



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by John Dowsett MA DipURP DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/X5990/Y/25/3367596

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 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by MSMR Architects against the decision of the Council of the City of Westminster.
 - The application Reference is: 25/00740/LBC.
 - The works proposed are described as: Refurbishment and alterations to the existing balcony on west elevation, installation of canopy to the balcony and associated works.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/X5990/W/25/3367591

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 MSMR Architects against the decision of the Council of the City of Westminster.
 - The application Reference is: 25/00739/FULL.
 - The development proposed is described as: Refurbishment and alterations to the existing balcony on west elevation, installation of canopy to the balcony and associated works.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. At the time of my site visit the exterior of the building was scaffolded and enclosed in a shroud. I was, however, able to view the balcony and balustrade from the scaffolding. The submitted evidence contains a number of photographs of the exterior of the building without scaffolding, and I am satisfied that I have sufficient information regarding the external appearance of the building to enable me to determine the appeal.
4. Both appeals relate to the same works to the building. Whilst the decision notices issued by the Council use slightly different descriptions, these are essentially similar and are just a slight rewording of the description that was used on the joint application form which was 'Refurbishment and alterations to the existing balcony on west elevation, installation of canopy to the balcony and associated works'. The appellant has adopted the Council's descriptions on the appeal forms. This

notwithstanding, for consistency, I have used the description from the original application form as this accurately describes the proposed works that were applied for.

5. The two applications both share a common, identical, reason for refusal, although the listed building consent application has an additional reason for refusal relating to a lack of information regarding the proposed works. To avoid duplication in this decision, I have dealt with the two appeals together, except where otherwise indicated.
6. On 21 January 2026, following a partial review, the Council adopted a revised version of the City of Westminster City Plan 2019 -2040. In terms of the policies that are most relevant to this appeal, and which are cited on the Decision Notice issued by the Council, the wording of these Policies in the new version is identical to that of the previous version of the plan. The numbering of the relevant policies has however changed, Policy 38 is now Policy 42, Policy 39 is now Policy 44, and Policy 40 is now Policy 45. References to Policy numbers in this decision are to those in the current, most recent, version of the City of Westminster City Plan (hereinafter the City Plan).
7. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

8. The main issue in these appeals is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building, Warwick House [List Entry No. 1236545], and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, preserve the setting of neighbouring heritage assets, and the extent to which it would preserve, or enhance, the character or appearance of the St James's Conservation Area.

Reasons

Works to the building

9. Warwick House is a four storey house built around 1770-1771. It has a high mansard roof with two tiers of dormer windows. The exterior is stuccoed/rendered, and the roof is finished in slate. The west elevation, facing Green Park, comprises four bays with round arched windows and French doors on the ground and first floors. A stone slab floored balcony with decorative cast iron railings runs almost the full width of this elevation at first floor level. In the southernmost bay the balcony has been extended to project further from the building than the remainder of the structure. It is this balcony which forms the main subject of these appeals.
10. The proposed works are to the west elevation of the building with some associated internal works for structural purposes. Although this elevation is, technically, the rear elevation, because it faces onto Green Park, it is highly visible. The wall is rendered or stuccoed and incised to replicate rustication at ground floor level. The balcony is located at first floor level above the rusticated section. There is a simple moulded string course over the first floor French windows that provide access to the balcony. A projecting cornice with a simple decorative frieze is present above the third floor windows and a simpler cornice with a stone balustrade above sits above the fourth floor windows. Within the roof there are two tiers of dormer

windows with the upper level being oval in form. A pilaster wraps around the corner of the building to the south return. This pilaster has decorative moulded panels at first and second floor levels in a similar style to moulded panels on the south and east elevations.

