Note: Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of this document but due to the complexity of conservation areas, it would be impossible to include every facet contributing to the area’s special interest. Therefore, the omission of any feature does not necessarily convey a lack of significance. The Council will continue to assess each development proposal on its own merits. As part of this process a more detailed and up to date assessment of a particular site and its context is undertaken. This may reveal additional considerations relating to character or appearance which may be of relevance to a particular case.
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1 Introduction

What does a conservation area designation mean?

1.1 The statutory definition of a conservation area is an “area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance”. The power to designate conservation areas is given to councils through the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (Sections 69 to 78). Once designated, proposals within a conservation area become subject to local conservation policies set out in Chapter 34 of the Council’s Local Plan and national policies outlined in part 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Our overarching duty which is set out in the Act is to preserve or enhance the historic or architectural character or appearance of the conservation area.

1.2 A conservation area appraisal aims to describe the special historic and architectural character of an area. A conservation area’s character is defined by a combination of elements such as architecture, uses, materials and detailing as well as the relationship between buildings and their settings. Many other elements contribute to character and appearance such as the placement of buildings within their plots; views and vistas; the relationship between the street and the buildings and the presence of trees and green space.

1.3 This document has been produced using the guidance set out by Historic England in their document, Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management: Historic England Advice Note 1 (2016). This appraisal will be a material consideration when assessing planning applications.

Purpose of this document

1.4 The aims of this appraisal are to:

- describe the historic and architectural character and appearance of the area which will assist applicants in making successful planning applications and decision makers in assessing planning applications
- raise public interest and awareness of the special character of their area
- identify the positive features which should be conserved, as well as negative features which indicate scope for future enhancements
Summary of Character

1.5  Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area comprises groups of generally modest residential properties that form an oasis of pleasant family homes and studios between the bustle and activity of Fulham Road and King’s Road.

1.6  The residential properties that form attractive and characterful streets date from the late Georgian period until to the mid-twentieth century. These are laid out as a mixture of terraces and detached/semi-detached houses. In this mature residential area can also be found important inter-war houses by Mendelsohm and Chermayeff, Gropius and Fry and Oliver Hill as well as a remarkable sequence of semi-formal housing schemes in a range of styles that reflect the changing fashions in urban design and together all add something to the special character of Chelsea.

1.7  Despite the predominantly residential character of the area the northern boundary formed by Fulham Road has a more commercial/institutional character with its row of terraced shops and hospital buildings. Likewise the southern boundary formed by the King’s Road also has a distinct commercial character with shops, pubs, restaurants and a former garage providing more active frontages to the street.

1.8  The buildings are constructed from a limited palette of materials that use yellow, red or grey bricks, stucco and stone with vertically sliding timber sash windows or casements. This gives the area coherence and a commonality where buildings sit in harmony with one another.
1.9 A significant contribution to the area is also made by the large number of mature trees and the lushly planted front gardens of houses as well as the large and modest communal gardens that can be found throughout the area. These provide visual amenity not only to residents but also to the public helping to soften the architecture and create a picturesque streetscape.

1.10 The conservation area comprises a high quality built environment that is primarily residential in character with commercial and institutional buildings located at the edges. The streets form an interesting array of housing and individual buildings that illustrate the nineteenth century and good quality housing developments of the early to mid-twentieth century which are all set in a comfortable residential atmosphere with mature green spaces.
Location and Setting

1.11 The Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area is situated in the south of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in an area that is largely bounded by Fulham Road to the north, King’s Road to the south, Dovehouse Street to the east and Park Walk to the west. The area is located wholly within the Stanley Ward.

1.12 Beyond the boundaries of the conservation area are yet more well-mannered Georgian/Victorian town houses arranged in terraces and larger blocks of twentieth century flats. The relatively low and consistent building heights and the frequent greening of the wider area by trees and the vitality offered episodically by the commercial streets and individual buildings contribute to the setting and desirability of the area. This setting combines with the conservation area to provide a swathe of attractive and historic places to live and work, helping to ensure the longevity of this part of the borough’s heritage.

1.13 The Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area is surrounded almost completely by other conservation areas. To the north by the Thurloe Smith’s Charity and The Boltons Conservation Areas; to the east by Chelsea Conservation Area; to the south by Cheyne Conservation Area and to the west by Sloane Stanley Conservation Area.

Fig 1.3: Conservation area context map
2 Townscape

Urban Form

2.1 The Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area contains many buildings of a modest scale ranging in height from two to seven storeys with a mixture of finely grained terrace houses and more coarsely grained semi-detached and detached buildings that line the streets. A number of buildings stand out in their own right as larger individually designed buildings, such as the Royal Marsden Hospital, the Royal Brompton Hospital South Wing, the Royal Brompton Hospital Nurses Accommodation Block on South Parade, the Chelsea Hospital for Women and nurses home in Dovehouse Street, the former Chelsea Polytechnic and public library on Manresa Road and St. Andrew’s Church in Park Walk.

2.2 The earliest parts of the conservation area to be developed were Park Walk, King’s Road, Dovehouse Street, Chelsea Park Gardens, South Parade and the southern part of Carlyle Square. These were built by about 1830. In the mid-Victorian period Elm Park Road, the north half of Beaufort Street, Elm Park Lane, Henniker Mews and the rest of Carlyle Square were laid out and development continued until the 1880s. The next significant development occurred in the 1910s-20s with The Vale, Mallord Street, Mulberry Walk, Queen Elm’s Square and adjacent shops to the north along Fulham being built. Redevelopment of previously developed sites were then undertaken with Chelsea Park Gardens and shops along King’s Road in the 1920s, Chelsea Square in the 1930s and the
east side of Dovehouse Street and **nos. 80-108 (even) Old Church Street** in the 1950s.

