

# **Vincent Square 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**

**February 2010**



**City of Westminster**

**Town and Country Planning (Local Development) England Regulations  
2004, as amended 2008 and 2009. Regulations 16 and 17.**

**Vincent Square Conservation Area Audit SPD: Notice of Supplementary  
Planning Document Matters**

<b>Title</b> Vincent Square Conservation Area Audit Supplementary Planning Document
<b>Purpose</b> To guide the protection, enhancement and management of the Vincent Square Conservation Area, 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.
<b>Content</b> This will include [a] Historical Development [b] Appraisal of character [c] Identification of Unlisted Buildings of Merit [d] Appraisal of roofscape [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
<b>Geographical coverage</b> Will apply to the Vincent Square Conservation Area.
<b>Consultation Period</b> The full public consultation on the draft audit and sustainability appraisal will be held in April-May 2009. During this time, the draft audit 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).
<b>Representations</b> 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: <b>Conservation Area Audits Team Westminster City Council City Hall 64 Victoria Street SW1E 6QP</b>  Or by e-mail to: <a href="mailto:conservationareaaudits@westminster.gov.uk">conservationareaaudits@westminster.gov.uk</a> Any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified in future, at a specified address, of the adoption of the SPD.

# Vincent Square 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, as amended, Westminster City Council has a duty to prepare a consultation statement to accompany the draft Vincent Square 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](http://www.westminster.gov.uk)); officers also attended the Area Forums with details of the forthcoming programme and held a workshop at South Area forum on 11 February 2009 to explain more about the council's conservation areas which was attended by residents of the estate, surrounding areas and local businesses. In addition, the Council sent letters advertising the Audit programme to local and national amenity societies and inviting comments prior to drafting and a programme of audits was publicised in a newspaper notice. Specific consultation letters on this area were sent to the following:

- Westminster Society
- Vincent Square Residents Association
- Westminster Property Association
- CityWest Homes
- Twentieth Century Society
- English Heritage
- Greater London Authority
- Transport for London

Following feedback on the initial information provided, the document was drafted and presented to the Cabinet Member for Built Environment in March 2009, 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 16 April 2009.

### Formal Consultation on Draft Conservation Area Audit

The draft Audit and Boundary Review documents along with their accompanying SPD Documents have been made available on the council website, with full details of the public consultation process and links to the feedback form since April 2009. The formal consultation period was from May to June 2009. A letter invited all interested parties to comment on the audit and letters were sent to all properties within proposed extensions. During this period, site notices were also put up throughout the conservation area advertising that the documents has been drafted and were available to view and comment upon. A press notice dated 27.04.2009 has also been issued describing the SPD matters and all information made available at Onestop Services, Westminster City Hall. The consultation letters were sent out on 05.05.2009 to the following consultees:

Ms	Susan	Denyer		<b>ICOMOS UK</b>	70 Cowcross Street
Mr	Ken	Bean	Planning & Housing Division	<b>Government Office for London</b>	9th Floor, Riverwalk House
Mr	Edmund	Bird	Heritage Advisor	<b>Design for London</b>	London Development Agency
Mr	Terry	Clark	Property Services Manager	<b>CityWest Homes</b>	21 Grosvenor Place
Mr	Ian	Mawson		<b>Citywest Homes</b>	21 Grosvenor Place
Ms	Debbie	McMullen	Special Development Strategy Team	<b>Greater London Authority</b>	City Hall
Mr	Giles	Dolphin	Planning Decisions Unit	<b>Greater London Authority</b>	City Hall
Mr	Tim	Jones	Central & West London Team	<b>English Heritage</b>	1 Waterhouse Square
			Head of Land Use Planning, Borough Partnerships	<b>Transport for London</b>	Windsor House
Mr	Paul	Houston		<b>Westminster Property Owners Association</b>	1 Warwick Row London
Ms	Patricia	Bras		<b>The Westminster Society</b>	
Cllr	Alexander	Nicoll	Ward Councillor		
Cllr	Danny	Chalkley	Ward Councillor		Westminster City Hall
Cllr	Duncan	Sandys	Ward Councillor		Westminster City Hall
Cllr	Steve	Summers	Ward Councillor		Westminster City Hall
Cllr	Louise	Hyams	Ward Councillor		Westminster City Hall
Cllr	Tim	Mitchell	Ward Councillor		Westminster City Hall
Mr	Graham	Nash		<b>Transport for London</b>	Westminster City Hall
Ms	Rebecca	Cloke	Parks Project Manager	<b>WCC Parks</b>	
	Martin	Low	Director of Transportation	<b>Highways</b>	10th Floor, City Hall
Mr	Don	Murchie	Policy manager		10th Floor, City Hall
	Paul	Akers	Transportation	<b>Trees and Landscape</b>	10th Floor, City Hall
Mr	Alan	Wharton	Property Strategy Manager	<b>Corporate Property Division</b>	10th Floor, City Hall
			Estates Manager	<b>Chelsea and Westminster</b>	Environment & Leisure

