fail to preserve the settings of the Grade I listed buildings Apartment 5, the Palace and Lancaster House; and fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the SJCA as a whole. As such, the significance of these designated heritage assets would be harmed.

Heritage balance

47. In finding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance requires the magnitude of that harm to be articulated. Given the nature and extent of the proposal, I find the harm to the significance of Warwick House, Apartment 5, the Palace and Lancaster House would be of a moderate level of 'less than substantial'. The harm to the SJCA as a whole would be at the low end of 'less than substantial'. Nevertheless, such harm is of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes securing the asset's optimum viable use.
48. The public benefits that would 'flow from' the proposal would comprise economic benefits brought about through the investment into the property and a time-limited benefit through the construction phase. Also, social benefits would be gained through improvements to the local housing stock. The scale of those benefits to the public at large is moderated by the limited scale of the proposal, but nonetheless, weigh in favour of the appeals. However, no evidence has been provided which verifies that the proposal is necessary to secure the residential use of the listed building.
49. In support of the proposal, the appellant suggests a public benefit would accrue through the re-instatement of a previous conservatory and retrofitting of a listed building. I have set out above that the proposal would not result in the recovery of an element of significance that has been previously removed. While I recognise that the principles of sustainable design have been taken into account in the proposed scheme, there is nothing before to demonstrate the proposal would facilitate the retention or re-purposing of the existing building or that it is necessary to viably achieve the wider responsible retrofit of the building as set out in Policy 43 of the WCP. In any event, harm to heritage assets has not been avoided or minimised. That the proposal would be an energy efficient addition to Warwick House and there would be no harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents are expectations of development and would not be public benefits.
50. Paragraph 200 of the Framework is explicit in its requirement that any harm to, or loss of the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification, which, in all of the respects outlined above, I find not to be the case in the appeals before me.
51. Overall, the weight that I ascribe to the public benefits that would result from the proposal would not be sufficient to outweigh the weight that I attach to the harm I have identified, and I am not persuaded that the only way of securing such benefits would be via the particular scheme that is before me.
52. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not preserve the Grade II listed building, known as Warwick House, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; it would fail to preserve the settings of the Grade I listed buildings Apartment 5, the Palace and Lancaster House; and fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the SJCA as a whole. There would therefore be harm to the significance of these designated heritage assets. This would fail to meet the requirements of sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act.

53. The proposal would conflict with policies 42, 44 and 45 of the WCP insofar as they are relevant. These policies, in part, seek to require that all development positively contributes to Westminster's townscape and streetscape; preserves or enhances the character and appearance of Westminster's conservation areas; that heritage assets and their settings are conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance. It would also be contrary to the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment and achieve well-designed and beautiful places.

Other Matters

54. Warwick House is attached to the Grade II listed Stornaway House. From the information before me and my observations on site, the special interest and significance of this listed building primarily stems from its historic and architectural interest. It is also derived, in part, from its group value as part of the long terrace of listed 19th century architecturally designed townhouses within a planned urban setting.
55. The west elevation of Warwick House fronts the Grade II* listed Park and Garden of Green Park and the Grade I listed Park and Garden of St James's Park abuts Green Park to the east. From the evidence, the significance of Green Park lies in part in its historic interest as a royal park. It also has group value in its relationship to the historic buildings and landscapes of Clarence House and Buckingham Palace. Similarly, the significance of St James's Park also lies in part in its historical association as a royal hunting park, remodelled in subsequent years by several celebrated landscape architects as a cherished public park and forming the main approach to Buckingham Palace.
56. There is a strong visual connection between Green Park, St James's Park and the backdrop of trees and buildings that line their boundaries, including the appeal site. The juxtaposition between the open park landscapes and the tight urban grain that exists along the eastern edge of Green Park contributes to the setting of and significance of these heritage assets.
57. Given the location of the proposal in relation to these designated heritage assets, and that it would address Stable Yard, I find that the setting of Stornaway House and the listed Green Park and St James's Park would be preserved, and their significance not harmed. In these regards, the proposal would meet the requirements of section 66(1) of the Act.
58. From the limited information available to me, it is evident Green Park and St James's Park sit within the Royal Parks Conservation Area (RPCA). I am aware that the RPCA includes several public parks, the significance of which are mainly derived from their historic interest, royal connections with the crown, and landscaping and layout within the city context. Although Warwick House lies on the edge of this conservation area, its west and southern elevations are clearly visible in views taken from within these parks. Given the location of the proposal in relation to the RPCA, and that it would address Stable Yard, I find that its setting would be preserved, and its significance not harmed.
59. I acknowledge that there was engagement with the Council prior to submission of the planning application and the proposal was amended in response to officer advice. However, the reasons for the eventual officer recommendation and decision are clearly set out in the officer report and communications prior to that

point do not have a bearing on my consideration of the main issue, as set out above.

Conclusions

60. **Appeal A:** The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.
61. **Appeal B:** For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

Ann Veevers

INSPECTOR