2.3 Most buildings front directly onto the street or are set back from the pavement with narrow lightwells to allow light to enter the lower ground floors. Large front gardens are few in number but can be found as communal spaces at **nos. 94-108 (even) Old Church Street**, and **nos. 32-50 and 56-96 (even) Chelsea Park Gardens**. These allow for more substantial planting to be achieved and help soften the surrounding architecture. Most houses have small rear gardens/yards which allow separation and a clear distinction to be made between the different groups. Some of the larger detached houses have generous rear gardens which can be found at **nos. 143-151 (odd) and nos. 64-68 (even) Old Church Street** and **nos. 40 and 42 Chelsea Square** which contribute significantly to the setting of each house and emphasise it as a single architectural composition.

2.4 Road widths vary, with the primary routes such as King’s Road and Fulham Road having the greatest width and most generous pavements. The secondary residential streets are narrower, but generally have adequate pavement widths and on-street parking. The only exceptions are the mews which are single laned.

2.5 The largest green spaces are Carlyle Square, Chelsea Square, Queen’s Elm Square, the Western Synagogue Cemetery, the church yard to St. Andrews Church and the front communal garden to **nos. 4-30 (even) Chelsea Park Gardens**. Other smaller green spaces which contribute to the softening of the area can be found in the front and rear gardens of many of the houses.

2.6 The result is an urban form that is highly legible with local landmark buildings and more modest housing and shops varying in age and style. These reflect the changing fashions in urban design and represent a fine example of the borough’s built heritage.
2.7 Two historic routes form part of the conservation area boundary: Fulham Road to the north and King’s Road to the south. Other old routes that connect these two roads are Lovers Walk (now Park Walk) forming the western edge of the conservation area and Old Church Street. These four roads can be seen on Hamilton’s Map of 1664 enclosing forty acres’ of space known as Lord Wharton’s Park.

2.8 The area was gradually developed for housing from the late eighteenth century onwards. Thompson’s Map of 1836 shows that many new roads had been constructed serving the new development including Camera Square (now Chelsea Park Garden), Oakley Square (now Carlyle Square), Trafalgar Square (now Chelsea Square), the southern part of The Vale, Arthur Street (now Dovehouse Street) and South Parade. The north western part of the area remained less developed being occupied with Chelsea Park and a market garden. During the mid-to-late nineteenth century Chelsea Park was eventually developed with the creation of Elm Park Road, the extension of Beaufort Street up to Fulham Road and two of the smallest streets Henniker Mews and Elm Park Gardens Mews (now Elm Park Lane). The last phase of development and road building was in the early twentieth century with the extension of The Vale up to Elm Park Road and the laying out of Mulberry Walk and Mallord Street. These smaller secondary streets at first glance form a rough grid which follows the residential perimeter blocks resulting in many short streets connecting to traversal ones.

2.9 The street layout has changed little since the early twentieth century. Despite a number of roads connecting King’s Road with Fulham Road the residential streets between have retained a calmness where car speeds are restricted due to many roads having on-street parking limiting the free flow of traffic. This is in contrast to the primary routes which have high volumes of traffic throughout the day.
The east side of Carlyle Square looking north.

Fig 2.2: Road hierarchy map
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Gaps

2.10 The conservation area is densely built up in most parts. In such a tightly grained urban area, even small spaces between and around buildings are all the more valuable in creating a pleasant and comfortable environment. The gaps shown on the map are therefore vital in providing a visual breathing space and extremely important to the character of the conservation area. Gaps that were an original part of the design of the architecture are of the utmost importance.

2.11 Important gaps usually fall into one of the following categories:

- Space around detached buildings.
- Gaps between semi-detached pairs (both at ground floor and upper levels).
- Space between groups of terraced houses.
- Gaps in the streetscape where communal and private gardens meet the street.

2.12 Detached buildings, such as those found at the north end of Old Church Street, and nos. 40 and 41 Chelsea Square sit in their own plots with space all around them. Semi-detached houses, such as those found in Carlyle Square and nos. 5-19 (odd), nos. 2-24 (even), nos. 107-121 (odd) Beaufort Street have a similar setting whereby there is space to both sides of the pair giving them their characteristic from.

2.13 Such gaps allow glimpses of the gardens and trees and create a breathing space in the dense urban environment as well as allowing pairs of houses or terraces to be read as one architectural composition as originally intended. Other gaps exist at the ends of streets where

Fig 2.3: Important townscape gaps map
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back-to-back houses are separated by small yards or gardens providing views along the backs of properties and these also provide breathing space between developments.

2.14 Fortunately, the vast majority of historic gaps have been respected since the buildings were constructed and there has been very little infill development to harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
2.15 The adjacent map shows the land uses as intended by the original landowners and developers. These uses have continued largely to the present day and have defined the different character areas of the conservation area.

2.16 The area is, however, predominantly residential with housing laid out as terraces, detached/semi-detached buildings or those which have been individually designed. Two mews terraces (former stabling with living accommodation above to serve the large houses) exist in the north eastern portion of the area which have now been converted to dwellings.

2.17 Along King’s Road, and Fulham Road there are rows of shops with living accommodation above. The shops, restaurants and public houses have, in the vast majority of cases, remained in their commercial uses since built and continue to serve the local population and visitors to the area. To the northern and eastern boundaries of the area there is also a distinctive institutional character with hospital buildings and a former polytechnic and library all of which date from the Victorian period.
Fig 2.5: Present day land uses map

Cows head ornamentation of former dairy at no. 350 King's Road
Materials

2.18 Materials used in the construction of the historic buildings within the conservation area are either natural materials such as slate and stone or traditionally (and then locally) manufactured ones such as brick, stucco and glass. Their original method of fabrication results in a finish that is typical of traditional building materials. The imperfections in cylinder or crown glass and folds/wrinkles in hand made bricks, along with the natural process of ageing and weathering, give the buildings their authentic historic character and patina that makes the conservation area so special. Traditional materials used in the Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area include:

- Stone (steps, coping stones, dressings, paving slabs)
- Brick (brown, yellow, red)
- Stucco (house frontages and decorative elements)
- Lime (main constituent of mortar)
- Slate and lead (roofs)
- Clay tile (roofs)
- Painted timber (windows, doors, shopfronts)
- Painted cast iron (railings, balconies, pot guards, boot scrapers, bollards).
- Buff and red terracotta (ornamentation, chimney pots)
- Faience (cladding and architectural decorative details)
- Glass (thin crown or cylinder glass, stained glass)
- Quarry/mosaic tiles (covering to steps)
- Granite (granite setts to mews, road surfaces and kerb stones)

Fig 2.6: Materials map (front elevations)
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Buildings Audit

2.19 The buildings audit map shows the contribution made by buildings to the historic and architectural character of the area. For all buildings identified here as positive buildings, change must be managed to conserve and, where appropriate, enhance their significance in accordance with national and local planning policies. Where particular sites, buildings or additions to buildings are harmful or out of keeping with the broader character of the conservation area as outlined in this appraisal, the Council will support proposals and where possible, take opportunities to make improvements and enhancements in line with Policies CL1, CL2 and CL3 of the Local Plan.

Listed Buildings

2.20 A listed building is a building designated by the Government on the advice of Historic England as a building of special architectural or historic interest, which local authorities have a statutory duty to preserve or enhance.

Positive Buildings

2.21 These buildings make a positive contribution to the historic and architectural character and appearance of the conservation area. They are a key reason for the designation and significance of the conservation area.

Neutral Buildings

2.22 These buildings may blend into the townscape by virtue of their form, scale or materials, but due to their level of design quality, fail to make a positive contribution.

Negative Buildings

2.23 Negative buildings are those which are out of keeping with the prevailing character of the conservation area.

Fig 2.7: Buildings audit map
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3 Architecture

Housing

3.1 Properties in the Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area date mainly from the early part of the nineteenth century to the nineteen sixties.

3.2 The Georgian theme of reflecting the vertical nature of individual houses within the horizontal framework of a terrace was continued into the Victorian and Edwardian period. The proportions of door and windows openings all emphasised verticality, as did those of door panels and of individual panes within window sashes. The vertical emphasis of individual houses was, however, subordinated to the horizontal lines of a long terrace; vertical lines were rarely continuous from roof to ground whilst horizontal cornices, parapet lines and rooflines were often constant along the length of the terrace. A fine balance was thus created between the length and height of a terrace and loss of any of the detailing can spoil the overall proportions of a terrace or group.

3.3 The significance of vertical details, such as door treatment and window openings, is increased when the building line abuts or is close to the pavement. Where houses are entered straight from the street or over basement areas, the eye is drawn to the elevational details at ground floor level, such as fenestration, bootscrapers and door fittings. Where a longer view of any group is available the importance of continuous details is emphasised. Cornices, parapets, roof lines, chimneys and repeated ornamentation are all seen in the context of a group of buildings rather than in isolation and are a significant characteristic of the conservation area.

3.4 The design of many houses, terraces and other buildings is often unique so that particular features seen on one group may not appear on another. Some buildings are not mentioned in this text, but that does not mean they are of no value and for this the reader should consult the buildings audit map to ascertain if a building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

3.5 There is a great variety in the architecture found within the conservation area and this is discussed in turn under the following headings:

Park Walk

3.6 The character of Park Walk depends very much on its residential nature compared
to the noise and bustle of King’s Road and Fulham Road. The section or Park Walk within the conservation area principally consists of St. Andrews Church and gardens and two listed Georgian terraces. The listed buildings are the only survivals from the modest type of development which existed in Park Walk and Camera Square (now Chelsea Park Gardens) in the early nineteenth century and they contrast in colour and height from the five-storey turn-of-the-century red brick development of Elm Park Mansions opposite. The houses are three storeys in height over a lower ground floor and are constructed from London stock brick laid in Flemish bond. Nos. 15-31 (odd) and nos. 37-43 (odd) are one window wide and the semi-detached pair at nos. 33-35 are two windows wide with vertical sliding timber sash windows that are set within simple brick reveals with cambered heads. Greater emphasis is given to the first floors with French casements that open onto Juliet balconies that are enclosed with decorative iron railings. The roof lines are largely intact with simple brick parapets and stone copings creating a clean and consistent termination across the groups. The front doors are of the six-panelled type with decorative fanlights above that are set within reveals with moulded architrave surrounds. The front gardens have a variety of metal railings that range from traditional spear tipped designs with acorn standards, decorative cast iron work and more modern plainer mild steel railings.

