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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose and structure of report

This Heritage Statement has been commissioned by Tite Street Holdings Ltd and prepared by Alan Baxter & Associates LLP (ABA) to support a listed building consent application for proposals to extend the residential accommodation at No. 33 Tite Street, a Grade II-listed building within the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea (RBKC). The building was designed in 1880 by the architect R. W. Edis, a significant figure in the Queen Anne Revival, as speculative flats with studios.

The purpose of the report is to explain the development history of the building and to provide an analysis of its significance (overall and of its component parts). This is followed by an assessment of the proposed scheme for the building against current planning policy. The report comprises seven sections – this Introduction (1.0), followed by Understanding the Asset (2.0), Significance (3.0), Planning Policy Context (4.0), Proposals and Justification (5.0) and Conclusion (6.0). Sources used are detailed in 7.0, and the list description and Historic Environment Search are included in the appendices.

1.2 Methodology and limitations

This report is based on research encompassing both original archival documents (consulted at Kensington Central Library and the London Metropolitan Archives) and secondary sources. A site visit was made on 5 February 2013, in which the ground-floor flat (including the lower ground floor and studio) and garden were inspected.

The scope of this assessment is the lower ground and upper ground floors only, as these are the parts of the building which are affected by the proposals. The rear garden is also touched upon although not dealt with in detail. References to the upper floors are included here only in the account of the building’s development, to provide the full historic context.

Throughout the report, ‘basement’ and ‘lower ground’ are both used to refer to the bottom floor of the building. ‘Basement’ is used in the account of the building’s historic development, as this is how it is referred to in historic drawings and the terminology is befitting of its historic use as a service area. In all other sections, it is referred to as ‘lower ground’, which is the current, preferred terminology.

Archaeology is not dealt with in this report, although the Historic Environment Record (HER) was consulted, in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.3 The site

The building is located on the east side of Tite Street, approximately 200m north of the Thames riverfront. It fronts directly onto the street and shares party walls with No. 31 (to the north) and No. 35 (to the south). A terraced garden to the rear is surrounded by a boundary wall, which separates it from No. 31 and No. 35, and the expansive grounds of Gordon House to the north-east.
1.4 Designations

No. 33 Tite Street was designated at Grade II in 1969. It is surrounded by several other listed buildings, including Nos. 31, 34, 44 and 46 Tite Street. These contribute to the Group Value identified in the list description for No. 33.

The building also stands within the Royal Hospital Conservation Area, which was designated by RBKC in 1967.

The site is not within an Archaeological Priority Area, but lies to the east of the Thames APA. The HER records show that the only archaeological find site within a 250m radius of the site is a Thames-side prehistoric clay deposit with molluscan remains. This is not considered to have any relevance to the site.

Note: Information in this plan is based on the National Heritage List for England website, consulted in March 2014, and the Royal Hospital Conservation Area Proposals Statement.

NB: This plan is not definitive. Locations of listed buildings are indicative, and only buildings in close proximity to the site are marked.
2.0 Understanding the Asset

2.1 Pre-nineteenth century Chelsea

Chelsea’s earliest incarnation was as a small village alongside the Thames, in a rural location beyond the reach of the Cities of London and Westminster. The King’s Road was a country highway for private use by royalty, connecting Westminster with Hampton Court. The small village was surrounded by several mansion houses – country retreats of the wealthy. These included Lindsey House and Stanley House, both of late seventeenth-century date, and Argyll House, built 1723. Of most note was the Royal Hospital, designed by Sir Christopher Wren and erected to the east of the village of Chelsea from 1682.

Gradually, from the beginning of the eighteenth century, the area began to be built up with smaller houses and terraces, similar to other villages which were subsumed by the expanding urban sprawl of London and Westminster. The beginning of this shift is evident in Rocque’s map of 1746.
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OS map of 1869, showing the area just prior to the build up of Tite Street

OS map of 1894, showing Tite Street developed
2.2 Victorian Chelsea

Artists were attracted to Chelsea from the beginning of the nineteenth century as it was affordable but close to the capital. As the century progressed, the improved wealth and social status of the profession enabled successful artists to commission their own purpose-built studios, and these proliferated throughout Kensington and Chelsea, and other outlying parts of London, from the 1870s.

The studios generally incorporated living space for the artists, and could be in the form of single studio houses or blocks of multiple studio flats. Later decades saw more speculative, rather than commissioned artists’ accommodation, catering for the less successful artists who wanted to be in the right area. It has been estimated that there were two or three speculative studios for every custom-built one and these were predominantly multiple, flatted studios.

The Queen Anne Revival style dominated architecturally. Characterised by its use of red brick, and architectural features such as gables and bay and oriel windows, it rejected the prescribed proportions of Classical architecture and freely mixed historical styles with an emphasis on English domestic architecture of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

Tite Street was the focus of much building at the time and became one of the most notable concentrations of artistic Chelsea, described as ‘an enclave of rather outré purpose-built artists’ houses, acquiring notoriety through its association with Whistler’ (Pevsner, 1991, p. 555). James Abbot McNeill Whistler (1834-1903), the prolific American-born painter, was responsible for commissioning the first of the studio houses on the street, when he appointed the progressive architect, E.W. Godwin, to design the White House (erected 1877-8, demolished 1960s).

Tite Street as it appears today, with many of its late Victorian buildings
2.3 1880: No. 33 Tite Street constructed

The two plots of No. 31 and No. 33 were purchased and developed in 1880. Both were executed to designs by R.W. Edis, with No. 31 built as a studio house (commissioned by Frank Dicey) and No. 33 built as a small block of studio flats. Edis adopted the Queen Anne style for these buildings. He made use of red and yellow brick for materials and incorporated architectural details such as gables, bay windows to the front rooms of the domestic floors and cut-brick decoration around the entrance, including a panel over the door announcing ‘The Studios’. Also typical of the style is the manner in which the form of the building demonstrates its function, as had already been done by, for example, R.N. Shaw in the design of studio houses in Melbury Road, Kensington. Rather than a symmetrical facade, therefore, there is an arrangement of alternating windows and heights, reflecting the internal plan of rooms.