11. These elements give the elevation a well ordered, hierarchical and broadly, although not entirely, symmetrical appearance. The pilaster is not replicated at the northern end of the elevation where the appeal building adjoins Stornoway House. The symmetry is also slightly disrupted by the added projection to the southern end of the balcony and the fact that the current balcony projects approximately half way across the pilaster.
12. The south elevation has a two storey bay window at the eastern end of the elevation and an oriel window at first floor at the western end. On the east elevation, a single storey entrance porch projects beyond the main elevation at ground floor level. To the north the building is joined to the neighbouring Stornoway House. Stornoway House is also Grade II Listed Building [List Entry No. 1291430].
13. It is clear from the submitted Heritage Statement that the building has been significantly altered over the course of its existence and that its context has also changed over time. When originally constructed, the building was a relatively simple, brick built, four storey house with a shallow hipped roof. Over the course of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century various alterations were carried out to the building leading to its present form. Of most relevance to these appeals, the balcony was added to the building in or around 1827 and then modified in or around 1894 to add a veranda roof. At the same time, the section of balcony at the southern end was altered to project forward and the railing reconfigured. The veranda roof and its supporting columns were subsequently removed in or around 1910.
14. Given the above, the special interest of the building insofar as it relates to these appeals is primarily derived from its architectural interest as a good example of a brick-built townhouse, by a principal architect of the late-18th century, William Chambers, which has been subsequently altered and adapted to reflect changes in stylistic and architectural tastes and the requirements of the occupiers of an important house in the prestigious district of St. James's. The later changes to the building also illustrate the work of other important and influential architects.
15. The building is of historic interest arising from its occupation by prominent individuals, including the Earls of Warwick, and also illustrating the importance of aristocratic patronage of architects. The building additionally has aesthetic value from its external appearance and contribution to a group of buildings fronting Green Park.
16. The proposed works to the balcony comprise retaining and refurbishing the existing stone slabs, ironwork, and brackets, while introducing structural alterations to support a widened balcony. This includes installing new stainless steel supports, additional matching stone slabs to increase the projection to 1.7m, decorative elements to conceal the structural works, and modifications to the existing balustrade by repairing and reusing existing components in a new configuration and restoring missing details. Existing decorative panels from the balustrade would

- be repaired and re-used with a panel containing a “W” sigil relocated from its current position on the projecting element to a central location.
17. A new canopy is proposed above the extended balcony. This would have a zinc covered roof over a timber frame and would have a bell profile. It would be supported on new scrollwork columns integrated into the balustrade. Further works involve adding safety features in the form of wire mesh behind the re-used decorative panels and tensile wires above the balcony hand rail to meet fall protection requirements, and the relocation of one of the existing decorative panels from the balustrade to be displayed inside the building.
 18. The evidence shows that the building has evolved over its lifetime as it has been adapted to suit the living requirements and tastes of successive occupiers. It is now much altered from its original appearance, although the building was largely in its current form at the time it was added to the List.
 19. The proposed new canopy would obscure the existing moulded string course above the first floor windows. This forms part of the articulation of the elevation together with the primary and secondary cornices. It appears from the drawings included in the Heritage Statement that this string course was added after the removal of the short lived previous veranda in or around 1910¹. The string course does, however, articulate the elevation by providing definition between the first and second floors. The height of the roof would allow the arched heads of the first floor windows to be seen below the eaves level. However, the overall height would cause the works to be perceived as encroaching onto the second floor and would obscure the external manifestation of the internal horizontal sub-division of the building.
 20. I have noted that on the 1894 drawings included in the Design and Access Statement, the canopy is shown at a similar height. Nevertheless, the drawings also show the external render incised to mimic stonework which would have given the façade a more monolithic appearance. The 1894 drawings also show that this may have been part of a unified scheme where the roof of the veranda and that of the oriel window, which was to be added at the same time, would align with roof of the 1860’s two storey bay on the south elevation². The photographic evidence shows that the oriel window was subsequently constructed in a simpler form with the roof at a lower level. The 1907 demolition drawing also shows the canopy to the balcony at an apparent lower height with the eaves obscuring the arched window heads. From the evidence, it does appear that the 1894 scheme may have been implemented in a manner that varied from the surviving drawings.
 21. The neighbouring building, Stornoway House, has a balcony with a cast iron rail at first floor level on the west facing elevation which wraps around the broad three storey bow and continues across the remainder of the elevation. From what I saw when I visited the site, this balcony projects approximately the same distance from the building as the extended section of the current balcony on the appeal building. Although set at slightly different levels, these two balconies provide a degree of visual continuity across the two buildings. The proposed widening of the balcony on the appeal building would have little effect on this. However, the addition of the canopied veranda to the appeal building would disrupt this visual continuity by introducing vertical elements and a much more prominent feature solid feature at a higher level than the existing balustrades.