Ms	Catherine	Hoyte	Associate	<b>Hospital NHS FoundationTrust</b> <b>Montagu Evans</b> <b>South</b> <b>Westminster</b> <b>Centre for Health</b> <b>The Regency Café</b> <b>Jones Lang</b> <b>Lasalle</b>	Clarges House, 6-12 Clarges Street St Georges House 82 Vincent Square
Ms	Alexandra	Jezpeh			17-19 Regency Street
				Basement Floor And Ground Floor	72 Rochester Row
				First And Second Floor	72 Rochester Row
					70A Rochester Row
				Basement And Ground Floor	Basement And Ground Floor 68 Rochester Row
				Ground Floor	70 Rochester Row
				Flat 3, 76 Rochester Row	76 Rochester Row
				Flat 1, 76 Rochester Row	
				Colourstat Ltd	
					68 Rochester Row
				Rochester Flowers Mortons Property Management Service	68-70 Rochester Row
				J Whitehead & Sons	70 Rochester Row
					72 Rochester Row
					74 Rochester Row
				Shepherds Bookbinders Ltd	74A Rochester Row
				Royal Military Police	76B Rochester Row London
					76D Rochester Row London
					Flat 6, 76 Rochester Row
					Basement And Ground Floor 87 Rochester Row
					Ground Floor Front 95 Rochester Row
					Basement And Ground Floor 85 Rochester Row
					Basement And Ground Floor 85 Rochester Row
				Hopes Snack Bar	Ground Floor 81 Rochester Row
				Rochester News	81 Rochester Row
					83 Rochester Row
				Popular Book Centre	85 Rochester Row
				Redwood & Feller Ltd	87 Rochester Row
				Chelsea Funeral Directors	Concession 89 Rochester Row
				Tejo	91 Rochester Row
				Belens Saloon	93 Rochester Row
					95 Rochester Row
				Salvation Army Hostel	95A Rochester Row
					97 Rochester Row
					Maisonette Second And Third Floor 9 Hatherley Street
					First Floor 164 - 166 Vauxhall Bridge Road
					Basement And Ground Floor 164 - 166 Vauxhall Bridge Road
					Flat 2 ,12 Hatherley Street
					Ground Floor And First Floor Maisonette 9 Hatherley Street
HSBC					Flat 3, 12 Hatherley Street
					166 Vauxhall Bridge Road
					Masionette First And Second Floor 89 Rochester Row