The principal elevation adopts the prevalent Queen Anne style of the time

Carved brick panel above the main entrance
Sir Robert William Edis (1839-1927)

Robert William Edis moved in the same circles as some of the period’s most elite architects, including E.W. Godwin and William Burges, but he is regarded as being a populariser rather than an innovator (Powers, 2004). He was one of many architects working in the Queen Anne style in the 1870s and 1880s, and this is the style with which he is most associated. His influential 1881 publication, *Decoration and Furniture of Town Houses* dealt with the Queen Anne Revival in a practical way, modifying its more extreme aspects to make the style accessible to the middle classes. His stylistic repertoire also included Gothic Revival in his early years and, later, Italian Renaissance, in tune with the trends of the time.

Edis joined the Architectural Association in 1859 and commenced practice in 1863. He became a fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1867, five years after first becoming an associate. In the same period, he was president of the Architectural Association (1865-1867). He also served as a colonel in the Artists’ Rifles Volunteers, and he often referred to himself as Colonel Edis in professional life.

Proportionally few of his buildings are said to survive. Despite this, at least 15 listed buildings are attributed to Edis - mostly complete designs, but some remodellings of existing buildings. His listed buildings include examples both within London and in various parts of the countryside. They encompass a range of building types, including villas and country houses, clubs, offices, a board school, a gymnasium and a drill hall for his Artists’ Rifle Volunteers.
Plan of 1880 showing the basement arrangement

A surviving fireplace, in the southeast lower ground-floor bedroom

Main staircase, at second-third floor landing
No. 33 was divided into three flats with three studios over staggered floors, with a service basement below. There was one flat per floor, providing basic accommodation: a living room, bedroom, bathroom and small kitchenette with an entrance corridor. A separate, double-height studio was provided for each occupant – in the southern half on the ground and first floors, and in the northern half on the top floor. Drawings of 1915 show that there was initially no direct access between the flats and the studios, with each accessed individually off a main, central staircase. Unlike the typical arrangement for studios at this period, there was also no separate access for artists’ models. Although the status of artists has improved, models were still treated in the manner of servants, and were usually assigned a discrete entrance.

The sole 1880 plan of the building shows that the northern part of the basement was a covered yard with furnace and coal cellars, while the southern part accommodated a kitchen and larder, where a housekeeper would have prepared food for the tenants of the flats above. The south-east room served as a bedroom for the domestic staff.

One of the first occupants of No. 33 Tite Street was the painter, John Singer Sargent, who resided there from around 1887. He reportedly later bought No. 31 in addition to No. 33, and knocked through the party wall on the ground floor. Post Office Directories of the time record him as residing at No. 31 & 33 between 1911 and 1915, adding validity to this suggestion. There is, however, no physical evidence of this connection today, with the opening having apparently been closed again when Sargent moved solely into No. 31 from 1916.
Occupants of No. 33 Tite Street

John Singer Sargent (1856-1925) is the artist most famously associated with No. 33 Tite Street but there have been some other notable residents:

- James Abbot McNeill Whistler, painter, resided here for a very short period in 1883
- David Mlinaric CBE (b. 1930), interior designer, resided on the ground floor in the 1960s
- Julian Barrow (1939-2013), landscape painter, occupied the upper floors from the early 1970s until last year
- Guy Roddon (1919-2006), portraitist, resided here in the early 1970s

In addition, Augustus John (1878-1961), painter, is reported to have worked in one of the studios intermittently between 1940 and 1958 but is not recorded as having resided here.

1915

The next known phase of works to the building was in 1915, when the Stanford Estate made an application for alterations. Plans of this period show a lift running between basement (in the former larder area) and second floor at the rear of the building. The fact that this ran up through all the individual flats suggests it may have been used as a service lift by the housekeeper.

The plans of this period also show that, at basement level, the covered yard had been enclosed by the infilling of openings to the rear garden. The 1915 works also included the addition of a WC in the south-east corner of this area, with the new wall intersecting the door and window arrangement.

1970s

In the 1970s, the building was altered to a scheme by the architects Gareth Wright Associates. The ground-floor flat, ground-floor studio and the southern half of the basement were converted into one flat. An opening had been created between the flat and studio on the ground floor some time after 1915, so these were already connected. As part of the 1970s works, a new staircase was introduced at the rear of the building to connect the ground floor and basement, where a lift had earlier been located. Modifications were also made to the main staircase at basement level, to incorporate an additional turn, thereby enabling a revised arrangement of space at this level. The basement plan form was slightly modified in the southern half, although room volumes were left largely the same, with previously existing walls appearing to have been rebuilt broadly on the same lines. Notably, the former housekeeper’s bedroom was left intact, including the fireplace, although the north wall has been modified, with a new opening created.
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1915 plan of basement

1915 plan of ground floor
Door and window arrangement to lower ground floor, inserted prior to 1915

The garden terrace, facing south
Twenty-first century

In the late twentieth century, a Trust was set up for the benefit of Mr Cann, who then owned No. 33 Tite Street. A private individual purchased the building from the Trust. Works carried out in 2008 following this purchase included the removal of a wall in the northern half of the basement and the creation of new openings in the existing wall in the ground floor above. A steel box-frame was inserted to consolidate the structure, and the cornice was re-run. The 1970s rear staircase area was also altered: an open stairwell was created, an existing door into the garden was converted back into a window (south), a ladder window created (north) and the staircase replaced with one in which salvaged historic timber balusters were used. The rear garden was also relandscaped, with the creation of new paved terracing immediately to the rear of the building to improve sunlight allowance. On the rear elevation, the southernmost window was extended down to become French windows, to match a similar intervention made to the neighbouring window at an unknown date.

2.4 The building today

The building today remains divided into three flats, accessed from original openings on the main staircase:

- Flat 1: southern half of lower ground (historically basement) floor, original ground-floor flat and ground-floor studio space
- Flat 2: original first-floor flat only
- Flat 3: original second-floor flat, second-floor studio and third-floor studio.

The northern half of the lower ground floor is currently used for storage; it is accessed via the main staircase as well as from the southern half of the lower ground floor (Flat 1).