¹ Heritage Statement: Proposed Balcony Works - Turley Heritage January 2025, Figures 3.14 and 3.15

² Design and Access Statement - John Simpson Architects January 2025, Figures 4 and 5

22. It is also apparent from the evidence in the Heritage Statement that, although the balcony was extended, the previous canopy did not project as far as current proposal would³. It is shown with a depth similar to that of the original section of the balcony. As set out above, the veranda may not have been constructed entirely as shown on the historic drawing. The demolition drawings show the roof as squared off and with two additional supporting columns. The drawings also show the balcony projecting over the corner pilaster as it does now, which is not shown as such on the 1894 drawing. The appellant's evidence also suggests that it is not clear whether the balcony was extended over the proposed two bays as shown on the 1894 drawing. Nonetheless, the demolition drawing does not illustrate a stagger in the roof line which strongly suggests that the previous veranda roof was only over the width of the original balcony. Consequently, the 1894 drawing is not necessarily a reliable precedent for the current proposal.
23. The width of the balcony resulting from the proposed works would be consistent with that on Stornoway House. However, the wider roof proposed by the appeal scheme would appear disproportionately large when seen in context with the roof over the oriel window on the south elevation. The supporting columns for the roof, although of an open scrollwork design, would also be visually prominent. The combination of the above would result in the extended balcony and roof appearing as an unduly dominant feature on the otherwise restrained and well-proportioned elevation.
24. The appellant suggests that the appeal proposal is a further evolution of the balcony as a feature of the building that has evolved over its existence and is no longer in its original form. Although noting the appellant's point about restoring symmetry through the uniform width and the relocation of the "W" sigil panel, the current rear elevation is not wholly symmetrical and indeed from the photographic evidence the two other visible elevations of the building are highly asymmetrical. Indeed, a large part of the architectural and aesthetic interest of the building is derived from its iterative modifications manifesting themselves in the informal arrangement of the elements.
25. I saw when I visited the site that balconies and balconettes are a common feature of buildings in immediately surrounding area on buildings of various ages. The balconies also exhibit a range of designs, including a balcony with a canopy at number 8 Cleveland Row. Whilst this covered balcony features similar scrollwork supporting columns, it features a tented roof that has a more recessive appearance than the bell profile of the appeal proposal, and the balcony only projects approximately the same distance as the unextended part of the balcony on the appeal building. In addition, the highest part of the canopy sits below the level of the string course separating the first and second floors, maintaining the visual hierarchy of the elevation. This balcony, although located on the front elevation the building and in a prominent location closing the view along Cleveland Road looking west, appears in proportion with the building on which it is located.
26. The other example of a roofed balcony cited by the appellant, at Endsleigh Street, also features a tented roof. From the partial image provided, the façade of this building is articulated in a different manner without horizontal string courses dividing the storeys resulting in a different visual effect to the appeal proposal.

³ Heritage Statement: Proposed Balcony Works - Turley Heritage January 2025 Figure 3.14