	Flat 1, 12 Hatherley Street
Salvation Army W S Jenkins & Co Ltd	Basement And Ground Floor 81A Rochester Row  Rochester Row 81A Rochester Row
Prontaprint	Ground Floor 91 Rochester Row
Cars & Couriers	160 Vauxhall Bridge Road
British Executive Service Overseas	162 Vauxhall Bridge Road 164 Vauxhall Bridge Road 1 Walcott Street Flat 10, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 11, Vincent Square Mansions Walcott Street Flat 12, Vincent Square Mansions Walcott Street Flat 14, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 14a, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 14b, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 15, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 16, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 17, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 18, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 4, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 5, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 6, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 7, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 8, Vincent Square Mansions Flat 9, Vincent Square Mansions 1 Hatherley Street 10 Hatherley Street
King Georges Fund For Sailors Association Of Wrens	11 Hatherley Street  Ground Floor 7-8 Hatherley Street First Floor 7-8 Hatherley Street Flat 1,7-8 Hatherley Street Flat 2, 7-8 Hatherley Street Flat 3, 7-8 Hatherley Street

In addition to the above, an Officer attended the Vincent Square Residents Association AGM on 29 April 2009 to present the document and copies of the draft document were made available as part of the meeting along with comments sheets.

### 3 Statement of Representations Received (Regulation 18(4)(b))

**Regulation 18 (4) (b)** of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, as amended, requires local authorities to set out how they have addressed representations received as a result of public consultation.

Seven written responses to the draft Audit and Boundary Review were received, which were considered and amendments were made to the draft SPD. A summary of the main issues raised and how these have been addressed in the SPD is set out below. These were considered by the Cabinet Member for the Built Environment and are also detailed in the Cabinet Member report published in the Directory appended to the Conservation Area Audit.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
GLA  Giles Dolphin	The Mayor does not usually comment on conservation area audits due to their mainly local and non-strategic nature, as such we have no formal strategic comments to make on the draft document.	Noted. As it is an SPD we are required to consult the GLA to ensure the document is in general conformity with the London Plan.
Design for London  Edmund Bird	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above draft audit and boundary review - this is an excellent document which should greatly assist both policy and development control decision making by setting out a comprehensive statement of the character and special interest of this fine conservation area, as well as detailed management guidelines which should proactively promote its protection and enhancement.</p> <p><b>Conservation area boundaries.</b></p> <p>The extensions you propose all seem very rational and all would make a relevant contribution to the overall character of the conservation area – the inclusion of the very distinctive Regency Café and the fine historic properties on Rochester Row are particularly welcome. The only puzzling omission is the HSBC Bank on the corner of Vauxhall Bridge Road and Rochester Row (No. 164 Vauxhall Bridge Road and 99 Rochester Row) – this is a notable mid C19th historic property and plays an important part as a key gateway building into the conservation area from Vauxhall Bridge Road – very much forming an integral part of the streetscape with the adjoining properties that are proposed to be included (see top photo overleaf).</p> <p>In addition there are two good examples of 1920s and 30s buildings opposite the HSBC Bank which could be considered for inclusion – the three-storey red-brick and stone dressings corner edifice of Barclays Bank and the adjoining</p>	<p>Welcome support for audit production.</p> <p>Agreed. HSBC bank has been added.</p> <p>The buildings opposite are considered more remote from</p>

	<p>elegant neo-Georgian post office with rusticated stone ground floor and red brick 1st floor, both of which complement the strong institutional character of many of the Vincent Square conservation area buildings and its Victorian and early C20th character (see second photo overleaf). Post offices of this design were once commonplace but are becoming increasingly rare as the closure programme accelerates and they are being redeveloped.</p> <p>The inclusion of the Grade II listed Royal Horticultural Hall could be considered – whilst this outstanding building, of international renown is already well protected by its listed status it does have a very strong connection with the Vincent Square Conservation Area in terms of its institutional use, its status as a classic mid C20th and its siting at a key axis of Elverton Street/Greycoat Lane.</p> <p>The only comment I would make regarding the very useful Map (Figure 67) showing unlisted buildings of merit would be to query why the characterful corner building at the junction of Maunsell Street and Regency Street is considered to be a neutral contributor when it appears to be one of the oldest properties in the conservation area – a fine circa early C19th townhouse with elegant hinged corner and deeply recessed box sash windows. It has a mansard storey and projecting shop unit which are later additions but these are relatively benign alterations that do not detract significantly from its overall character and contribution to the conservation area in my view.</p> <p>Whilst looking at Vincent Square I noticed some very interesting tenement/apartment buildings to the east and west of the Vincent Square CA that have no CA protection including those to the west of Greencoat Place and the block of listed Lutyens flats (see second attached photo) and older red-brick Victorian model dwellings east of Regency Street (see first attached photo). Are there any plans to look at these for CA status?</p> <p>In conclusion this commendable audit and the proposed extensions are strongly supported with the request that you consider the further extension outlined and other points raised.</p>	<p>the conservation area, which is centred around Vincent Square. These are not considered to be as significant as other buildings within the conservation area and their inclusion is not therefore recommended.</p> <p>Agree that the Royal Horticultural Hall is of significant interest but as it is a listed building, it is considered it is adequately protected and the extension of the conservation area is not necessary in this location.</p> <p>Agreed. Amended.</p> <p>This proposal is being considered and a report proposing the potential designation of these dwellings as a new conservation area will be with the Cabinet Member shortly.</p>
<p>St Stephen with St John Westminster Philip Welsh</p>	<p>Will you kindly note that each of the current maps of the area misidentify St Stephen’s church as St John’s church (which is in Smith Square), while the text refers correctly to St Stephen’s church.</p>	<p>All maps amended.</p>
	<p>On p.16 the comment about the ‘replacement vicarage’ is misleading, as it has now been replaced by no.21 Vincent Square (the present</p>	<p>The text has been edited to avoid it sounding misleading with regards to the vicarage.</p>



	vicarage) and by the adjacent houses 21A and 21B. This also affects your statement on p.39. I simply wish to avoid your report giving the impression that there is no longer a vicarage on this site.	
	You might note that Fig.80 has house numbers missing and Fig.55 is surely the current (not former) Gordon Hospital.	Amended text
	Finally, I suggest that the very attractive bas-relief and inscription above the entrance of the recently refurbished 64-5 is worthy of mention to your report.	Added.
Chairman, Vincent Square Residents Association.	Suggested that the conservation area be extended to include the houses on Hatherley Street. At present, some but not all of the street is included in the area, whereas the whole street forms part of the community from a visual, social and architectural viewpoint.	Agreed. Has been amended.
Steven Zielinski Vincent Square resident	<p>Requested that Nos 1-4 Fynes Street be re-designated as buildings which may be suitable for roof extension. For the following reasons:</p> <p><b>1. Surrounding buildings:</b> The houses are dwarfed by surrounding buildings, in particular the office block across the road at No. 1 Vincent Square and the surrounding blocks of flats on Regency Street behind and to the side of the houses. The houses are also dwarfed by the neighbouring houses at No.s 5 and 6 Fynes Street, which, as well as occupying a larger footprint, have both had roof extensions. Nos. 1-4 Fynes Street are among the oldest buildings in the area but have not historically enjoyed the kind of protection that conservation area status and the current audit seek to provide. On the contrary they have been terrorised by later developments in the surrounding area. Appropriate roof extension may afford an opportunity for these delightful and historic houses to reclaim some ground.</p> <p><b>2. Inappropriate and dangerous roofs:</b> The butterfly roofs do not afford effective protection from the elements. Each and every one of the houses at 1-4 Fynes Street has continually suffered from a leaking roof. This is caused by leaves and/or seeds falling from the trees, damming the "v" in the butterfly roof and creating a large puddle which quickly spills over the lead flashing, causing water ingress and damage to lofts, ceilings and to structural timbers supporting the roof and the lofts. At No. 3 (despite having a roof in good condition) we have suffered several leaks, most recently only last week during a short but relatively heavy shower when only one and a half plastic shopping bag's worth of seeds (which can accumulate in only a few hours when there's a bit of wind) were enough to dam the "v" and cause water to rise over the flashing and come through the ceiling. When water comes in it often comes through the ceiling of our childrens' nursery so is</p>	<p>1-4 Fyne Street are identified as buildings which form part of a group with a consistent roofline. The buildings form part of a complete group of buildings of significant historic interest which date from 1820 and are potentially listable. The group is visible in views down Regency Street. The buildings are characterised by their small scale and have an unimpaired roofline with roofs set behind a consistent parapet cornice, which provides a strong horizontal termination to the group. If one building were to extend above this line, this would disrupt the character of this attractive group. It is therefore highly unlikely that any extension to this group would be acceptable. However, each application is considered on its own merits and on some occasions coordinated designs for complete terraces may be considered.</p> <p>There may also be flexibility for other forms of extensions for example rear extensions which are less harmful to the character of the area.</p> <p>The respondent refers to 5 to 6 Fyne Street. However, these have been rebuilt and therefore have a different character.</p> <p>A meeting was held on site with the respondent and it was</p>

	<p>a constant cause of concern. Thankfully on this latest occasion I managed to get onto the roof to fix it in time, but on a previous occasion so much water came in that within two hours it had penetrated the ceiling light fittings in the childrens' nursery.</p> <p>The problem is made worse by the proximity of big trees and by extra seeds and leaves blowing onto the roofs of Nos. 1-4 from the flat roofs of Nos. 5 and 6. All the residents in Nos. 1-4 are forced to clear the roofs on a regular basis (in our case as much as weekly or fortnightly) during the long periods of leaf and seed fall to mitigate this problem. Even then there is no guarantee that the problem will be contained. To clear the roofs residents are forced to climb up a ladder into the loft then out through a small hatch on to the roof to sweep up the leaves/seeds and lean over the side to clear the hopper at the top of the drain pipe. This of course is far from safe and the residents feel strongly that the danger is unacceptable, particularly when they have to get out on the roof in the middle of a downpour and the roof is covered in wet and slippery leaves.</p> <p>It's even worse in the dark and it seems only a matter of time before a potentially fatal accident will occur. I'm not sure whether the butterfly roofs are a historic roof form but on these houses in this location they are dangerous and not fit for the purpose.</p> <p><b>3. Overcrowding:</b> The area suffers from overcrowding, the houses are very small and both would benefit greatly from extra living space. Three of the four households need at least one extra bedroom. Without extra living space families may be forced to leave the area.</p> <p><b>4. Roof/skyline:</b> The roofline is not exposed to long views from public places, nor does it contribute to the local skyline. Furthermore, the roofline of Nos 5 and 6 and that of Nos 1-4 is incongruous.</p> <p><b>5. Precedent:</b> The roof extensions at Nos 5 and 6 set a precedent for the rest of the street.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>There seem to be two options for extending the roofs of the houses, namely:</p> <p>(a) to erect a mansard extension behind the parapet at the front of the house. This could be done at any individual house without affecting the skyline as the mansard would not be visible from street level; or</p> <p>(b) to build an extension similar to those at Nos 5 and 6 by raising the parapet and building behind it. If there were a concern with keeping rooflines consistent this could be controlled either by starting at No. 4 and working across or by building an extension on all four roofs at the same time.</p> <p><b>SUMMARY</b></p> <p>In summary, we need to redress the architectural</p>	<p>agreed that if an appropriately detailed extension could be constructed which was not visible from anywhere in the public realm, this might be considered. However, it was explained that it is considered it is unlikely this could be achieved. It was clear from this site meeting that the neighbours do not wish to pursue an application for one coordinated proposal across the group of buildings. Certain amendments to wording have, however, been made in the light of these concerns including the addition of:</p> <p><i>“this survey is intended as a guide and the identification of buildings as unlikely to be suitable for roof extension will not necessarily preclude all roof alteration. Individual applications for roof alterations will be considered on their merits and assessed having regard to their detailed design, impact on the character of the conservation area and impact on amenity of adjoining occupiers.”</i></p> <p>The wording of the key has also been amended so it does not say ‘roof extensions unacceptable’.</p>
--	--	---

	balance and address the dangerous roofs and overcrowding issues. This can be achieved without adverse affect and we have a great opportunity to pave the way in the audit. I hope the audit team will consider the above submissions favourably and look forward to hearing from you that Nos 1-4 Fynes Street have been re-designated as buildings which may be suitable for roof extension.	
Cllr Steve Summers	Ward Councillors view is supportive of the residents of Fynes street i.e. that the draft should make it clear that extensions may be acceptable, provided that certain provisos have been met	Any roof extension in this location would be contrary to policy and would therefore be contentious. The audits has however been amended and states that each individual application will be considered on its merits to make it clear that an application for a roof extension will be considered and may be acceptable, even where a building has been identified in the audit as unlikely to be suitable for roof extension
The Westminster Society  Olwen Rowlands, Chair	The Westminster Society supports the Westminster City Council Conservation Area Audits.  We feel that it is important that the varied nature of the conservation areas be acknowledged and the extent of modern 20 <sup>th</sup> century developments within them recognised as an important part of the urban mix. Within these areas there are sites that will come up for redevelopment and we hope that the audits will identify opportunities for improvement here on both the large and small scale.	Welcome support.  Agree. The audit includes descriptions of the importance of buildings from all eras and identifies these as unlisted buildings of merit. We also identify negative features and buildings, many of which may be appropriate for redevelopment or alteration.
	We would like to encourage any large scale developments to be of the highest quality and representative of the best architectural, landscape and associated design disciplines. At all times it should be recognised that the contribution to the public realm made by a development is every bit as important as the development itself. At the small end of the scale we hope the audits will consider public realm improvements that could be made within the conservation areas. These might include blocking off streets to provide improved pedestrian environments but might also consist of no more than the reduction and improvement of street and highways signage.	Agree. Reference to high quality design and public realm improvements added in 'Section 9: Management Proposals' section.
Resident 87 Vincent Square	One important views that looks northwest down Walcot Street towards St James the Less adds to the Square's character particularly when there are no leaves on trees.	A view of St James the Less from Vincent square is included at View 6 as are general views across the Square included from the

	<p>I do not believe that 17 Regency Street should be included. The potential retention of this building, of no particular merit, would impact adversely on any future development of the street cleansing depot site and in any event it is out of scale with its neighbours on Regency Street and Page Street</p>	<p>southern edge of Walcot Street. NW from Walcott Square St James the Less is not visible.</p> <p>This is considered to be a building of some interest, which relates to the character of the area. Its inclusion has not been opposed by owners of the building and has been supported by others.</p>
--	--	---

## 4 Statement of Adoption

**Westminster City Council**  
**Vincent Square Conservation Area Audit Supplementary Planning Document: Statement of Adoption**

Westminster City Council adopted the Vincent Square Conservation Area Audit Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on **23 February 2010**. This adoption statement is required by regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, as amended.

Any person with sufficient interest in the adoption of the Vincent Square 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:** Vincent Square Conservation Area Audit Supplementary Planning Document
- Geographical coverage:** Will apply to the Vincent Square Conservation Area.
- Availability:** You can inspect 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/vincentsquare](http://www.westminster.gov.uk/environment/planning/conservationlistedbuildings/areaprofiles/vincentsquare)
  3. Copies are also available by contacting:  
**Conservation Area Audits Team**  
**City Planning**  
**Westminster City Council**  
**11<sup>th</sup> Floor, City Hall**  
**64 Victoria Street**  
**London SW1E 6QP**
- Tel:** 020 7641 2850/8705/8019  
**E-mail:** [conservationareaaudits@westminster.gov.uk](mailto: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.
- Decision dated:** **23 February 2010**