The garden is accessed from Flat 1 only, both from the upper ground-floor north room and from several points in the lower ground floor.

2.5 Phasing plans

The drawings over the next two pages show the development of the building in visual form, with the structure coloured according to the age of fabric. These reflect the best of current knowledge and are based on historic drawings and an examination of the standing fabric.

The phasing drawings only cover the lower ground and upper ground floors, as the parts of the building affected by the current proposals.
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Upper Ground Floor Phasing

- Original 1880s fabric
- Late C19/early C20 alterations
- Mid C20/early C21 alterations

Line of 1880s wall, with later modifications

TITE STREET
3.0 Significance

3.1 Introduction

Assessing ‘significance’ is the means by which the cultural importance of a place and its component parts are identified and compared, both absolutely and relatively. This is essential for effective conservation. The identification of areas and aspects of higher and lower significance, based on a thorough understanding of a listed building, (defined as a ‘heritage asset’) enables policies to be developed which protect, respect and, where possible, enhance its character and cultural values. Significance is a concept embedded in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). ‘Annex 2 (Glossary)’ defines it as: ‘the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting’.

The following are commonly used and widely accepted definitions of archaeological, architectural, artistic and historic interest:

**Archaeological Interest:** An interest in carrying out an expert investigation at some point in the future into the evidence a heritage asset may hold of past human activity. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them. These heritage assets are part of a record of the past that begins with traces of early humans and continues to be created and destroyed.

**Architectural and Artistic Interest:** These are the interests in the design and general aesthetics of a place. They can arise from conscious design or fortuitously from the way the heritage asset has evolved. More specifically, architectural interest is an interest in the art or science of the design, construction, craftsmanship and decoration of buildings and structures of all types. Artistic interest in other human creative skill, like sculpture.

**Historic Interest:** An interest in past lives and events (including pre-historic). Heritage assets can illustrate or be associated with them. Heritage assets with historic interest not only provide a material record of our nation’s history, but can also provide an emotional meaning for communities derived from their collective experience of a place and can symbolise wider values such as faith and cultural identity.

The above definitions have been used to inform the assessment provided in this chapter, in tandem with the historic understanding outlined in Section 2.

The assessment of significance represents a synthesis of several different aspects of the building’s special interest: originality of fabric, hierarchy of rooms and floors, quality of decoration, historic interest, and the nature and extent of alteration. It deals only with the exterior of the building and the lower ground and upper ground floors, which are the floors that will be affected by the proposals.
3.2 Summary Significance

The special interest of No. 33 Tite Street – ‘The Studios’ – is recognised by its Grade II listing, designated in 1969. The list description is typical of early listings: it is minimal and does not indicate the reasoning behind the building’s designation.

The architectural significance of No. 33 can be partly attributed to the fact that it is a good-quality example of the Queen Anne Revival style, executed to the design of a recognised and respected architect, Sir Robert William Edis. The adoption of the Queen Anne style is illustrative of late-Victorian architectural taste.

Another reason for its architectural interest is the fact that it is, overall, a well-preserved and still legible example of artists’ studio flats. This was a very distinct building type, which is particularly associated with this area of London in the late nineteenth century. The dimensions of the most important rooms have been largely retained. Although some openings have been created between flats and historic studio spaces, and additional vertical circulation inserted, the division between the historic flat use and the historic studio use is still apparent, thanks to the predominant retention of the plan form.

Some associative historic interest is derived for the association with famous artists who resided and worked here, particularly John Singer Sargent. In addition, there is illustrative historic interest in understanding how a certain section of society - namely artists - lived in the nineteenth century: despite a generally improved social status, studio flats provided fairly basic accommodation for those unable to commission their own houses. The surviving elements of plan form and features such as the coal vaults demonstrate how the living accommodation, work spaces and service area were arranged and operated.

Finally, there is no known archaeological interest associated with the site.

The significance of the building has been diminished in some places. Minor modern reconfiguration in the lower ground floor has caused it to lose some of historic legibility, while modern redecoration has led to the loss of some of the simple but good-quality joinery and decorative features of the original rooms. The rear elevation has also suffered from some incremental alterations and the landscaping of the garden has been largely modernised.

The relative level of significance of each element of No. 33 Tite Street has been ranked below according to a sliding scale. The greater the degree of alteration and the lesser the architectural and/or historical importance of a space or element of fabric, the lower its ranking on this scale. The three levels of significance used are:

- **Highly significant**: important elements of the 1880s building which survive with little or no alteration and which allow the original form and function of the building to be understood
- **Significant**: elements of the 1880s building which survive with little or no alteration but are not obviously indicative of the original function
- **Neutral**: twentieth-century additions and alterations
3.3 Exterior

The front façade is of architectural interest as it is a good example of the rich Queen Anne style. Features such as the large studio windows and the carved brick panel over the main entrance reading ‘The Studios’ indicate the building’s original use, which is of historic interest. It is virtually unaltered from its original construction, with the exception of replacement Crittal windows to the studio spaces. The façade is therefore highly significant. It also makes a positive contribution to the streetscape and the character of the Royal Hospital Conservation Area.

The rear façade also has large studio windows, indicating the building’s original use, and is of good design quality. However, as is to be expected, it does not make use of the same distinct and interesting architectural features as the principal façade. It has also been subject to alteration, including the infilling of the covered yard and alterations to openings to create French doors and larger windows. Although these changes have each been relatively minor, they have incrementally diminished the original design. This façade is therefore significant.

3.4 Plan form

Much of the original plan form of the building survives at each floor. At upper ground floor the plan form is of particular architectural interest as the division of space in the northern and southern sides of the house is distinctly different. This demonstrates the different historic uses of each part - the northern side as a simple flat and the southern side as a generously proportioned studio. The plan form on upper ground floor is therefore highly significant.

At lower ground floor, the survival of the service corridor and four individual vaults in the northern half is again interesting as it is a legible reminder of the continuous division of the building into several flats. These elements are of architectural and historic interest.
and, therefore, *highly significant*. In the southern half of the floor, the plan form of the housekeeper’s bedroom has been retained. Compared with the coal vaults, the original use of this area not so apparent from the retained plan form; nevertheless, it is also of some architectural and historic interest. One of the walls accommodates a corner fireplace, the other is a less substantial, more altered remnant; they are respectively, *highly significant* and *significant*. Other elements of the plan form on the lower ground floor have been obviously altered during the twentieth century. Some of the walls follow a similar plan to the original walls but appear to have been rebuilt and slightly reconfigured. Where this is the case, the plan form is of *neutral significance*.

### 3.5 Staircases

The *main staircase* and the entrance hall are preserved much as built, with only superficial resurfacing of the stairs from upper ground floor upwards. The stairwell and staircase are simply detailed but well designed, and demonstrate how the building originally functioned. It is therefore of architectural and illustrative historical interest and, as such, *highly significant*. The exception to this is the lowest part, which has been reconfigured in the latter half of the twentieth century. This has been detailed to fit in with the original stairs so its effect on significance is *neutral*.

The *rear staircase*, running between the lower ground and upper ground floor is a modern intervention and has transformed the character of this area. Although the balusters were reportedly salvaged from another historic building, these are not Victorian in style, and the staircase is a modern design overall. However, this has always been a secondary space and has been altered in the past. The staircase here is therefore of *neutral significance*.
3.6 Lower ground-floor rooms

The surviving coal vaults are of historic interest in understanding the original operation of the building. Although utilitarian spaces, they and the service corridor are therefore significant. The original housekeeper's bedroom, in the south-east corner, is of historic interest and, therefore, also significant. The joinery is basic but the volume of the space has been retained and the surviving chimney piece in particular denotes it as a domestic space.

Other spaces throughout the lower ground floor have been substantially redecorated in the twentieth century (in the case of the southern half) or are nondescript service spaces which have been much altered in character and do not retain any functional features of interest to indicate their earlier use. The rest of the lower ground floor is therefore of neutral significance.

3.7 Upper ground-floor rooms

Many of the spaces in the upper ground-floor flat provide some architectural interest as they retain their original volumes, joinery and simple decorative detailing. This includes the entrance hall and north-east and north-west rooms. Their original design was, however, very basic, and none of the individual spaces has anything of outstanding interest to distinguish it. They are therefore significant.

The kitchen and WC, although occupying original volumes, have been entirely refitted as modern spaces. They are therefore of neutral significance.

3.8 Former artist’s studio (upper ground)

Although this hasn’t been used as an artist’s studio for some time, the original function of this space can still be recognised, as it retains its original proportions, large window openings to east and west (albeit with twentieth-century Crittal windows inserted). Although some joinery has been replaced, including the doors and doorframes, features such as the chimney piece have been retained and the overall effect of the space is unchanged. The historical and architectural interest of this space makes it highly significant.
One of the small coal vaults, for the individual tenants, on the lower ground floor.

The north-east space on the lower ground floor.
3.9 Significance drawings

Beginning on p.23 are floor plans in which the significance of the different rooms and spaces of No. 33 Tite Street are expressed graphically. Significance drawings have inherent limitations and are therefore used here as a means of communicating ideas as a guide – they are not definitive statements in themselves.

The drawings describe the relative level of significance according to a sliding scale. The greater the degree of alteration and the lesser the architectural and/or historic importance of a space or element of fabric, the lower its ranking on this scale. The levels of significance used on the drawings are the same as those described in Section 3.1.

Strong colours are used for walls and plan form; washes are used to indicate the significance of floor spaces and room volumes. Only the lower ground and upper ground floors are shown here, as the floors affected by the current proposals.
Lower Ground Floor

Remnant yard wall

Remnant original wall

Highly significant

Significant

Neutral
Upper Ground Floor

Mix of ages of fabric; previous alterations
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4.0  Planning Policy Context

4.1 Historic environment policies

As No. 33 Tite Street is Grade II-listed, any works that might affect its significance are subject to statutory controls and Government guidance, notably the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In regional policy, the updated spatial planning strategy for London (The London Plan) contains relevant policies for the historic environment. In addition, there are local policies which have been adopted by RBKC as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF). These include those in the Core Strategy and saved policies from the Unitary Development Plan (UDP), as well as Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents (SPGs and SPDs).

This section outlines policies pertaining to the historic environment that are relevant to the current policies.


The overarching legislation governing the consideration of applications for planning consent that affect heritage assets is contained in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act require local planning authorities, in considering whether to grant listed building consent, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 of the Act requires local planning authorities, in considering whether to grant planning permission with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

4.3 National Policy: National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF was adopted in March 2012. Section 12, entitled Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment, contains guidance on heritage assets, which include listed buildings and conservation areas. The following paragraphs are relevant to the present application:

- Paragraph 128 requires an applicant to give a summary of significance of the building or area affected, proportionate to its importance.
- Paragraph 129 advises local authorities to take account of that significance in assessing proposals to avoid or minimise conflict between the proposals and conservation of the asset.
- Paragraphs 131 and 132 emphasise the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of individual assets and wider, local distinctiveness, and the desirability of viable and fitting uses for a building being found or continued.
- Paragraphs 133 and 134 carry on to detail how significance can be harmed, and what tests are required to demonstrate that the harm can be justified (whether that be substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm).
Guidance on applying the NPPF is provided in the National Planning Guidance, adopted in March 2014. This stands alongside the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide, which was prepared in relation to previous planning policy (PPS5) but remains valid for the time being, where it does not contradict NPPF.

Paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Practice Guide emphasise the general importance of maintaining the historic environment for the benefit of communities. The paragraphs of particular relevance to the current proposals are:

Paragraph 79

There are a number of potential heritage benefits that could weigh in favour of a proposed scheme:

1. It sustains or enhances the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting.
2. It reduces or removes risks to a heritage asset.
3. It secures the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation.
4. It makes a positive contribution to economic vitality
5. It is an appropriate design for its context and makes a positive contribution to the appearance, character, quality and local distinctiveness of the historic environment.
6. It better reveals the significance of a heritage asset and therefore enhances our enjoyment of it and the sense of place.

Paragraph 88

Proposals for the development of a heritage asset will ideally be for its optimum viable use. By their nature, some heritage assets have limited or even no economic end use. A scheduled monument in a rural area may preclude any use of the land other than as pasture, whereas a listed building may potentially have a variety of alternative uses such as residential, commercial or leisure.

Paragraph 89

It is important that any use is viable, not just for the owner but also for the future conservation of the asset. Viable uses will fund future maintenance. It is obviously desirable to avoid successive harmful changes carried out in the interests of successive speculative and failed uses. If there are a range of alternative ways in which an asset could viably be used, the optimum use is the one that causes the least harm to the significance of the asset, not just through necessary initial changes but also as a result of subsequent wear and tear and likely future changes. The optimum viable use is not necessarily the most profitable one. It might be the original use, but that may no longer be economically viable or even the most compatible with the long-term conservation of the asset.

The Practice Guide offers further guidance on restoration in the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 160

Restoration is likely to be acceptable if:

1. The significance of the elements that would be restored decisively outweighs the significance of those that would be lost.
2. The work proposed is justified by compelling evidence of the evolution of the heritage asset, and is executed in accordance with that evidence.
3. The form in which the heritage asset currently exists is not the result of a historically-significant event.
4. The work proposed respects previous forms of the heritage asset.
5. No archaeological interest is lost if the restoration work could later be confused with the original fabric.

6. The maintenance implications of the proposed restoration are considered to be sustainable.

Paragraph 161

Restoration works are those that are intended to reveal or recover something of significance that has been eroded, obscured or previously removed. In some cases, restoration can thus be said to enhance significance. However, additions and changes in response to the changing needs of owners and occupants over time may themselves be a key part of the asset’s significance.

In relation to buildings and structures, the Practice Guide offers the following advice:

Paragraph 182

The plan form of a building is frequently one of its most important characteristics and internal partitions, staircases (whether decorated or plain, principal or secondary) and other features are likely to form part of its significance. Indeed they may be its most significant feature. Proposals to remove or modify internal arrangements, including the insertion of new openings or extension underground, will be subject to the same considerations of impact on significance (particularly architectural interest) as for externally visible alterations.

Paragraph 186

New features added to a building are less likely to have an impact on the significance if they follow the character of the building...

Paragraph 189

Although some works of up-grading, such as new kitchens and WC units, are unlikely to need consent, new services, both internal and external can have a considerable, and often cumulative, effect on the appearance of a building and can affect significance. The impact of necessary services can be minimised by avoiding damage to decorative features by carefully routeing and finishing and by use of materials appropriate to the relevant period, such as cast iron for gutters and down-pipes for many Georgian and Victorian buildings.

4.4 Regional policy: The London Plan

In July 2011, the Mayor published an updated spatial strategy for London. Policy 7.8 deals with heritage assets and archaeology, Under ‘Planning decisions’, this policy states:

C Development should identify, value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, where appropriate.

D Development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

In October 2013, the London Plan: Revised early minor alterations: consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework was issued. This makes minor clarifications and amendments but none of immediate relevance to this application.

4.5 Local policy: Core Strategy

Until recently, development within RBKC was controlled by the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). This is now being replaced by the Local Development Framework (LDF). The key document of the LDF, which sets out the spatial planning strategy for the Borough, is the Core Strategy, which was adopted on 8 December 2010. For the time being, RBKC’s development plan consists of the Core Strategy and parts of the UDP as well as the London Plan.
Section 1 of the Core Strategy sets out the Strategic Objectives for the Borough. These include:

**Objective COS Strategic Objective for Renewing the Legacy:** Our strategic objective to renew the legacy is not simply to ensure no diminution in the excellence we have inherited, but to pass to the next generation a Borough that is better than today, of the highest quality and inclusive for all, by taking great care to maintain, conserve and enhance the glorious built heritage we have inherited and to ensure that where new development takes place it enhances the Borough.

**Policy CL 1 Context and Character** states:

The Council will require all development to respect the existing context, character, and appearance, taking opportunities available to improve the quality and character of buildings and the area and the way it functions, including being inclusive for all. To deliver this the Council will:

a) require development through its architecture and urban form to contribute positively to the context of the townscape, addressing matters such as scale, height, bulk, mass, proportion, plot width, building lines, street form, rhythm, roofscape, materials, vistas, views, gaps and historic fabric;

b) require the analysis of context to be drawn from an area that is proportionate and relevant to the size of the development site;

c) require the density of development to be optimised relative to context;

d) require riverside and canalside development to enhance the waterside character and setting, including opening up views and securing access to the waterway;

e) resist development which interrupts, disrupts or detracts from strategic and local vistas, views and gaps;

f) require a comprehensive approach to site layout and design including adjacent sites where these are suitable for redevelopment, resisting schemes which prejudice future development potential and/or quality.

**Policy CL 2 New Buildings, Extensions and Modifications to Existing Buildings** states:

The Council will require new buildings, extensions and modifications to existing buildings to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, taking opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings and the area and the way it functions. To deliver this the Council will, in relation to:

**Architectural Design**

a. require development to be:

i. Functional - fit for purpose and legible;

ii. Robust - well built, remain in good condition and adaptable to changes of use, lifestyle, demography and climate;

iii. Attractive - pleasing in its composition, materials and craftsmanship;

iv. Locally distinctive - responding well to its context;

v. Sustainable - in the use of resources, construction and operation;

vi. Inclusive - accessible to all;

vii. Secure - designs out crime.

b. require an appropriate architectural style on a site-by-site basis, in response to:

i. the context of the site;

ii. the building’s proposed design, form and use;
iii. whether the townscape is of uniform or varied character.

c. facilitate the redevelopment of ‘eyesores’ by offering flexibility in relation to policies which make redevelopment with buildings more suited to their context demonstrably unviable;

Extensions and modifications

a. require extensions, including conservatories, and modifications to meet all the following:

   i. to be visually subordinate to the original building; and
   ii. to allow the form of the original building to be clearly seen; and
   iii. to reinforce the integrity of the original building.

b. require extensions, including conservatories, and modifications to respect those aspects of character and integrity of the original building and group of buildings that contribute to local distinctiveness such as height, width, depth, building line, footprint, position, symmetry, rhythm, materials, detailed design, important gaps and sense of garden openness;

c. require additional storeys and roof level alterations to be sympathetic to the architectural style and character of the building and to either assist in unifying a group of buildings or where there is a detached building to be no higher than the prevailing building height;

d. require it is demonstrated that subterranean extensions meet the following criteria:

   i. the proposal does not involve excavation underneath a listed building;
   ii. the stability of the existing or neighbouring buildings is safeguarded;
   iii. there is no loss of trees of townscape or amenity value;
   iv. adequate soil depth and material is provided to ensure sustainable growth.

Policy CL3 deals with conservation areas and historic spaces. A conservation area is a material consideration in determining planning applications, with this policy requiring any development “to preserve and to take opportunities to enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas.”

Policy CL 4 Heritage Assets - Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology states:

The Council will require development to preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments and their settings, and the conservation and protection of sites of archaeological interest. To deliver this the Council will:

a. resist the demolition of listed buildings in whole or in part, or the removal or modification of features of architectural importance (both internal and external);

b. require the preservation of the special architectural and historic interest of listed buildings, scheduled monuments or other buildings or places of interest. In particular the integrity, plan form and structure of the building including the ground and first floor principal rooms, original staircases and such other areas of the building as may be identified as being of special interest should be preserved;

c. require the preservation of the original architectural features, and later features of interest, both internal and external;

d. require internal or external architectural features of listed buildings or scheduled ancient monuments, commensurate with the scale of the development, to be:

   i. reinstated where the missing features are considered important to their special interest;
   ii. removed where the additions or modifications are considered inappropriate or detract from their special character;
e. resist the change of use of a listed building which would materially harm its character;
f. strongly encourage any works to a listed building to be carried out in a correct, scholarly manner by appropriate specialists;
g. require development to protect the setting of listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments or sites of archaeological interest;
h. resist development which would threaten the conservation, protection or setting of archaeological remains;
i. require desk based assessments and where necessary archaeological field evaluation before development proposals are determined, where development is proposed on sites of archaeological significance or potential.

**Policy CL 6** deals with small-scale alterations and additions, requiring that these “do not harm the existing character and appearance of the building and its context.”

To deliver this the Council will:

a. resist small-scale development which:

   i. harms the character or appearance of the existing building, its setting or townscape;
   ii. results in a cumulative effect which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area;
   iii. are not of high quality form, detailed design and materials;
   iv. do not remove physical barriers to access or improve the security of the building in a sensitive manner in relation to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area;

b. require telecommunication, plant, micro-generation and other mechanical equipment to be sited discretely so that visual amenity is not impaired.

### 4.6 Unitary Development Plan

The UDP policies relevant to the historic environment have largely been replaced by the Core Strategy. However, the following saved policies are of potential relevance to the current proposals.

**Policy CD47** states the Council will resist proposals for extensions if:

a) the extension would extend rearward beyond the existing general rear building line of any neighbouring extensions;
b) the extension would significantly reduce garden space of amenity value, or spoil the sense of garden openness when viewed from properties around (see also policy CD80);
c) the extension would rise above the general height of neighbouring and nearby extensions, or rise to or above the original main eaves or parapet;
d) the extension would not be visually subordinate to the parent building;
e) on the site boundary, the extension would cause an undue cliff-like effect or sense of enclosure to neighbouring property;
f) the extension would spoil or disrupt the even rhythm of rear additions. Full width extensions will not usually be allowed;
g) the adequacy of sunlight and daylight reaching neighbouring dwellings and gardens would be impaired, or existing below standard situations made significantly worse (see Planning Standards Chapter);
h) there would be a significant increase in overlooking of neighbouring properties or gardens;
i) the detailed design of the addition, including the location or proportions or dimensions of
fenestration or the external materials and finishes, would not be in character with the existing
building (some exception may be allowed at basement level).
j) the extension would breach the established front building line;
k) an important or historic gap or view would be blocked or diminished.

Policy CD56 states that the council will "resist the loss of, and inappropriate alterations
and extensions to artists' studios." Further detail about artists' studios as a building type is
provided in the Supplementary Planning Guidance, detailed below at 4.8.

Policy CD63 states that development in conservation areas should give consideration to the
total potential impact on views within the conservation area, including from neighbouring sites.

4.7 SPD: Subterranean Development

In response to an unprecedented number of planning applications for subterranean
development, RBKC have produced a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), Subterranean
Development (adopted 26 May 2009). This sets out the approach they will take to applications
for basement extensions, and contains detailed guidance on material planning considerations,
including the historic environment. The SPD was adopted by the Council on the 26 May 2009.
The guidance is currently under review and a new SPD for basements is due to be adopted
this year. Given the contentious nature of the subject matter, RBKC have stated that they will
continued to determine applications against the existing SPD until the inspector's report has
been issued, following examination of the draft SPD.

The Subterranean Development SPD is relevant in the case of the present proposals for No.
33 Tite Street, which will entail both a small amount of excavation of the existing basement,
to create a more usable space, and the creation of a new subterranean extension under the
garden.

In relation to listed buildings, the SPD states, in paragraph 2.2.1–4:

2.2.1 Apart from the structural considerations, there is a particular concern regarding the impact of
subterranean development on the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings. The
special interest is not the same as appearance. Special interest includes the location and hierarchy
of rooms and floor levels, foundations, the original purpose of the building, the size and location
of any original basement, cellar or vault, and the integrity of the historic structure, among other
things. Whilst roof additions and rear and side extensions have become commonly accepted
means of enlarging listed buildings, development beneath the building raises other issues about
the relationship of the building to its site, its structure and the degree of intervention involved.

2.2.2 An addition of a new floor level underneath the original lowest floor of a listed building
(normally the lower ground floor level) would have a significant impact on the hierarchy of the
historic floor levels. For this reason, excavation under the main body of statutory listed buildings
is normally resisted in this Borough due to its detrimental impact on the hierarchy of the historic
floor levels and the historic integrity, scale and layout of the original building. In addition, the
excavation and construction of new foundations may have consequential effects on historic
foundations which may impact upon the future stability of the parent building and any adjoining
listed buildings.

2.2.3 The Council will normally resist proposals for subterranean development under listed
buildings or directly attached to existing basements, cellars or vaults of listed buildings. However,
the Council may consider proposals for subterranean development under gardens within the
curtilage of a listed building, as long as any connecting passage between the existing and proposed structure is narrow and discreet to preserve the integrity and character of the original listed building. In considering such applications account will also be taken of the importance of preserving the integrity of historic boundary walls.

2.2.4 Any works for the alteration or extension of a listed building, in a manner which affects its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest, such as subterranean development, will require Listed Building Consent whether planning permission is required or not.

4.8 SPG: Artists’ Studios

Given the existence of so many studio houses and flats in RBKC, there is an SPG dedicated to the building type. This notes that, due to development pressure, studios frequently come under threat in proposals for alterations and extensions: if insensitively designed, these can “erode the original character of these buildings and remove the clues to their artistic associations.” (p.24)

To protect against insensitive alterations, the SPG states that “all original and later features of interest in artists’ studios should be retained and repaired in situ, wherever possible” (p.29). Where interventions are necessary, it states that “materials used for alterations and repairs should match the original in terms of colour, texture and quality.” (p.29)

The SPG notes that “the plan form of studio buildings contributes to their character and special interest.” (p.31) Particular focus is placed on the importance of retaining the dimensions of the studio spaces themselves, where these remain intact.

4.9 Royal Hospital Conservation Area Proposals Statement

The Proposals Statement does not present any of its own specific policy and, being produced in the 1980s, any references to local and national policy are now outdated. It provides information about the history and character of the Conservation Area but there is no guidance of direct relevance to the site.
5.0 Proposals and Justification

Full details of the proposals are shown in Studio Mackereth’s drawings. These have been developed and revised in the light of pre-application discussion and advice from RBKC in relation to a previous, more ambitious scheme.

The table below provides a breakdown of the proposals, assesses their impact on significance, and justifies them against current planning policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Impact on significance</th>
<th>Justification / mitigation</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rear elevation</td>
<td>Modification of existing lower ground-floor</td>
<td>No harm; although the</td>
<td>Improves access to the</td>
<td>NPPF 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Significant)</td>
<td>window openings</td>
<td>elevation is significant, new</td>
<td>garden and introduces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>openings will make use of</td>
<td>extension; new routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>existing windows</td>
<td>improve the usability of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>residence, supporting its</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continued viable use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front / rear elevations</td>
<td>Temporary removal of studio windows for refurb</td>
<td>No harm; the removal of</td>
<td>The temporary removal of</td>
<td>CL 4. c.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Highly significant;</td>
<td></td>
<td>the windows is a temporary</td>
<td>the windows will enable</td>
<td>CL 4. f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>measure to enable their</td>
<td>their complete and careful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>effective refurbishment</td>
<td>repair; their conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by skilled specialist off-site</td>
<td>will enhance the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>significance of the heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower ground floor</td>
<td>Alterations to plan form in south-west</td>
<td>No harm, as partitions</td>
<td>Improves the layout of the</td>
<td>NPPF 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Neutral)</td>
<td>corner</td>
<td>are not part of original</td>
<td>flat, making the continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plan form and area is of</td>
<td>use of this part of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neutral significance</td>
<td>heritage asset as a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>residence more viable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower ground floor</td>
<td>Reconfiguration of plan form in south-east</td>
<td>No harm; although some</td>
<td>Improves the layout of the</td>
<td>NPPF 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Significant; neutral)</td>
<td>corner</td>
<td>significant fabric will be lost,</td>
<td>flat, making the continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the area is less important than</td>
<td>use of this part of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other parts of the</td>
<td>heritage asset as a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>building (as a service space)</td>
<td>residence more viable; the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and the affected wall has</td>
<td>original plan form will still</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>already been altered; fabric</td>
<td>be evident due to retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>loss has been kept to the</td>
<td>of downstand and piers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower ground floor</td>
<td>Alteration to plan form and excavation to</td>
<td>No harm, as area of neutral</td>
<td>Creates habitable floor</td>
<td>NPPF 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Neutral)</td>
<td>north-east area</td>
<td>significance; ceiling heights</td>
<td>heights, making the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will remain comparatively</td>
<td>continued use of this part of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>low, so will not disrupt</td>
<td>the heritage asset as a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hierarchy of floors and the</td>
<td>residence more viable; the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stepped brick foundations</td>
<td>original foundations will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will be largely retained,</td>
<td>retained, except in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>making evident the original</td>
<td>localised areas where</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>floor level</td>
<td>minor loss is necessary in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relation to creating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>openings to rear garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Impact on significance</td>
<td>Justification / mitigation</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper ground floor</td>
<td>New opening to create kitchen/dining space</td>
<td>No harm; the original wall has already been altered in previous works and further loss of fabric will be kept to the minimum necessary; the works replicate the highly significant plan form and retain the significant space to north</td>
<td>Upgrades and improves the layout and usability of the residential area; the original plan form will still be evident due to retention of downstand and piers and a central opening will improve the architectural arrangement through better symmetry; any new kitchen fittings will be light-touch and reversible</td>
<td>NPPF 131; CL 4. b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Significant; neutral)</td>
<td>Subterranean extension</td>
<td>No harm, as the garden is of no significance; the extension does not compete with historic hierarchy of floors in main building and the transition between the historic and modern spaces is distinct; the link to the existing building is discreet and will not be apparent from the upper floors of the listed building, nor from surrounding properties</td>
<td>Increases the living space, enabling the continued use of the heritage asset in a viable use; better reveals the significant rear façade with improved landscaping</td>
<td>NPPF 131; CL 2. d.; Subterranean Development SPD 2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden: lower ground</td>
<td>Link formed with existing building and new landscaping</td>
<td>Positive, as the link is an improved alternative to an existing arrangement; the current garden is of no significance and the proposed landscaping is rationalised, whilst maintaining an intimate, green space</td>
<td>Improves the appearance and usability of the garden</td>
<td>NPPF 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Neutral)</td>
<td>Modification of external pipework and new gas pipework internally</td>
<td>No harm, as modifications to the external pipework will be localised and new internal pipework will follow a similar route to existing or will be in existing risers, requiring no modification of fabric</td>
<td>Modification of external pipework allows for necessary creation of openings to garden and extension; the relocation of gas pipework removes some clutter from rear façade</td>
<td>NPPF 131; PPS5 Practice Guide 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No alterations are proposed to the roof or to the interiors on any floor above upper ground level.

In addition to the restoration of the studio windows, as outlined above, the proposed works are to take place in conjunction with the refurbishment of the main staircase and the front and rear façades. This will include internal redecoration, cleaning of external brickwork, making good brickwork where damaged and the in situ repair of the other windows. Listed building consent is not required for these basic repair and cleaning works.
6.0 Conclusion

No. 33 Tite Street is a good example of a Victorian artists’ studio flats in the Queen Anne style. Despite some modern alterations, including the creation of additional vertical circulation and openings in some walls, its plan form survives largely intact and the original use and division of spaces is still apparent, particularly above lower ground floor. The decorative detailing is minimal but many of the spaces are nevertheless of architectural interest, with the exception of those that have seen modern alterations. Compared with the upper floors, the lower ground floor has been subject to more alteration and redecoration, but has some surviving features of interest, including the coal vaults. The garden has been relandscaped in recent years, including the addition of new terracing immediately to the rear of the house, and is of no particular significance to the listed building or its setting.

The proposed scheme relates to the flat occupying the lower ground and upper ground floors. The works entail the creation of a subterranean extension to the rear to extend the residential accommodation, along with minor alterations to the interiors of the existing building. Internal works include the reconfiguration of some spaces (mostly at lower ground floor) and the lowering of part of the lower ground floor. The current proposals have been developed and modified in response to pre-application advice from RBKC between May and September 2013, given in response to a previous, more ambitious scheme.

As demonstrated in 5.0, the proposals all contribute to improving the quality of the residence at lower ground and upper ground floor, whilst maintaining most of the plan form, so that the historic artist’s studio flat can still be understood. The alterations are all intended to bring the flat up to modern standards and provide the floor areas expected in high-quality family homes in this part of Chelsea. This will enable the building to continue in an historically appropriate and viable use that is consistent with its conservation. In this respect, the proposals accord with NPPF paragraph 131.

Where alterations to historic plan form are proposed, these have been carefully considered and developed so that they are, where possible, concentrated in areas of neutral significance. Where areas of significance are affected, the modifications have been designed so that the original plan form will remain discernible, by maintaining the envelope of the historic spaces and by the retention of nibs and downstands. In addition, where alterations are proposed, the affected walls have already seen modification.

The internal alterations therefore cause no harm to the significance of the heritage asset and have the positive benefit of improving the layout and facilities of the residence. It has been possible to keep the alterations to the listed building itself to a minimum due to the introduction of the rear extension: by locating additional facilities in this separate, subterranean extension the need to interfere considerably with the plan form of the listed building is negated, thereby avoiding loss of significant fabric.

Although no change of use is proposed for No. 33 Tite Street, it is worth noting the guidance in RBKC’s SPG on Artists’ Studios as it relates to the physical fabric of the building and, in particular, the importance placed on the studio spaces within the plan form. The current proposals are all concentrated in areas of lesser or no significance or in a new, subterranean extension. No permanent changes are proposed to the studio: the studio windows – a particularly characteristic feature of the building type – will be removed temporarily for sensitive refurbishment off-site by Fabco Sanctuary. Fabco is a practice with suitable experience of the restoration of steel windows of historic importance and the removal of windows for the purpose of refurbishment is an appropriate conservation approach.
The proliferation of subterranean extensions is a particular concern in RBKC. Careful consideration has therefore been given to the existing subterranean development SPD and to emerging policies, and the proposed extension has been designed so that it will not compromise the historical significance of the listed building. It does not lie under the existing building and has been designed to be distinctly separate, making the transition between the listed building and the modern extension unmistakable. The extension will be accessed via a discreet, covered link, which has been designed, in response to advice from RBKC, to blend into the landscaping when viewed from above and from neighbouring properties so it will not compromise the listed building, its setting, or the conservation area. Due to the physical and stylistic separation between the historic and modern spaces, the extension will not compete with the original building and so does not disrupt the existing hierarchy of spaces. In addition, the key domestic spaces such as bedrooms, kitchen and dining rooms, will remain in the listed building, while the extension will accommodate ancillary, recreational uses – a gymnasium, games room and screening room.

The small amount of excavation within the footprint of the existing building, to improve head height on the lower ground floor, will also not affect the existing hierarchy as it is the minimum necessary to make this a usable space. In addition, the original, stepped footings will be retained wherever possible, to make evident the original floor level and also to reduce loss of fabric. Therefore, neither element of subterranean work does harm to the significance of the listed building.

Notably, the extension is modest in scale as it takes the prevailing ground level down by only half a level. It has been designed to respond to the existing lower level of the listed building, rather than attempting to create a new, deeper storey. The extension occupies only 65% of the garden area, which is below the limit stipulated by current policy, and also tallies with the emerging policy, which will see a reduction in the acceptable area allowance for subterranean extensions. The existing landscaping is of no historic significance and makes no contribution to the setting of the listed building as it is currently overplanted and steeply terraced; therefore, the creation of an extension under the garden is deemed to cause no harm to significance of the listed building, nor to views within the conservation area, from the neighbouring properties.

The proposed landscaping will maintain the sense of an intimate, Chelsea garden, incorporating gentle changes in levels, with the necessary lightwells screened by vegetation. The proposals will improve the character of the garden and better reveal the significance of the rear façade. In addition, the existing garden provides very little usable amenity space, diminishing the overall quality of the site as a residence. The proposals will improve the usability of the site, enabling it to carry on its current use, with its consistent with its conservation.

In summary, the proposed works will facilitate the optimum viable use of the listed building in support of its long-term conservation and have been developed with careful consideration given to their potential impact on its significance. Overall, the works are considered to do no harm to the significance of the heritage asset and have the benefit of keeping the building in use as a residence. The scheme satisfies both national and local policies regarding the historic environment and should therefore be permitted.
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