27. The proposed extended balcony would be enclosed by a balustrade incorporating the supporting uprights for the roof. This would re-use refurbished and repaired components from the existing balustrade in a new configuration, combined with new components. The existing wavy balusters would be respaced and supplemented with new facsimiles to meet the requirements of the building regulations for baluster spacing.
28. This would result in an essentially new structure containing re-used components from the existing balustrade. The application included a Condition Survey Report of the balustrade. This identified that there are a number of defects with decorative elements missing or damaged by corrosion, damage to scrollwork with loose collars holding elements and deformation or loss of a section causing distortion of the handrail. A small number of previous poor repairs are also identified. The condition report does not identify that the existing balustrade is beyond repair or restoration and, indeed, outlines a conservation option which proposes that.
29. Although the proposed structure of the new balustrade and canopy supports would re-use components from the current balustrade, the works would necessarily involve the removal and dismantling of the balustrade. The balcony and balustrade are not in their original form having been altered in the late nineteenth century and again in the early twentieth century. Nonetheless, much of original balcony remains, although the railings could contain elements from a number of phases. As it currently exists, the balcony and balustrade provide evidence of the adaptation of the building over time. This would be lost as a result of the proposed works.
30. Notwithstanding that the floor slabs and support brackets would remain and the ironwork from the balustrade re-used, the upper part above the floor level would be essentially a new structure that would obscure Georgian origins of the balcony and provide fewer clues to the evolution of the building over time. The present asymmetrical form of the balcony and balustrade are not inconsistent with the asymmetry apparent on the elevations of the building and are part of its historic layering.
31. Drawing the above points together, the proposed widening of the balcony floor would, of itself, not necessarily be harmful. The original support brackets and the historic floor slabs would be retained and the new slabs forming the extension would be grafted onto the existing slabs. However, the proposed canopy due to its height and projection would obscure architectural details that articulate the façade and the resulting combined structure would appear disproportionately large on the elevation of the building. It would also compromise the ability to appreciate the historic development of the building. This would be harmful to the architectural interest of the building and to its aesthetic value.
32. The proposal would necessitate some structural alterations to the building. Three new openings would have to be made through the exterior wall to accommodate structural steel to support the extended balcony. It would also be necessary to notch an existing secondary timber beam within the building to install a new steel beam to provide an anchor point for two of the new steel supporting beams. This approach was explained within the Heritage Statement submitted with the

application, and was illustrated in drawings included in the Structural Engineering Notes on the Proposals to Widen the Existing Rear Balcony⁴.

33. Further larger scale details were provided in drawing form as part of the appeal. From the evidence that I have I am satisfied that there is sufficient detail to determine the effects of the proposed works on the structure of the listed building.
34. The works would also involve the removal of the stone slab which has been used to extend the end bay of the balcony in the past and the removal of some steel beams below this section of the balcony which provide support for it. These are simple I section beams that were most likely inserted when that section of the balcony was extended in the late nineteenth century. These I beams have, however, been decorated with applied scrollwork within the profile where they would be visible around the periphery of the balcony. The original slimmer T section brackets used on the remainder of the balcony are still in place behind this additional supporting structure.
35. These beams are a later addition and, despite the attempt at embellishment, are somewhat crude compared to the other metalwork on the building. They are suffering from corrosion along the top flanges beneath the stone slabs and where they are embedded into the building wall. Following their removal, the points where the beams pass through the external wall would be re-used for the new supporting beams.
36. The proposed structural works would result in a small amount of historic building fabric being lost to accommodate the new steelwork passing through the external wall and the insertion of some new structural elements within the building. The loss of building fabric would not generally prevent the method of construction and building techniques used in the initial construction and subsequent alteration of the building from being discerned in the future. The only exception to this being the loss of the later I section beams beneath the balcony which provide evidence of how that section of balcony was previously extended and the attempt made to disguise a functional element. Whilst the loss of historic fabric is harmful, it would be small scale.
37. I have noted the Council's point that it has no records of permission being sought for an existing internal steel beam that three of the new supporting beams would be anchored to. However, it is not suggested that this is something that would be actionable. There is no evidence regarding this beam. Structural steel beams have existed since the late nineteenth century and this beam may have been inserted prior to the building being listed in 1970, or as part of one of the earlier phases of modification of the building.
38. Although the building has been much altered since its original construction in the later eighteenth century, this contributes to its architectural interest and has resulted in its aesthetic value. Whilst listed status does not prevent alterations or additions to the building, any alterations should preserve the building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. For the reasons set out above, I find that the proposed works would result in harm to the building and would not conserve it in a manner appropriate to its significance.