3.7 The houses have been harmed by the erection of an infill extension between nos. 31 and 33 (odd), the rendering and painting of one of the houses, a roof addition and inconsistent boundary treatments.
Elm Park Road: west of Beaufort Street

3.8  This part of the Elm Park Road nos. 2-24 (even) and nos. 5-19 (odd) along with nos. 107-121 (odd) Beaufort Street comprises dignified mid-Victorian town houses. Fundamental to the visual character is the arrangement of the buildings in pairs and their location set back from the street frontage behind small gardens. The more 'open' garden atmosphere is further enhanced by a number of ornamental trees which, when in flower, can be stunning. The larger gaps at the end of the streets are critical to this spacious, mature character. These factors combined with lower rooflines reduces the sense of enclosure compared to neighbouring Beaufort Street or the lower section of The Vale, for example. The lower rooflines allow the spire of St. Andrew's Church to make an important contribution to the skyline. Elm Park Mansions also has an important role in closing the vista to Park Walk.

3.9  The houses themselves have a strong sense of visual rhythm created by cornice lines, classical detailing and regular gaps between the buildings. They are two-storey-with-basement in height and are constructed from gault or London stock brick with stucco to the upper and lower ground floors. Entrance to the ground floor is achieved by a flight of steps leading up to a classical portico that is finished with square pilasters that support an entablature and bottle balustrade. The entrance doors themselves are to traditional Victorian designs, the most frequent of which are of the two elongated panel type that are set within a glass screen with side and transom lights. The houses are two windows wide with vertical sliding timber sash windows set within architrave surrounds, those to the first floor with console bracketed corniced heads. Further embellishment has been added to the elevation with canted bay windows to the lower and upper ground floors that are crowned with bottle balustrades to match the entrance and
have decorative cast iron pot guards. The front gardens are enclosed with spear tipped railings unifying the group at street level.

3.10 A number of alterations, however, detract from the historic appearance of these semi-detached buildings. Roof extensions are now commonplace but lack uniformity. A regrettable side effect has been the cutting of gaps in cornices and the removal of blocking courses to allow inserted dormers a view of the street. The more discreet mansards are lower and are finished in natural slate with flat roofed dormers that are set behind the blocking cornice with the original façade left intact. Where flank elevations of the houses meet the street, such as those found at nos. 7 and 9 Elm Park Road and nos. 113 and 115 Beaufort Street, they are finished with an unusual pediment detail which makes a positive contribution to the street scene. Unfortunately, some of these have been altered and added to through later roof alterations harming their original architectural compositions.

Beaufort Street: north end

3.11 Beaufort Street is a major traffic thoroughfare which divides the conservation area and creates an unfortunate break in its residential character. Architecturally the built form at its northern end is Victorian terrace houses of the 1870s which line the street in a regular manner.

3.12 The two sides of Beaufort Street were constructed at different times and differ significantly in form. The earlier properties on the eastern side, nos. 86-122 (even) have smaller and plainer facades with very little
decoration. These houses are three storeys in height over a lower ground floor and have later mansard roof extensions. They are constructed from gault brick laid in Flemish bond with visual interest being added in the form of canted bay windows that extend up from the lower ground to first floors. Further architectural embellishment has been added with a ‘dog tooth’ band to the upper ground floor canted bay window and moulded brackets to the eaves. The houses are two windows wide with vertical sliding timber sash windows that are set within plain brick reveals with gauged brickwork heads, the tripartite windows to the second floor having rusticated keystones. The front entrance doors are to a traditional four panelled Victorian design with transom light above set within a pilaster surround. The front lightwells are enclosed with ornate spear tipped cast iron railings the bars of which are set into a stone plinth. No. 102 was destroyed by bombing during World War II and was rebuilt in 1957. The post war design disrupts the rhythm of the Victorian terrace drawing undue attention in the street scene (see Recent Architecture section). Over the years many of the houses have been painted or have had stucco applied changing the appearance of the terrace. A few houses have, however, been left in near original condition with their original brick finish. There have also been some recent works to remove paint on some of the houses restoring their façades back to their original condition and this has improved their appearance considerably. Mansard roof extensions have been undertaken across the group of various designs and of indifferent quality which has harmed the rhythm of the terrace at roof level. The terrace has also been harmed with new coverings to the entrance steps which in some cases has introduced inappropriate tiling that has detracted from the terraces’ Victorian character.

3.13 The western side of Beaufort Street, nos. 123-147 (odd), in contrast, have larger frontages that are three windows wide at first and second floor levels and have more ornamentation. The houses are also three storeys in height
over a lower ground floors with later mansard roof extensions and constructed from gault brick. The windows comprise vertical sliding timber sashes set within architrave surrounds, those to the second floor with rounded heads and a keystone detail. The elevation is further embellished with canted bay windows that are crowned with bottle balustrades, a detail which is also found on the bracketed canopies above the front entrances. The doors themselves are paired with their neighbours and are of the traditional four-panelled type with transom light above that are set within pilaster surrounds. The front boundaries are also more ornate and enclose small gardens with cast iron railings with standards that are separated at the party wall line and at the entrance path with stucco piers with moulded capping stones. Cast iron work is also present on many of the upper ground floor canted bay windows in the form of attractive pot guards that also add visual interest to the elevation. The roof extensions differ slightly in design between properties but all have three dormer windows with flat roofs. Harm has been caused to the group with the painting of gault brickwork to some of the houses disrupting the rhythm and unity of the terrace. Modern replacement coverings to front entrance steps have also harmed the unity of the terrace and are at odds with the Victorian character of the street.

Elm Park Road: between Beaufort Street and Old Church Street

3.14 A marked change in the type of buildings occurs in Elm Park Road after the junction with Beaufort Street. Two tall, moderately grand and ornate Victorian terraces, nos. 26-48 (even) and nos. 52-68 (even) Beaufort Street and no. 26 The Vale were built in the 1870s and dominate the location. Although they repeat the visual rhythm established in the earlier developments from Park Walk to Beaufort Street, the height of the buildings and their unbroken lengths are altogether more imposing and ostentatious and
the atmosphere they create is very much more urban. The terraced group comprising nos. 26-48 (even) were originally three storeys in height with lower ground floor and attic storey as can be seen at no. 34 which has remained in an unaltered condition. The other terraced houses within the group have had either an additional full storey in brick or a mansard roof extension or a combination of the two. This has resulted in nos. 38-48 (even) having a rather top heavy appearance in comparison to nos. 28-36 (even) which have largely respected the original dentilled cornice line albeit with some incorporating a low parapet. The houses are constructed from gault brick laid in Flemish bond with decorative lattice string courses and spandrel panels to the round arches of the first floor windows. The fenestration comprises vertical sliding timber sash windows which diminish in height as they raise through the building. The first floor has a tripartite window separated into three parts by brick piers with the central arch finished in gauged brick with keystone. The elevation is further embellished with canted bay windows to the lower and upper ground floor windows. Originally the brick facades would have been left unpainted, however, only three, nos. 30-34 (even), remain in their natural state and provide a reference as to how the terrace would originally have looked. The front entrances are accessed via paired porticos with Tuscan columns. The front doors themselves are of traditional four panelled construction that are set within a screen with side and transom lights. The front lightwells are enclosed with spear tipped railings, the bars of which are set into a stone plinth. The terrace has been harmed by roof extensions of indifferent quality, the painting of the brickwork and the introduction of modern tiled finishes to some of the entrance steps.

3.15 The terrace comprising nos. 52-68 (even) are very similar in design to nos. 26-48 (even) but have some distinct design differences and are slightly more imposing with an additional brick storey. The houses are also two windows wide but rather than having tripartite windows to the first floor they have French doors that open onto a balcony enclosed with ornate cast iron railings that stretch across the full width of the terrace. The roofline is more consistent being finished with a brick parapet behind which sits mansard roof extensions the most imposing of which is at no. 52 which has an additional flat roof addition that rises up above anything else within the terrace detracting from its architectural composition. The terrace also suffers from some unsympathetic alterations including the painting of the brick facades of individual properties harming the consistent rhythm of the terrace.
Near the eastern end of Elm Park Road is a collection of individual red brick and one stucco fronted properties, nos. 70-78 (even) that were built in the 1880s. Nos. 74-78 were originally built as artists’ studios and are discussed in the Artists’ Studios section. No. 70 is a three storey property over a lower ground floor and has a mansard roof addition. The building is stucco fronted and painted with a distinctive over-sailing dentilled eaves course, bay window and mullion and transomed windows with leaded glazing. The front boundary is different to the others on the south side of the street comprising a bottle balustrade set between masonry piers and cast iron railings to the front entrance steps. The adjacent building at no. 72 is three storeys in height with lower ground floor and attic storey with Dutch gable and flat roofed dormer window. The house is constructed from red brick laid in Flemish bond and has white stucco decoration to the entrance portico, ball finials to the bay window of the upper ground floor and a band to the eaves and a red clay tiled roof. The windows have vertical sliding sash windows with glazing bars which are set within plain brick reveals with gauged brickwork heads. The front boundary is more characteristic with the southern side of the street with decorative iron railings, the bars of which are set into a stone plinth.

Further east and directly adjacent to the artists’ studios are an attractive row of five houses that were built in the 1920s. These modest houses are two storeys in height with attics that are lit by eaves level dormers. Nos. 82-88 (even) appear as two pairs of semi-detached houses that are linked within recessed gaps in the façade. The houses are built from
red brick laid in Flemish bond and have hipped red tiled roofs. The windows have a more cottage style that comprise timber side hung casements with leaded lights. The elevation is enlivened with canted bay windows and a dentilled string course above the first floor windows. Unfortunately, the front boundaries have been removed to allow for off street parking creating unsightly gaps within the street frontage.

3.18 Across the road are two late nineteenth century individual houses that help to fill the gap between Elm Park Gardens and Old Church Street. No.23 is three storeys in height with attic and has some Tudor motifs in its well-modelled London stock brick and part stucco façade. The windows are side hung casements that are split centrally with mullions and are set within painted stone surrounds. No. 25 is a much smaller property that is two storeys in height and finished in painted stucco. The elevation fronting the street has a large window at street level that is split into smaller panes with glazing bars. The window directly above is narrower with a cambered head and a pair of louvered external shutters. The elevation is embellished with cornices to the roof parapet and above the ground floor window. The gardens to the houses are enclosed with London stock brick walls that are broken only by small pedestrian and vehicular access gates.

3.19 The variety in architecture at the east end of the Elm Park Road has great charm and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
Carlyle Square

3.20 Whatever the original plans for Oakley/Carlyle Square, the variety of dwellings actually constructed provides an instructive view of changing architectural and social patterns through the middle years of the nineteenth century.

3.21 If Thompson's 1836 map has been interpreted correctly, the first element to be laid out was the garden square itself. In recent years the garden frontage to King's Road has been reorganised to connect the two sides of the square independently of King's Road and extend that part of the garden on the King's Road frontage. This has been achieved successfully and it is difficult to believe that this was not the original design. The gardens and their King's Road frontage are further enhanced by the reinstatement of cast iron railings. The contrast between the busy thoroughfare and the character of the Square only yards away is dramatic and effective.

3.22 The finest of the Carlyle Square properties, also the earliest and the most prominent are the terraces closest to King's Road, nos. 1-3 (consec) and 40-42 (consec) that sit opposite each other at the southern end of the square. Each group of three four-storied houses have a balanced composition that achieve their grandeur from their scale and from the elegant, almost Adamesque enrichment of the central houses that include grand double height fluted ionic pilasters to the first and second floors. The houses are constructed from London stock brick laid in Flemish bond and have banded stucco to the upper ground floor. The fenestration comprises vertical sliding sash windows with glazing bars that are set within plain brick reveals with gauged brickwork heads. The first floor has French casements that open onto narrow balconies that are enclosed with ornate cast iron railings. The front entrance doors vary but are traditional in their designs with fanlights above. The original design is likely to be of the two vertical panelled type as can be seen at nos. 2 and 3 on the eastern side of the square. The front lightwells are enclosed with spear tipped cast iron railings the bars of which are set into a stone plinth.

3.23 Immediately north of nos. 40-42 (consec) can be found the next houses to be built in the square: the immediate contrast is obvious. Any idea of terraced housing has been rejected in favour of individual villas containing two semi-detached properties (nos. 38 and 39, nos. 36 and 37) that were built in the 1860s. The houses are three storeys in height above a lower ground floor and are constructed from gault brick laid in Flemish bond with banded stucco
and rustication work to the upper ground floor. The roofs are hipped and have a covering of natural slates with overhanging eaves. These blocks, though of similar bulk, have varied elevations with differently handled fenestration and stucco decoration applied across the whole façade rather than concentrated for special contrasting effects as with the earlier properties. They have frontage walls with piers and balustrades, another direct contrast with the earlier terraces. The gaps between these villas are a fundamental feature of the square as it continued to develop.

3.24 The properties that can be found on the north side of the square were built at a similar time to nos. 37-39 (consec) though with greater variety and architectural quality. There is generally more room between properties, but with the consistency of piers and balustrades at the front a surprisingly coherent and attractive frontage is made of these villas and pairs. The houses range in height between two and two to three storeys over a lower ground floor. They are also constructed from gault brick with stucco decoration applied in the form of window surrounds, quoins and banded stucco work. Particularly noteworthy are nos. 21 and 22 with their generous and enriched eaves. The porch to no. 21 which is a beautiful and restrained example of Victorian stuccowork, the complexities of hollow chamfer and rustication being elegantly handled. Nos. 23 and 24 make an interesting pair: no. 23 exhibits a rather Gothic glazing pattern at variance with its neighbours but apparently of some antiquity. No. 24 has a doorcase and fanlight which is of a clean elegance again invoking the Adam brothers. No. 26 is strikingly unlike other houses in the square, particularly in the bow-fronted
3.25 With three exceptions the remaining houses, nos. 4-17 (consec) and nos. 29-34 (consec), are semi-detached pairs of villas with consistent detailing that were also built in the 1860s. The houses are constructed from gault brickwork laid in Flemish bond with stucco decoration and oversailing hipped roofs with bracketed eaves. Notably the elevation has paired entrance porticos and paired first floor windows above ground-floor canted bays. The vertical sliding timber sash windows are set within decorative stucco surrounds with moulded architrave and corniced heads. Railings again form the front boundaries in an attractive and appropriate manner. The consistent roof line of hipped slate roofs is an important feature and the addition of a mansard roof to one of the houses has caused significant harm to the roofscape.

3.26 One exception can be seen at no. 35. This single house is double fronted and is to the same plot size as the adjacent semi-detached villas. Its pedimented eaves rise slightly above its neighbours giving the dwelling a slightly grander appearance, but it still retains a quiet presence within the street. This house is also three storeys in height over a lower ground floor and is constructed from gault brick with painted stucco to the lower and upper ground floors. The windows comprise vertical sliding timber sashs that are of the tripartite type to the first and second floors above the canted bay windows and are set within architrave surrounds, those to the first floor having greater emphasis with
segmental and triangular pediments. The front entrance is of the four-panelled type that is set into a timber screen with side and transom lights with access provided via a columned portico. The front lightwell is enclosed with spear tipped iron railings set between masonry piers, those to the entrance supporting an iron arch with lantern light.

3.27 Another exception occurs at no. 18 where a semi-detached villa has been turned into a terrace of three by an individually-designed house which is reminiscent of no. 35.

3.28 The major exception, however, is at nos. 27 and 28 opposite which comprise a pair of four-storey Italianate houses imported from the mid-Victorian squares to the north. These are the only buildings in the square to match the scale and seriousness of the listed terraces. The houses are four storeys in height over a lower ground floor and are constructed from gault brick with banded stucco to the upper ground floor. The houses are two windows wide with vertical sliding timber sash windows that are set within architrave surrounds, those to the first floor with console bracketed hoods. The building is terminated with a hipped roof with pedimented and bracketed eaves. The front doors comprise traditional four-panelled doors with transom light above that are accessed via large columned porticos that are surmounted with a bottle balustrade that extends across the façade above the canted bay windows. The front lightwells are enclosed with spear tipped railings the bars of which are set into a stone plinth.
Old Church Street: north end

3.29 The spacious character of the northern end of Old Church Street is established more than anything else by the substantial houses to be found on either side. In this respect the ‘Modern Movement’ houses (nos. 66 and 68) by Mendelssohn and Chermayeff and Gropius and Fry respectively, do not disrupt but instead underline this distinctive character. From its earliest days, what is now Old Church Street contrasted large individual houses and terraces and this remains the case even now when the buildings are drawn from the oldest and from the most uncompromising non-traditional in the conservation area.

3.30 The relationship of the larger houses to their street frontages is of great importance in townscape terms and it is significant that the front wall to the listed Sloane House (no. 149) is listed in its own right. The visual contribution made by this grand and elegant late eighteenth century residence, as substantially extended in the early part of the twentieth century, is reinforced by its tall front boundary with its rusticated brick piers. This attractive late eighteenth century house is three storeys in height over a lower ground floor and is constructed from London stock brick laid in Flemish bond. The original facade of the houses is five windows wide with vertical sliding six-over-six and three-over-three vertical sliding timber sash windows that are set within plain brick surrounds with gauged brick heads. The exception is the central window directly above the main entrance which has an architrave surround with console bracketed hood. The main entrance door is of the six-panelled type with decorative fanlight above set within a plain brick reveal with rounded gauged brickwork head. The building is finished with a parapet and cornice behind which sits a pitched roof covered in slate.

3.31 Immediately to the north is Sloane Lodge a two storey house with a white painted stucco
finish which has a balanced composition with central projecting bay with portico and pineapple finials to the parapet. The building contrasts strongly with the imposing character of Sloane House which is constructed from London stock brick. The front wall, is an exact continuation of the one that encloses Sloane House although it was built in more recent times. This lodge was largely rebuilt in 2016 following building works to Sloane House.

3.32 Further north again are nos. 153 and 155, which are much altered early nineteenth century houses. The buildings have stucco fronted elevations and altered fenestration but have some attractive features, such as the ‘thermal' window and pagoda porch to the side of no. 155 and a bottle balustrade to the parapets. Despite later alterations the period character of the houses still remains and they make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

3.33 Occupying a significant plot to the south side of Sloane House is Chelsea Arts Club (no. 143). The core of the club buildings can be found on Thompson’s map of 1836 as a group of small properties. The elevation is now finished in stucco and painted white. Interest is added to the two storey elevation with stucco decoration in the form architrave surrounds to the windows and a moulded cornice to the roof parapet. Additions and rationalisations have been accomplished at the rear over the intervening years but without significant alteration to the low and rambling nature of the façade which contributes positively to the architectural variety of Old Church Street.

3.34 Completing this varied group of older properties is the terrace, nos. 125-141 (odd). Thompson refers to this terrace as Bolton Place, a name kept alive at Bolton House, no. 141. Any symmetry or consistency has long since disappeared, the terrace exhibiting a wide range of front doors, fenestration and glazing patterns with varied levels of ornamentation in cornices, window surrounds and fanlights.
Front boundaries vary as well, most front gardens have now been given over to parking, sometimes with communal access which have detracted from the terrace’s setting, losing the boundary treatment and creating a large bland hard standing forecourt. No. 125’s boundary is in strong contrast to the iron railings of the other houses within the group with its bottle balustrade set between masonry piers with capping stones. This property has had an interesting history as it comprises two former terraced houses that were modified in the early part of the twentieth century to create an artists’ studio (see Artists’ Studio section).

3.35 At the other end of the terrace, no. 141a may date from around 1890 as it appears on the Ordnance Survey map of this date but was later modified in the 1920s/30s with additional storeys and a modern movement flavour with its large, prominent metal windows when it became an artists’ studio. The houses, despite the many different alterations over the years still retain their period character and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

3.36 The 1930s white stucco detached houses directly opposite at, nos. 64 (grade II* listed) by Mendelssohn and Chermayeff and nos. 66 and 68 (grade II listed) by Walter Gropius and E Maxwell Fry, were designed in the International Modern idiom and are significant and attractive additions in this distinctive location despite some later alterations and additions. Together they occupy a long frontage which in itself and in terms of its interrelationships with the houses, has been considered in careful design terms. In this way they are worthy and equal companions for the attractive late eighteenth century properties which at first sight appear to be so fundamentally different.

3.37 Directly to the north of these houses are two 1950s terraces at nos. 80-92 (even) and nos. 94-108 (even) respectively which have similarities in their design but with slightly
different architectural detailing. The more southerly block rises to two-and-a-half storeys and is set behind small front gardens that are enclosed with low frontage walls that are surmounted with timber posts linked together with chains. The houses are constructed from a red/brown brick that is laid in stretcher bond finished at parapet level with a simple coping. The hipped roof is finished in clay roof tiles and is punctuated with a series of flat roofed dormer windows that light the attic spaces. The façade has a balanced composition that is embellished with projecting semi-circular bays which provide a strong rhythm which helps to enliven the street frontage. The windows comprise vertical sliding glazing bar sashes and side hung casements, those to the first floor set within dark brown brick reveals. The front entrances comprise two panelled doors with side windows and a transom light above that is set within pilaster surrounds with a door hood.

3.38 In contrast, nos. 94-108 (even) are lower and set further back from the street frontage behind a communal garden with mature shrub planting. The terrace also has a balanced composition with the two end houses and two central houses stepping forward from the façade and being finished with hipped roofs, the central pair having a taller roof with attic rooms lit by flat roofed dormer windows. The façade has less embellishment than nos. 80-92 (even) with the elevation being broken up with vertical sliding glazing bar sash windows. Greater emphasis is given to the two end houses with tripartite sash windows to help emphasise the balanced comparison of the terrace. The front boundary is very similar to nos. 80-92 and provides some continuity between the 1950s developments in this varied but attractive part of Old Church Street whilst also helping to reinforce its residential character against the bustle of Fulham Road.
Queen’s Elm Square and no. 157 Old Church Street

3.39 Queen’s Elm Square is a charming development constructed in 1904, on the site of a jumble of frontage properties and rear yards tucked into the acute angle behind The Queen’s Elm public house. Most of the available open space is found in the neatly-cared-for gardens and an access road at the front, behind which rise two-and-a-half storeys of Tudor-style buildings with strong gables and inventive balconies. The houses are constructed from a combination of red brick, mock Tudor timber work with rendered panels and a clay tiled roof with gables. Gate piers and a screen wall and hedge continue the theme of the other substantial properties to the south, while the frontage is given additional visual weight by the insertion of a corner turret to catch the eye from Fulham Road. Consistent management has ensured the survival of Queen’s Elm Square virtually unaltered with an intact roofline and in good decorative condition. The development makes a significant contribution to the character of the area adding to the architectural variety at the north end of Old Church Street.

3.40 No. 157 Old Church Street is situated directly between Queen’s Elm Square and the former The Queen’s Elm public house. This early nineteenth century development comprises a block of flats that is built from London stock brick with red brick dressings. A double height mansard roof covered in red clay tiles rises up behind a recessed panelled brick parapet. The building is five windows wide with vertical sliding glazing bar sash windows set within red brick reveals with gauged brick heads. The building has an interesting entrance which has survived intact comprising a six-panelled door with fanlight above and side panels with individual cast iron letter boxes, one for each
of the flats set within a pilaster surround with dentilled cornice. Unfortunately, uPVC windows have replaced the original timber sashes to the detriment of the elevation.

3.41 It could be said that two sorts of townscape typify Chelsea: firstly, the surviving streets around Chelsea Old Church which helped establish the area’s popularity with the artistic fraternity during the last century, and secondly those developments in the first half of the twentieth century which capitalised on that popularity. Of the second type, Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area has two superb examples: Chelsea Park Gardens and, slightly earlier, the streets laid out by The Vale Estates Limited as the The Vale, Mallord Street and Mulberry Walk.

3.42 Both areas owe much of their character, delight and charm to a skilful balance between standardisation and individuality, between plain surfaces and carefully considered ornament, between pragmatic building and inventive detailing. If Chelsea Park Gardens achieves a higher level of success as a unity, the earlier area is surely more interesting because of the greater variety arising out of its social aspirations.

3.43 Consistency comes from the employment by the company of a limited number of architects...
who were then content to use a restricted palette of facing materials. The general effect is of ‘Queen Anne’ style houses, showing the design influence of Webb and Norman Shaw, in heather grey bricks with red brick dressings. The choice of Queen Anne rather than Georgian styling allows casement windows as well as sashes, pitched roofs as well as parapets, and generous amounts of wooden detailing in dormers, eaves, bays and doorcases, usually utilised to enhance the homely, well-healed domesticity of the street frontages. Variety and delight are better achieved by the confident handling of built form than with a multiplicity of facing materials.

3.44 The Vale was probably completed first: while the Ordnance Survey sheet of 1916 shows about half of eventual ninety or so properties, all but four properties in The Vale were in existence. Interestingly the earliest completed section is unlike the rest of the development: nos. 2-18 (even) between Mallord Street and Mulberry Walk are notable for their terrace frontages combining red brick and stone in tall bay windows. Across the road, however, is perhaps the conservation area’s most interesting single architectural composition, nos. 1-29 (odd), a continuous terrace of substantial houses comprising three individual designs, two pairs and three symmetrical groups of three, to one of which the drawing room of no. 27 provides an unexpected, delightful and unmatched centrepiece. This comprises a jettied two-storey wing that projects towards the street with a brick ground floor with a 4-light, horizontally set, casement window supporting a timber-framed and weather-boarded upper storey with large Venetian window set in the gable end of a tiled roof with upswept eaves. Consistent materials and the full exploitation of a limited range of decorative details weld the composition together. The whole street derives much unity from the attractive mature street trees.

3.45 Mallord Street and Mulberry Walk are narrower and the buildings generally smaller in
scale, yet these two streets have considerably different characters. To some extent this derives from the houses: Mulberry Walk is lined with either single or paired houses making a picturesque whole, while Mallord Street has one or two strikingly individual houses between longer runs of terraced houses, the grade II listed group of four houses nos. 9-15 (odd) with the oriel canted bay windows and dentilled eaves cornice by the architect F.E. Williams being particularly attractive. Augustus John’s house at no. 28 (grade II listed) could be mentioned as well as a rarity (see Artist’s Studios section) as well as a private house by the famous church architect W.D. Caroë at nos. 6 and 8 (grade II listed) which are attractive three storey houses set over a coach house that dates from 1912. Mulberry Walk, is if anything more designed, Mallord Street more accidental. In addition, Mallord Street has the flats and the Telephone Exchange and is noticeably closer to the noise and bustle of King’s Road.

3.46 The houses remain largely in their original condition, however, there have been some alterations which have caused harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Front gardens have generally survived in Mallord Street while in Mulberry Walk front gardens, trees and original paving have been removed and dropped kerbs introduced to enable cars to be parked on forecourts. This has created unsightly gaps within the boundary treatments where the former front garden spaces ‘leak’ onto the pavement. The removal of original pointing to the brickwork and its replacement with cement mortar has introduced heavy weather struck pointing, and the buttering over of brick edges has also had a noticeable harmful impact.
The remainder of Old Church Street

3.47 Still to be considered is the western side of part of Old Church Street and the small part of Elm Park Road redeveloped when The Vale, Mulberry Walk and Mallord Street were laid out. