

Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Area Audit

Statutory Documents to Accompany SPD

- 1. Statement of SPD Matters**
- 2. Consultation Statement**
- 3. Statement of Representations received**
- 4. Statement of Adoption**

May 2009



City of Westminster

1 Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Area Audit SPD: Notice of Supplementary Planning Document Matters (Regulation 16 (2))

Title Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Area Audit Supplementary Planning Document
Purpose To guide the protection, enhancement and management of the Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Areas, by identifying those features of special historic and architectural interest which contribute to the local townscape and which the council will seek to protect. It will also identify negative features, opportunities for enhancement and management proposals to guide future change and development within the area.
Content This will include [a] Historical Development [b] Appraisal of character [c] Identification of Unlisted Buildings of Merit [d] Appraisal of roofscape and Identification of properties suitable for roof extension [e] Identification of townscape detail and landscape features which contribute to the character of the area [f] Identification of Features which detract from the character of the conservation Area [g] Management and enhancement proposals
Geographical coverage Will apply to the Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Areas.
Consultation Period The full public consultation on the draft audit and sustainability appraisal will be held from 28 October -1 December 2008. During this time, the draft audit and sustainability appraisal can be downloaded from the internet or inspected at One Stop Services, 62 Victoria Street, SW1 (Open 8.30am-7pm, Monday-Friday; 9am-1pm Saturday).
Representations You can submit comments and suggestions at any stage of the process. Representations on the draft SPD can be submitted in writing during the six week consultation period. Written representations should be made by post to the following address: Conservation Area Audits Team Department of Planning and City Development 12th Floor (South) Westminster City Council City Hall 64 Victoria Street SW1E 6QP Or by e-mail to: conservationareaaudits@westminster.gov.uk Any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified in future, at a specified address, of the adoption of the SPD.

Knightsbridge Conservation Area Audit SPD

2 Statement of Consultation (Section 17 (B))

Under Section 17(b) of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, Westminster City Council has a duty to prepare a consultation statement to accompany the draft Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Area Audit Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), setting out the details of any consultation that has taken place in connection with the preparation of a draft SPD. Consultation on all SPDs follow procedures set out in Westminster's adopted 'Statement of Community Involvement' (January 2007). Main steps undertaken are set out below.

Pre-drafting consultation

A phase of pre-drafting consultation was undertaken prior to the initial drafting of the Conservation Area Audit. The Conservation Area Audit programme for 2008/9 was made available on council's website (www.westminster.gov.uk); officers also attended the Area Forums of May/June 2007 with details of the forthcoming programme. In addition, the Council sent letters advertising the Audit programme to local and national amenity societies inviting comments prior to drafting and the programme of audits was publicised in a newspaper notice. Specific consultation letters were sent to the following:

- Westminster Society
- Knightsbridge Association
- Belgravia Residents Association
- Grosvenor Estate
- Westminster Property Owners' Association (WPOA)
- Crown Estates
- Gerald Eve
- Land Securities
- Royal Parks
- Imperial College
- English Heritage
- Greater London Authority
- Transport for London
- Ward Councillors
- Other Council departments including Corporate Property, Transportation,

A Scoping report on the Sustainability Appraisal was consulted on with copies sent to Natural England, the Environment Agency and English Heritage.

Following feedback on the initial information provided, the document was drafted

and presented to the Cabinet Member for Planning in March 2008, along with details of the pre-consultation process and how this has informed the drafting of the document. Taking comments received into consideration, the Cabinet Member agreed that the document should be published for formal public consultation on 20 March 2008.

Formal Consultation on Draft Conservation Area Audit

In accordance with the relevant legislation, the City Council's standard procedures for consulting and the City of Westminster's Statement of Community Involvement extensive public consultation on the conservation area audits took place from **27/10/2008** to **01/12/2008**.

The draft Audit and Boundary Review documents along with their accompanying SPD Documents including Sustainability Appraisal were made available on the council website, with full details of the public consultation process and links to the feedback form. Site notices were put up throughout the conservation area advertising that the documents has been drafted and are available to view and comment upon. A press notice has also been issued dated describing the SPD matters and all information and SPD documents were made available at Onestop Services, Westminster City Hall. Formal consultation letters were sent to the following:

Consul tee No.	Title	First Name	Last Name	Job Title	Organisation
1	Mr	Colin	Buttery	Director	Royal Parks
2	Mr	Tim	Jones	Central and West London Team	English Heritage
3	Mrs	C	Seymour-Newton	Knightsbridge Association	
4	Ms	Randa	Hanna		Belgravia Residents Association
5	Mrs	Pat	Wilson		Hyde Park Estate Association
6				The Chair	Wellington Court Tenants Association
7	Mr	Paul	Houston		Westminster Property Owners Association
8	Mr	Nigel	Buck	Director of Property Management	Imperial College
9	Mr	James	Finn	Planning Consultant	Barton Willmore
10	Mr	Hugh	Bullock	Partner	Gerald Eve
11	Mr	David	McDonald	Team Leader: Conservation and Urban Design	Royal Borough Of Kensington and Chelsea
12	Mr	Malcolm	Shirley CEng	Secretary	The Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851
13	Mr	James	Weeks		Alan Baxter Associates

14	Ms	Beverley	Butler		Fusion
15	Ms	Lucy	Carmichael	Senior Design Review Advisor	CABE
16	Mr	Nigel	Hughes	London Estates Director	Grosvenor Estate
17	Ms	Josephine	Brown	Case Officer for Westminster	The Georgian Group
18	Ms	Eva	Branscombe	Case Officer	The Twentieth Century Society
19	Dr	Kathryn	Ferry	Case Officer	The Victorian Society
20	Mr	Ian	Kennaway		London Historic Parks & Gardens Trust
21	Ms	Jacqueline	Hyer	Co-Chairman	Friends of Hyde Park
22	Lady		Cleaver	Co-Chairman	Friends of Hyde Park
23	Mr	Peter	Merriman	Director	Albert Court Management Company Ltd c/o Stiles Harold Williams
24	Mr	Steve	Howe		Imperial College
25	Dr	Rita	Gardener	Director & Secretary	Royal Geographical Society with IBG
26				The General Manager	Mandarin Oriental Hotel
27	Captain	David	Freeman	Secretary	Royal Thames Yacht Club
28	Rev	Alan	Gyle		St Pauls Church
29	Ms	Katherine	Newman		Royal College of Music
30	Mr	John	Knight		Harrods Ltd
31	Mr	Garry	Philpott	Director of Administration	Royal College of Art
32	Mr	Michael	Anderson		Holy Trinity Church
33	Ms	Elspeth	Miller	Head of Central London Estates	Crown Estate
34	Mr	David	Shaw		Crown Estate
35	Mr	Nigel	Hughes	Planning & Estate Director	Grosvenor Estate
36	Mr	Dominic	Cole	Chairman	Garden History Society
37	Mr	Giles	Dolphin		Greater London Authority
38				Queen Alexandra's House Association c/o	Ansell and Bailey
39				Kingston House Property Management Ltd	c/o Woods Management Ltd
40				Park Mansions Management	c/o Marsh and Parsons
41					Cluttons
42				Head of Land Use Planning	Transport for London

43	Mr	Edmund	Bird	Heritage Advisor	Design for London
44	Mr	Ken	Bean	Planning & Housing Division	Government Office for London
45	Ms	Ruth	Lloyd		Exhibition Road Cultural Group
46					Royal Albert Hall
47				The General Manager	Hyde Park Hotel
48				Property Manager	Kuwaiti Embassy
49				Property Manager	French Embassy
50					The Park Office
51	Mr	Paul	Velluet	Historic Buildings Consultant	HOK International Architects
52	Mr	Paul	Akers		Trees and Landscape
53	Cllr	Frances	Blois	Ward Councillor	Westminster City Council
54	Cllr	Phillippa	Roe	Ward Councillor	Westminster City Council
55	Cllr	Anthony	Devenish	Ward Councillor	Westminster City Council
56	Ms	Rebecca	Cloke		Parks
57	Mr	Martin	Low	Director of Transportation	Highways
58	Mr	Alan	Wharton	Property Strategy Manager	Corporate Property Division
59	Mr	Micheal	Clarke		Corporate Property Division
60	Mr	Ian	Mawson		Citywest Homes
61	Mr	Barry	Smith		Policy
62	Ms	Stacey	Coughill	Project Manager (Environment)	
63					The Russian Orthodox Church
64					Brompton Estates Management Limited
65					Westminster Synagogue
66				London Estates	DE OPERATIONS SOUTH
67	Mr	Godfrey	Woods		South Team
69	Mr	Simon	Betts	Director of Estates	The Royal Parks

Following public consultation, where appropriate, the audit will be revised to take account of the comments received and will go forward to the Cabinet Member for the Built Environment for a decision on whether or not it should be formally adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.

3 Statement of Representations

Regulation 18 (4) (b) requires local authorities to set out how they have addressed representations received.

A summary of the main issues raised both and how these have been addressed in the SPD is set out below. This is followed by the minutes of the public meeting held, with details of how each point raised has been responded to These were considered by the Cabinet Member for the Built Environment and are also detailed in the Cabinet Member report appended to the Conservation Area Audit.

APPENDIX 3: Table of comments

Respondent	Comment	Response
Knightsbridge Association	We suggest that Kingston House (North) by Michael Rosenauer (1936) and 1-7 Princes Gate by Septimus Warwick (1936) should be included in the conservation area. They are good examples of mansion flats pre-World War 2 and designed to standards of London Building Act of that period	Disagree. Both buildings are substantially out of scale with the rest of the conservation area and have undergone subsequent unsympathetic alteration which is detrimental to their character and to the character of the conservation area and setting of the Royal Parks.
	A great deal of work has been involved; the maps are excellent but there are too many errors in the text. The presentation is confusing; maps should be numbered separately from the photos and the Contents page should include an index. Figure 78 should show Normandie Hotel as a Building of Merit - it should not be judged by its present run down state. This Audit is a very important document and both editing and presentation should recognise its importance as a reference book	Agree. Document has been reviewed and edited to make more consistent. Agree that the building is of interest. However as consent has been granted for its demolition and works have commenced, it has been retained as a neutral building.

	<p>1. Montpelier is incorrectly spelt almost all the way through. The local spelling has one 1. Two Is is French spelling.</p> <p>2. P31, 4.36: 2-8 Rutland Gate is a modern pastiche built some 5-10 years ago. It is on the west side of Rutland Gate facing the Barracks. Do you mean 1-7, on the east side which the Association saved from demolition in the 70s?</p> <p>P31, 4.39 Princes Gardens, not Square (there is no Princes Square here)</p> <p>P31, Figure 13, this is the wrong pic, it is looking south from Kensington Road down past Albert Hall Mansions (the pic is used correctly later in the report)</p> <p>P.35 Francis Fowke, not Fawke</p> <p>P39: Knights Arcade no longer exists but was incorporated some years ago into the Jaeger shop.</p> <p>P41: 55-91 Knightsbridge is Listed.</p> <p>P48: Ennismore Gardens 35. 34 and 35 are now one block of flats, laterally converted so 35 is part of the listing.</p> <p>P48: Montpelier Square 3-7 are listed, as part of the east terrace 1-7.</p>	Amended
	Buildings worth putting in Conservation Area: 1-5 and 7-11 Princes Gate by Septimus Warwick, and Kingston House North 1936 and East, by Rosenauer, architect of Westbury Hotel and a mansion block in High Street Ken.	Buildings have been reviewed but not included. See above.
	P53: Royal College of Organists is now a private residence.	Amended in text and on land-use map.
	p54. There is no Queen's Gardens in this area. Do you mean Queen's Gate, or Queen's Gate Gardens (which is in the Royal Borough)	Amended to Queen's Gate.
	15 should read Mews of Brompton Square	Amended.
	P61: 5.25 the first to go back were Ennismore Gardens railings. Rutland Gate Lower gardens installed this Oct/Nov (2008).	Amended.
	P.62 5.29: no such place as Ennismore Terrace	Amended to Ennismore Gardens.
	Public Art P67: 5.47 Aston Webb, not Ashton Webb: Also include Age of Innocence to rear of Normandie hotel, etching into brick. Lost on redevelopment of Mercury House, now The	Amended Aston, Age of Innocence included within audit. Other public art has not been included as it is not within the conservation areas.

	Knightsbridge flats, The Seer by ? Ledward. One Hyde Park, the Epstein statue has been removed and will be re-sited just inside the Park.	
	6.5 include Camellias under shrubs	Added.
	P73 7.10 should include Holy Trinity Prince Consort Road by G.F. Bodley	Added.
	8. Missing features: loss of parapet cornice treatment (several on east side Ennismore Gardens).	Agree. Photo and text added to negative features.
	.23 The traffic fumes have a particularly disastrous effect on the stucco of 1 & 2 Albert Gate.	Agree. Added to negative features text.
	55-91 Knightsbridge, sometimes referred to as 55-87, which is it?	55-91. Text amended.
	P82: Should include 15-17 Rutland Gate.	
	<u>Illustration and Maps</u> Confusingly these have both a figure no. and page no.	This is to help the reader find relevant figures.
	Figure 76: The arcade in Park Mansions no longer exists.	Maps amended.
	Figure 77. 35 Ennismore Gardens is listed as neighbour to and part of no. 34. 24 Rutland Gate is listed (at the same time as no. 26)	
	Figure 77 & 78 are perhaps the most important and deserve a thorough check up and walkabout.	Agree. Maps checked and amended.
	Figure 78 The Normandie Hotel is shown as "Neutral", but this surely is only because of its dilapidated state. It is, in fact, one of the 4 buildings of similar date, forming the Knightsbridge Green Conservation Area.	Agree that it is of similar age. However, the building has consent for demolition and works have already begun so its loss has been accepted by the Council.
	Figure 125: We believe that each building on the east side is either residential or part/residential. No. 56 was the only wholly office building and this currently has permission to convert to residential.	Land uses map reviewed and amended.
Savills (for Imperial College)	Figure 17: Eastside, Prince's Gardens has now been demolished and a new building is under construction.	Maps amended and reference made in text.
	Figure 125: Clarity is needed where a building is used for both residential and educational uses. For example Beit Hall (north of Prince Consort Way, south of Kensington Gore) appears to be both, as well as Garden Hall, 10-12 Prince's Gardens. Further ¹ clarification is also needed at 52 Prince's Gate which is occupied by educational offices without teaching.	Halls of residence are shown as residential whilst other Imperial College buildings, including offices, are shown as educational.
	46, 47,48 Prince's Gardens are	Amended map

	residential properties following planning permission being granted in 2007 (Ref: 07/04116/FULL).	
Royal Thames Yacht Club	This property at 60 Knightsbridge is not known as Royal Thames House, and never has been as far as our records indicate. This Club has been the freeholder of the land since 1923. The building on the site then was known as Hyde Park House and this is the registered name of the property that replaced it in 1963	Amended all references to Royal Thames House.
CABE	<p>We are unable to comment on this document. However, we would like to make some general comments which you should consider.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design is now well established in planning policy at national and regional levels, and LDFs offer an opportunity to secure high-quality development, of the right type, in the right place, at the right time. 2. Robust design policies should be included within all LDF documents and the Community Strategy, embedding design as a priority from strategic frameworks to site-specific scales. 3. To take aspiration to implementation, local planning authorities' officers and members should champion good design. 4. Treat design as a cross-cutting issue – consider how other policy areas relate to urban design, open space management, architectural quality, roads and highways, social infrastructure and the public realm. 5. Design should reflect understanding of local context, character and aspirations. 	Comments noted. These are of a general nature and will therefore be fed into LDF consultation process.
Greater London Authority	Does not wish to comment	Noted.
Gerald Eve (for Mandarin Oriental Hotel)	<p>The Council's map on page 47 identifies the Mandarin Oriental Hotel to be categorised as a <i>'Building which form part of groups or have distinctive roof forms, where roof extensions are unlikely to be considered acceptable'</i>.</p> <p>We have recently received pre-application advice from Westminster City Council Development Planning Services in relation to a proposed roof extension at the Mandarin Oriental Hotel. I have attached this letter for your information. The letter supports the extension to the roof of the Mandarin Oriental Hotel.</p>	Disagree. There are many buildings which may be suitable for some form of roof alteration subject to detailed design. However, it is not possible to make this assessment without considering the individual scheme. The roof extensions survey categorises types of buildings and gives an indication of where an additional storey may be unacceptable or difficult to accommodate. It is considered that the Mandarin Oriental Hotel has a particularly distinctive and prominent roofscape, visible in long view from Hyde Park. Roof extensions are therefore difficult to accommodate on this building. However, the roof extensions map is only a guide and this does not preclude roof

	<p>We therefore believe that an additional category should be added to the map on page 47 titled <i>'Buildings where roof extensions may be acceptable subject to detailed design'</i> and we believe the Mandarin Oriental Hotel should be re-designated to this category.</p>	<p>level alterations The Council has given favourable pre-application advice on a proposal for roof alteration, which does not involve a full additional storey on top of the existing roof. However, this particular scheme may not be implemented and roof extensions on this site would be contentious.</p>
<p>Edmund Bird Heritage Advisor, Design for London</p>	<p>This study is of the usual high Westminster standard and its comprehensive coverage of every aspect of the character and townscape of these important conservation areas is particularly welcomed. The detailed management proposals and bespoke guidance for two of the charming mews in this neighbourhood are highly relevant. The document is particularly well illustrated which greatly aids the interpretation of the area and its history, drawing attention to the considerable architectural attributes of the built heritage, both good and bad examples of more recent development (such as the well-designed new IC Sports Centre and inappropriate shop fronts and signage) and the important contribution of trees, soft landscape and public art.</p>	
	<p>1) Figure 77 which indicates the listed buildings in the neighbourhood illustrates a clear discrepancy in the boundary cutting through the Imperial College Campus – the current boundary seems to exclude significant parts of the listed Royal College of Music and the Royal School of Mines – this makes no sense and the boundary should be amended to incorporate all of listed elements of these monumental buildings.</p> <p>2) The existing CA wisely excludes the great majority of the IC campus which most would agree is largely devoid of any special architectural interest with the exception of the listed Queen's Tower. However there are two buildings on Queen's Gate that most certainly merit inclusion within the CA – the Grade II* listed mansion building by Sir Richard Norman Shaw (No.170 – see far right of photo below) and the adjacent Alexandra Court (Nos. 171 – 175 Queen's Gate) – the pair of linked mansion blocks seen in the photo</p>	<p>The frontages are the main townscape features which contribute to the character of the area. The rest are listed and a minor amendment to the boundary here is not therefore considered necessary.</p> <p>Agree these are of interest; however, these are located some distance from the conservation area their inclusion would require inclusion of a large amount of the Imperial College campus, which is not considered of architectural and historic interest. 170 Queens Gate is protected as a listed building and it is not therefore proposed to be included. Alexandra Court will be added to a file of buildings which could form a local list, should the Council wish to consider this in future.</p>

	<p>below. Whilst the former building is afforded statutory protection by virtue of its listing, Alexandra Court has no protection and is a very fine example of its period. It is also very much in character with the scale, architectural design and scale of mansion blocks found within the CA. The corner roof-turrets over fourth floor loggias are unusual features and the pair of linked blocks retains all of their original features. I therefore suggest the CA is extended south down Queen's Gate to include these historic properties either as a narrow linking segment including only the highway and trees or including the 1960s IC frontage building, identified within the audit as a neutral contributor.</p>	
	<p>Another puzzling omission is the elegant Princes Gate Court - a pair of monumental H-shaped classical/art deco style blocks of apartments designed by renowned architect Septimus Warwick (architect of Grade II listed Lambeth Town Hall and remodelling of Grade II* Canada House in Trafalgar Square) and completed between 1937 and 1940. It echoes the apartment block tradition evident in 1930s New York (see photo below) and has an interesting history as the two blocks were built either side of an early Victorian house which the developer was unable to purchase. This house survived until 1972 when it was replaced by an all-glazed, bronze framed infill building. Princes Gate Court is well detailed with elevations of silver-grey bricks with portland stone dressings, streamlined classical details such as the stone oriel bays with columned aedicules capped with stone urns and the Lutyenesque entrance porches, Crittal windows and projecting bays overlooking the gardens to the rear. This apartment building forms an important frontage to Hyde Park and relates to the park in a similar way as the New York mansions do to Central Park, set back behind a private drive and making the most of the views across the park. During WWII it was the home of the Combined Operations Branch, led by Lord Louis Mountbatten.</p>	<p>Disagree. See response to Knightsbridge Association, above.</p>

	<p>Immediately to the west of Princes Gate Court is Kingston House – an elegant apartment complex on a very large scale by the Viennese-born architect Michael Rosenauer – a restrained mid C20th continental moderne design which forms an appropriate backdrop to Hyde Park, set back from the road with a long frontage well articulated by a regular rhythm of oriel bay windows and recessed balconies (photo below). Two blocks were completed between 1937 and 1940 and a third commenced after WWII, completed in 1955. Rosenauer was one of the leading architects designing buildings in Westminster in the middle decades of the C20th – his practice was very prolific and over a dozen examples of his work are now either listed or protected by conservation areas in Westminster, his most famous work (Grade II listed) being the Time & Life Building on New Bond Street of 1952. Both Kingston House and Princes Gate Court are covered extensively within a chapter on development of this part of Knightsbridge since the 1920s in English Heritage’s Survey of London Vol 45 – published in 2000. More recent developments within this city-block could be identified as neutral contributors.</p>	<p>Disagree. This building is substantially out of scale with the adjoining buildings in the conservation area and has undergone unsympathetic alteration, including the replacement of windows in uPVC. The frontage to Hyde Park is relatively bland and overall it is not considered this building merits inclusion within the conservation area, as its inclusion might dilute the sense of a coherent character to this part of the conservation area.</p>
	<p>It would seem sensible to include the west side of Lancelot Place within the conservation area as the existing boundary cuts through buildings and runs down back-garden fences – this very modest extension would be a rational move and would include some pleasant mews-scale residences built in a reserved inter-war Georgian style (see below) which are an evolution of the earlier mews dwellings elsewhere in this CA and therefore a significant part of the area’s social and architectural history.</p>	<p>Disagree. Whilst the 1950s buildings are reasonably well-detailed, they are not considered to be of significant architectural and historic interest and have not therefore been included. The rest of the street comprises recent redevelopment.</p>
	<p>Boundary to east of Wellington Court – the current CA boundary includes a portion of the Bowater House site which is now occupied by a huge shed with angled roof supported on steel columns. This makes no sense as this new structure bears no resemblance to the character of any part of the</p>	<p>Whilst the structure is not of architectural and historic interest in itself, this does form an entrance route to the park and it is not considered necessary to designate part of the conservation area.</p>

	Knightsbridge CA (see photo below). The boundary should therefore be redrawn to exclude this structure and run along the curtilage of Wellington Court.	
	Figure 17 (p28) – the plan recording the ages of buildings in the conservation area is very useful and well presented. There is a small error on Prince Consort Road – whilst Beit Hall fronting this road is indeed interwar (Maurice Webb 1929), the Tudor-style east and north wings (facing the Albert Hall steps and the Hall itself) are both Edwardian (1910-1914) – see Pevsner London Vol 3 p491). This information is correctly recorded later in this audit on p.36.	Amended
	Page 20 – the Knightsbridge timeline is an innovative feature of the audit which provides a very useful historical background to the evolution of development within these conservation areas. It would benefit from additional information on the first half of the 20 th Century, which is presently rather sparse, as this was a period of rapid social change and new architectural trends in Knightsbridge, particularly the development of large apartment buildings and the disruption of WWII.	Add additional info.
	Page 34 – the sections on C20th buildings would also benefit from more detailed information, particularly the dates of these important historic buildings e.g. Eresby House was completed in 1934 (ref: Survey of London Vol 45: C20th Redevelopments), the Harrods Depot built 1913-1920 and the block of flats by Adie, Button & Partners completed in 1938 which stands on the corner of Exhibition Road and Princes Gate Mews - Nos 59-63 (NB the address should be checked – the Survey of London refers to this block as 59-63 Princes Gate not Exhibition Road used in the Audit?). Although the listed status of the Harrod's Depot is not strictly a matter for the process of compiling this audit, it does seem extraordinary that this monumental building is unlisted given its outstanding frontage (photo below) – it is a very fine example of Edwardian architecture and the authority may wish to consider its submission for a Grade II listing.	Additional info added.

	<p>Page 38 – the description of Princes Gate Court - an elegant 1920s classical design as “monolithic” is unnecessarily pejorative – it is a good example of its type and era and is well articulated by stone dressing details and projecting elements which creates an attractive composition.</p> <p>Page 40 (and Figure 78 on page 51) - the former Normandie Hotel. Whilst the description of this landmark building is well-described in parag 4.98 (photo below), there is absolutely no way the annotation on Figure 78 which terms this building as a neutral contributor to the conservation area can be justified. As 4.98 states, this is a fine example of Edwardian Baroque architecture reflecting the popular architectural detailing of this period and is of the same style and quality as the immediately adjacent block Nos 151-161 (which includes the listed pub) which this plan quite rightly identifies as an Unlisted Building of Merit. The building also contributes positively to the charming character of the narrow passageway to Brompton Road (see photo on page 10 of my comments) which again is recognised on p40 of the audit.</p>	<p>Added sentence ‘it is a good example of its type and era..etc. But it is nonetheless considered to be ‘monolithic’ and over-scale in its context.</p> <p>The building has consent for demolition and works are now in progress.</p>
	<p>Page 40 – 4.100 - Wellington Court – the Survey of London records the completion date of this building as 1895.</p> <p>Page 41 – 4.102 - the same volume dates Albert Gate Court as 1887 and records the architect as Henry Charles Newmarch.</p> <p>Page 41 – 4.105 – ditto source for Park Lodge – designed by G Martin & E Purchase and completed in 1892</p> <p>Page 43 4.111 and Figure 78 – I am surprised Royal Thames House is considered to be a neutral contributor – there would be strong grounds to justify its identification as a negative contributor given its alien materials, jarring horizontal emphasis and truly monolithic flat fronted frontage which</p>	<p>Amended</p> <p>The townscape here is fairly mixed with a range of building styles and ages and a wide variety of materials used. In this context, it is not considered this building has a significant and detrimental impact on the townscape. It is therefore identified as neutral.</p>

	<p>detracts markedly from the setting of its neighbours.</p> <p>Page 43 4.112 – 64 Knightsbridge – this is a particularly fine listed building and may deserve a more detailed description and its date of 1885 being recorded in the text.</p> <p>Page 48 the Schedules of Unlisted Buildings of Merit – this should be revised taking into account the points raised above (for example including 59-63 Exhibition Rd – see next para. and the former Normandie Hotel – see comments on previous page).</p> <p>Page 50 – the identification of the block of flats on the corner of Exhibition Road and Princes Gate Mews on Figure 77 as a neutral contributor must be a typographical error as this outstanding modernist 1930s block (its merits are acknowledged in the text on page 34 of the Audit) is most certainly a positive contributor (photo to right and an extensive description within the Survey of London). Indeed, even taking into consideration the re-fenestration, this building could be a candidate for Grade II listing given its progressive design. Both the building and its C19th context are not dissimilar to the Grade II* listed Embassy Court in Brighton – see photo below.</p> <p>Also on Figure 77 there is a building shaded grey, an annotation that does not appear on the key, presumably this is due to its current refurbishment (see photo below) – but it appears to have an attractive late Victorian red brick and gabled façade so this should be identified as a positive contributor.</p>	<p>Further detail added.</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended to be an unlisted building of merit given that it is of significant architectural interest. However, the building’s appearance has been damaged by the replacement windows and it does appear out of scale with the adjoining townscape. This is why it was originally identified as neutral and this has been made clear in the text.</p> <p>Map amended to identify as of merit.</p>
	<p>Pages 52-57 – the chapters on Landmark Buildings and Views are very well written and particularly comprehensive. Pages 58-84 Local Townscape Detail, Trees & Soft Landscape, Characteristic Land Uses and Negative features & Enhancement – the same comments above apply to Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8.</p> <p>The comments pertaining to the Thistle Hotel could also be expanded to add that it is also its alien form and poor relationship with the street frontages that exacerbate its negative impact as well as the points raised in this para.</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>

	<p>Royal Thames House could also be added to this section given its banal elevational design.</p> <p>Point 5.34 regarding the ground floor frontage of the Normandie Hotel could be interpreted by some as a justification for redeveloping the building – it is not the character of the building that exerts a negative impact upon this thoroughfare, it is the poor maintenance, vacancy and condition of this structure. Notwithstanding any existing consents for this site the audit should be encouraging the proper maintenance and upgrading of this frontage which would address the issue of its poor condition and greatly enhance its contribution to this part of the CA.</p> <p>Pages 85-86 Management Proposals - all good points and sound recommendations.</p> <p>Page 95 List of Listed Buildings – Schedule of Listed Buildings may read better? It is not the case that there are no listed buildings in the Knightsbridge Green CA as the Paxton’s Head Public House (No.153 Knightsbridge) is Grade II listed. There is also a great deal more than 14 listed buildings in the Albert Gate CA (I counted 39 on the Westminster listed buildings map within this CA) – there may be some confusion between entries on the LB register and actual individual buildings?</p>	<p>Royal Thames House not considered to be negative (see above).</p> <p>The building has consent for demolition and works are in progress.</p> <p>Amended</p>
--	---	---



Minutes

Meeting: **Public meeting to discuss the draft Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Area Audit**

Date of meeting: **11.11. 2008**

Venue: **Ballroom, 58 Prince's Gate, SW7 2PG**

Attendees:

External
 Michael Wright, Knightsbridge Association
 Carol Seymour-Newton, Knightsbridge Association
 David Martin, Imperial College
 Robert Couchman, South Kensington Estates
 Chris Cotton, Royal Albert Hall
 Valerie Guillotin, French Embassy
 Paul Velluet, Architecture adviser to Knightsbridge Association

Westminster City Council
 Jane Hamilton
 Lyndsay Glover
 Toby Cuthbertson
 Helen Ensor

1. Presentation

1.1 The meeting began at 18.30 with a presentation, which introduced what a conservation area audit is and why the Council undertakes them. The value in receiving public comments on the document was also explained. Each section of the audit was then outlined and questions were invited.

2. Discussion

2.1 Conservation Area Boundaries

The boundaries of the present conservation areas were discussed and it was considered that there was little avenue to extend these, however, Carol Seymour-Newton proposed the inclusion of the block 1-11 Prince's Gate (with the exception of No.5) due its attractive appearance. This suggestion will be taken into consideration. The two lodges, designed by Decimus Burton and located within the Royal Park, were also suggested. As these are already within the Royal Parks Conservation Area, alteration to the boundary here is not considered necessary.

Chris Cotton wished to know whether the conservation area boundary ran along the middle of Knightsbridge (the road) as the Royal Albert Hall are unhappy with the quality of the pavement and the 'horrible' bus stop outside the Hall.

Action/ Amendments: Extension to the area to include these buildings has been considered but for reasons given in the table of responses, this was not considered appropriate.

2.2 Character

With regards to the *Character Summary* (pg 22) Paul Velluet considers that any reference to traffic implies that this is an integral and important part of the character of the conservation area and should therefore be preserved. This is a potential threat and should be revised, preferably with the removal of any reference to traffic or roads.

Action/ Amendments: Character summary amended to make clear.

2.3 Unlisted Buildings of Merit

The difference between listed and unlisted buildings of merits was queried by a number of attendees, who wished to know how these designations come about and what these designations mean. Helen Ensor explained that there is a statutory difference: buildings designated as listed are subject to Listed Building Consent for any alterations which affect their historic interest both internally and externally. The designation of buildings as Unlisted of Merit is more concerned with resisting their demolition as positive contributions to the conservation area; where a building is designated as an Unlisted Building of Merit there is a general presumption against its demolition.

The term 'Unlisted Buildings of Merit' was also an issue of discussion due to this terminology being only used in Westminster's Conservation Area Audits and not appearing in either PPG 15, DES 9 of the UDP or in the English Heritage Guidance. Paul Velluet suggested that there needs to be some form of compatibility between these documents to clarify what is meant by this designation.

The term 'positive contribution' from PPG15 should be used within Westminster's Conservation Area Audits. The deviation from this accepted language could result in confusion. A section of definitions and cross-referencing of terms in the Audits would lead to more clarity.

The discussion of the City Council's Policy led to queries regarding the City Development Plan and the need for such issues to be considered in it and drawn together to produce a clear document with the correct terminology. Such issues are understood but it was explained that many of the terms the City Council uses are a result of historical practice and that all such terms are used with reasonable intention.

Action/ Amendments: The term unlisted building of merit has been added to the glossary. Reference to EH guidance added to Grey Policy box. Issue should be clarified through LDF process with better definitions in future.

2.4 Roof Profiles

The subject of roof profiles was raised by Chris Cotton, who wished to know the impact that sustainability has on how we use our roofscape, especially with the long term issue of global warming. As a representative from the Royal Albert Hall, he felt that this was a particular issue. He also felt that the Roof Profiles map (pg 46) should be amended to remove the category of '*Listed building which may have historic roof structures and roof extension are unlikely to be considered acceptable.*' This will be reviewed. This query also highlighted that some of the attendees were not aware of the position of the audit as a review of the area rather than specific to particular buildings. Individual buildings, such as the Royal Albert Hall, and any possible alterations to it, would be considered through individual Planning and Listed Building applications.

It was proposed that the text in the roof profiles section could also be altered to highlight that the map addresses roof level alterations, such as mansards, plant and dormers, not issues such as small PV cells, air conditioning units, flues or similar additions to the roof line (these issues are reviewed in Sections 8 & 9 of the Audit (*Negative Features and Management Proposals*)).

Further to the discussion on roof profiles, Carol Seymour-Newton wished to address the 'ghastly extensions' found to numerous properties throughout the conservation areas. She wished to know whether the Planning Department were exerting more control on such extensions. Jane Hamilton highlighted that many of these said extensions are unfortunately historic (i.e. predate the City Council's SPG '*ROOFS: A Guide to Alterations and Extensions on Domestic Buildings*', adopted in 1995). Furthermore, due to many of the roof lines already having undergone extensive alteration it is often difficult to resist some applications due to the presence of so many extensions in the area. However, where possible, the City Council looks to maintain the historic profile of buildings and terrace and it is hoped that the conservation area audits go some way in assisting this.

Michael Wright felt that more effort and attention needs to be made to address this historic damage to the streetscape and to make sure that any new extensions fit in with neighbouring properties. It is highlighted that this is also the City Council's objective and that officers endeavour to only grant schemes that work within their context.

Paul Velluet felt that the reference to the City Council's Roof Policy DES6 of the UDP should not be left to the end of the Roof Profile section. The issues it raises are of great importance and fundamental to understanding the Council's views on roof profiles; it should therefore be moved to the beginning of this section.

Action/ Amendments: Roof extensions map has been reviewed/amended. Ensure reference to existing poor quality roof extensions in negative features and reference to their enhancement in management proposals.

2.5 Public Art

Michael Wright of the Knightsbridge Association had particular issues with the concept of Public Art and the City Council's belief that new large developments should have public art integrated into their schemes. 100 Brompton Road was used as a particularly bad example of this and he felt that it would be more worthwhile if major developers contributed money to a fund, which would ultimately result in public art of a higher standard, rather than being an afterthought. Toby Cuthberson pointed out that this is an option in situations where developers can argue that an off site or temporary piece would be more acceptable. It is also felt that there are many situations of successful collaboration between architects, developers and artists which results in successful schemes such as 197 Knightsbridge. Michael Wright's main point however was that if a building is of high quality design it does not necessitate the addition of public art, especially when this detracts from its appearance. Helen Ensor highlighted that decoration and enrichment can benefit our townscape and public art is an integral part of Westminster both historically and up to this present day.

Paul Velluet agreed with Michael Wright and outlined that he felt such forced collaborations were at times dangerous, often resulting in the context of a scheme not fully being considered and thus the public art produced being incompatible with the overall development. It was felt that public art can simply come from the quality of a building as a structure without the necessity of additional artwork. Helen Ensor addressed these concerns but highlighted that many developers are keen to integrate artwork into schemes. In these instances Michael Wright applauded such wishes but pointed out that historically decoration and embellishment was done without being told it was essential and it should ultimately be left to the designer as to whether art is integrated into a scheme.

With reference to existing public art, Carol Seymour-Newton pointed out that various statues (specifically 'The Seer') have been disappearing and this should be prevented.

Action/ Amendments: Agree that some schemes have done this better than others. Any change to policy would have to come through the LDF process.

2.6 Landmark Buildings

With regards to the audit's recognition of local landmark buildings, Paul Velluet raised the issue that none had been acknowledged within the Albert Gate Conservation Area and he could not understand this as it holds two of the most notorious houses of the 19th century (known then as Malta and Gibraltar) as well as the listed building to the southside of Knightsbridge and the Hyde Park Hotel. These buildings will be considered in our review of the document and were perhaps overlooked due to the somewhat consistent scale of buildings in the conservation area meaning these buildings did not initially stand out in the streetscape.

Action/ Amendments: Whilst these were historical landmarks they can no longer be considered as such due to the scale of adjoining townscape. However, their importance and historical status as landmarks has been emphasised elsewhere in the document.

2.7 PVC Windows

The issue of uPVC windows within the conservation area was raised by Carol Seymour-Newton. Unfortunately, as with the roof extensions, this is a historical problem which is a result of prohibited development rights to some properties. The implementation of an Article 4 on some areas (Ennismore Garden Mews and Relton Mews) can assist in preserving the character of the conservation area as properties previously open to prohibited development need consent under Article 4. Future developments in policy and English Heritage's proposal to overturn the Shimizu decision in their new Heritage Protection Bill will also assist in preserving and enhancing conservation areas.

<p>Action/ Amendments: Guidance on Relton Mews and Ennismore Mews has been included at the back of the document and an action related to seeking improvements to windows added within management proposals</p>
<p>2.8 Negative Features Paul Velluet had further issues with the wording used in the Negative Features section. It should be ensured that the audit is specific about the difference between a <i>negative building</i> and those buildings which have <i>negative features</i>. This is essential as otherwise there is risk that buildings which simply have negative features or are in need of repair are at risk of demolition. The French Embassy in Albert Gate is a prime example of this, being in a bad state but certainly not a negative building.</p>
<p>Action/ Amendments: Text amended to ensure wording makes this clear.</p>
<p>2.9 Management Proposals/ Terminology It is also suggested that the conservation area audits have a high potential to be considerably more influential than at present with the Management Proposals to the back of the document being made more substantial. The Management Proposals could be more pro-active with more emphasis on the promotion of beneficial change rather than its current stance preserving the status quo. Westminster's use of 'Audit', a deviation from English Heritage's term 'Appraisal' was discussed as it is felt that this term does not accurately describe the content or purpose of the document.</p>
<p>Action/ Amendments: Added the term management proposals to the title of the document and within the introduction. Agree this is an important element and this will be reviewed and strengthened in future audits. However, the term audits has been used for all previous document and in policy so it is not felt appropriate to change this part way through the programme of production of documents.</p>
<p>2.10 Land Use Robert Couchman, of South Kensington Estates, enquired whether the audits should perhaps in future have more concern over the use of buildings. It is understood that the audit does have some considerable influence and the issue of function is just as important as the visual effect change of use might have. However, it is almost impossible to refuse LBC on the grounds of a change of use and therefore the audit is not really the right mechanism for controlling this. Chris Cotton hoped that another category would be added to the 'Land Use' map to acknowledge the presence of 'cultural' buildings as is done in the text. This is particularly relevant as the area around the Royal Albert Hall is in fact designated in the UDP as an Arts, Culture and Education Special Policy Area as well as the London Plan identifying the South Kensington Museums area as a Strategic Cultural Complex. Furthermore, Chris Cotton wished to highlight three particular issues relevant to the Royal Albert Hall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the chimney by the Royal Albert Hall has been incorrectly designated; ▪ the Royal Organists is now a private residence and this should thus be acknowledged on the land uses map. ▪ the traffic along Knightsbridge is hugely detrimental to the area and this should be acknowledged in the audit.
<p>It was suggested that any further comments and suggestions that arise from this discussion should be sent to the Audit Team, from which all will be considered.</p>
<p>Action/ Amendments: Land use map amended to acknowledge cultural buildings.</p>
<p>3. Meeting ended: 20:00</p>

4 Statement of Adoption

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
City of Westminster
Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Area Audit
Supplementary Planning Document: Statement of Adoption

Westminster City Council adopted the Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Area Audit Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on **20 April 2009**. This adoption statement is required by Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

Any person aggrieved by the Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Area Audit SPD may make an application to the High Court for permission to apply for judicial review of the decision to adopt the Supplementary Planning Document. Any such application must be made promptly and in any event not later than 3 months after the date on which the Supplementary Planning Document was adopted.

Title: Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Area Audit Supplementary Planning Document

Geographical Coverage: Will apply to the Knightsbridge, Knightsbridge Green and Albert Gate Conservation Area.

Availability: You can obtain a copy of the SPD:

1. At Westminster City Council One Stop Services, 62 Victoria Street, SW1 (Open 8.30am-7pm, Monday-Friday; 9am-1pm Saturday).
2. On the city council's website at:
www.westminster.gov.uk/environment/planning/conservationlistedbuildings/areaprofiles/knightsbridge
3. Hard copies are available by contacting:

Conservation Area Audits Team
Department of Planning and City Development
12th Floor (South)
Westminster City Council
City Hall
64 Victoria Street
SW1E 6QP

Tel: 020 7641 2850/8705/8019

E-mail: conservationareaaudits@westminster.gov.uk

Documents: Alongside the adopted SPD and this statement of adoption, the Statement of Consultation and Statement of Representations are also available for inspection.