⁴ Structural Engineering Notes on the Proposals to Widen the Existing Rear Balcony - Alan Baxter January 2025

The effect on other heritage assets

39. Warwick House is situated within the St James's Conservation Area and is located adjacent to the boundary of this conservation area with the Royal Parks Conservation Area. The Council have identified that the building is within the settings of the Grade I listed Lancaster House and of Stornoway House which is listed Grade II. It is also identified as within the setting of the Green Park Grade II* Registered Park and Garden.
40. The St James's Conservation Area is a relatively compact area sitting between Piccadilly to the north and The Mall to the south. The western boundary abuts The Green Park. The eastern boundary is staggered, with the northern part located to the rear of the buildings on the west side of Waterloo Place and the southern section extending almost as far as Trafalgar Square and the National Gallery. It is focussed on St James's Square and St James's Palace. The area has a planned formal grid of streets with the primary roads being St James's Street and Pall Mall. Within the grid of streets and development blocks there are a number of mews, lanes, and yards that form more intimate spaces. The frontage to Queens Walk (within Green Park) acts as a transitional zone between the built up area and the open space beyond with the built edge forming an important backdrop to Green Park. The area has a mixed character with a predominantly commercial focus but includes some residential uses.
41. From the evidence, the significance of the St James's Conservation Area is derived from its origins as a new residential suburb developed from the late seventeenth century retaining its distinctive, planned grid pattern of streets and buildings but which has been successively redeveloped over the subsequent centuries to become a hub of high-status and fashionable, trades, retail, and social clubs alongside residential uses. The architecture is diverse in terms of ages, height, scale, and style and in the use of materials. It provides evidence of the response to changing uses and architectural fashion over its period of development.
42. The Royal Parks Conservation Area, which has a common boundary with the St James's Conservation Area, is comprised of St James's Park, Green Park, Buckingham Palace Gardens, Hyde Park and the part of Kensington Gardens that is within the City of Westminster administrative area. Its significance, insofar as it is relevant to this appeal is that it contains a sequence of former Royal Parks that exhibit the 'Picturesque' landscaping tradition of the mid-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries that were later opened to the public. The parks are important open spaces in central London that provide a landscaped setting for the surrounding buildings.
43. The individual parks that make up the Royal Parks Conservation Area are also separately recorded as Registered Parks and Gardens. Green Park is Registered at Grade II* [List Entry No: 1000806]. It was designated for its historic interest, its contribution to the important series of historic Royal Parks within the urban setting; informal landscaping with tree planting and paths; views within and out of the park; and its group value from its relationship with the historic buildings and landscapes of Clarence House and Buckingham Palace. Insofar as it is relevant to these appeals, its significance is derived from its aesthetic value and the visual relationship with the surrounding buildings.

44. The appeal building is joined to Stornoway House, a late eighteenth century town mansion that was subsequently altered in the early nineteenth century and rebuilt internally in the mid-twentieth century. From the limited evidence submitted, its significance primarily arises from the architectural interest of the exterior and the visual contribution that the building makes to the group of high status buildings on the edge of Green Park.
45. Lancaster House [List Entry No: 1236546] is listed Grade I. Dating from the 1820's, it is a grand mansion in classical style, stone built, with an impressive two storey porte-cochère style portico on the north front. From the evidence, its significance is derived from its architectural quality, and historic value derived from its association with leading nineteenth century designers, high-profile clients and patterns of historic use.
46. The Council has not adduced any substantive evidence in respect of the contribution made by their settings to the significance of the nearby listed buildings, Green Park or the Royal Parks Conservation Area. Nor has it provided any substantive evidence in respect of the special architectural or historic interest of the St James's Conservation Area beyond providing a copy of the St James's Conservation Area Audit Supplementary Planning Guidance. Whilst this document is informative, no specific analysis of the effects of the proposal and what harm would result to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area has been put to me.
47. From its appeal Statement, the Council's concerns in respect of the above amount to the proposal increasing the visual prominence of the building, thus becoming a more dominant feature in the townscape and drawing attention away from the surrounding buildings, including in views from Green Park.
48. As set out above, the St James's Conservation Area contains buildings in a wide range of architectural styles and of varying ages. It is this diversity that shapes its appearance. Whilst the appeal building is within the conservation area, it is located immediately adjacent to the boundary, and the proposed works face out of the conservation area. The area also contains numerous buildings which feature balconies and balconettes of various designs.
49. I have found that the proposed works would be harmful to the external appearance of the appeal building which, in turn would diminish its contribution to the appearance of the conservation area. The conservation area does not cover an extensive geographical area, but it does, nevertheless, encompass a number of streets and contain a significant number of buildings. The effect of the proposed works would be limited to the near vicinity of the building itself and would be mainly experienced from views into the conservation area from outside. Primarily these would be from Queens Walk, the pathway that runs along the eastern edge of Green Park from Picadilly to The Mall. As such it would be seen as part of a series of sequential views in the context of the other buildings facing onto Green Park. These buildings are varied in design and age and many also feature balconies in a variety of forms, albeit none are covered. Features such as the tall railings to Lancaster House and Bridgewater House also occlude the views from Queens Walk until the near approaches to the appeal building.
50. There are some potential views from other paths and open spaces within the park. However, due to the extensive established tree cover within and on the periphery of

Green Park such views will be very limited when the trees are in leaf and still filtered by branches and tree trunks when they are not. The proposed works would not be seen in context with any other streets within the Conservation Area. There is nothing in the evidence which would indicate that the proposed works would be harmful to the character of the conservation area as a historic, mixed use, part of the city. Although the proposed works would have a slight adverse effect on the appearance of a small part of the conservation area, I find that the effect on the conservation area as a whole would be a neutral one.

51. Similar factors apply to the effect on the Registered Park and Garden and the Royal Parks Conservation Area. The appeal building forms part of a sequence of buildings which frame the open space and makes a positive contribution to it partly because of its scale and partly because of its appearance. The proposed works would alter the external appearance of the building. However, the proposal would affect only a small part of the wider setting of these extensive areas and there is nothing in the evidence before me which would suggest that the appeal proposal would diminish the ability to understand or appreciate the significance of these historic open spaces. I also note that Gardens Trust did not wish to comment on the proposal and adopted a neutral stance to it. I therefore find that the proposal would have a neutral effect on the settings of Green Park Registered Park and Garden and the Royal Parks Conservation Area.
52. With regard to the effect on the setting of the neighbouring listed buildings, Warwick House forms part of the immediate setting of both of these, positioned as it is between the two. The evidence in respect of the contribution that their setting makes to the significance of these two buildings is somewhat scant. Nonetheless, all three buildings form part of a larger assemblage of historic buildings, often built for high status occupiers in the environs of St James's Palace.
53. The immediate setting of Lancaster House is defined by Stable Yard, Green Park, The Mall to the south, and Clarence House and St James's Palace to the east. The appeal proposal would introduce a new built element into this setting. Given the grand scale of Lancaster House and its imposing presence, it is difficult to see how the introduction of a relatively small, albeit visually prominent feature, into this would diminish the understanding of the building, its architectural features, and its visual and historical relationship with the other buildings in the group. As such, I find that the effect on the setting of Lancaster House would be neutral.
54. The appeal building has a much closer visual relationship with the adjoining Stornoway House. The proposed works would have a more immediate effect on this building due to their proximity and relative size. In particular, they would disrupt the visual continuity derived from the first floor balconies on each building. However, the prominent half round bay on the west elevation of Stornoway House, with its first floor balcony and the strong cornice at third floor level, together with the pedimented north elevation give the building a very strong visual presence. Stornoway House is architecturally distinct in its own right and the proposed works would not reduce the ability to understand or appreciate that. Similarly, I find that there would be a neutral effect on the setting of this building.
55. Despite the harm that would be caused to the listed building, for the reasons set out above, I do not find that the proposed works would be harmful to the character and appearance of the St James's Conservation Area, or the respective settings of

Lancaster House, Stornoway House, Green Park Registered Park and Garden, or the Royal Parks Conservation Area.

Heritage balance

56. I have found that the proposal would cause harm to the special architectural interest, aesthetic value and, hence, the significance of the appeal building. This harm would not result in a total loss of the significance of the building and would be primarily limited to the west elevation of the building. However, this elevation is prominent. As such, this harm would be less than substantial in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) but, nevertheless, of considerable importance and weight.
57. Under such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes the securing of optimal viable use of listed buildings. The appellant is of the opinion that the proposal would be beneficial for a number of reasons.
58. Firstly, it is suggested that the works would facilitate the optimal use of the balcony beyond the current limitations imposed by the arrangement and dimensions of the balustrade. Although the appeal building is within a slightly constrained urban context, it is not without external amenity space. At the time the balcony was added to the building, balconies were more akin to architectural and safety features, rather than additional usable space for the occupants. In any event, as the Council point out, additional amenity space is a private benefit rather than a public benefit. As such I can give this no weight in favour of the scheme.
59. The appellant also suggests that there would be a benefit in the form of increased surveillance of Green Park from an elevated position. However, it is not clear why this would be the case. It would be possible to stand out on the balcony in its current configuration, and the building has large windows at first floor level. Consequently, I would agree with the Council that any additional casual surveillance of the Green Park would be at best marginal, and little weight can be given to this.
60. The evidence indicates that the proposed balcony roof would provide a degree of solar shading which would reduce solar gain during the afternoon and early evening in the two first floor rooms. This would provide a greater degree of thermal comfort during the summer months, although it would limit the benefits of passive solar gain during the cooler months and may also increase the need for artificial lighting within these rooms. As the Council point out, there are other, less harmful ways to achieve same result, which could include blinds, curtains, or shutters. Such options do not appear to have been explored. Whilst this may provide a slight benefit, only a moderate amount of weight can be given to it.
61. The proposal would result in the removal of the cruder steel beams below the current balcony extension that may require repairs in the future. Nevertheless, other options to address this have not been considered in any detail in the submissions. The replacement of the structural beams is a small benefit but adds little weight in favour of the proposal.
62. The appellant refers to the removal of later unsympathetic alterations to the balcony as a further benefit. This seems to be referring mainly to the extension of southern end of the balcony, although it could include the steel beams mentioned above that

form part of the works. Whilst the current form of the balcony is asymmetric, the west elevation, and the other elevations of the building are also asymmetric. The widening of only part of the balcony in the late nineteenth century appears to have been a deliberate choice and is not out of keeping with the other, organic, slightly idiosyncratic alterations carried out the building over time. The removal of the steel beams would be a slight benefit from a longer term maintenance perspective, but this would be at the expense of the loss of historic fabric and evidence of the historic evolution of the building. Overall, this is a neutral factor in the balance and adds no weight.

63. The appellant suggests as a benefit that the proposal would result in a resolution of the visual relationship between the balcony and the west elevation. As I have found, for the reasons set out above, that the proposed works would be harmful to appearance and understanding of this elevation, I cannot ascribe any weight to this suggested benefit.
64. The building was designed as a dwellinghouse and whilst it is currently being extensively refurbished, the continued viable use of the appeal property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence.
65. Whilst there would be some slight benefits arising from the proposal, these are either a private benefit or relatively minor. These would not, either individually or collectively, outweigh the harm that I have identified.
66. Given the above and in the absence of any substantive public benefits, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II Listed Warwick House. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 210 of the NPPF and, in respect of Appeal B, would conflict with policies 42, 44 and 45 of the City Plan. Taken together these policies seek to ensure that new development is of a high standard of design; that ensure heritage assets are conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance; and that alterations and extensions will respect the character of the existing building, avoid adverse visual impacts and will not obscure important architectural features. As a result, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan. No material considerations have been identified which would indicate that permission should be granted for a development which conflicts with the development plan.

Conclusion

67. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

John Dowsett

INSPECTOR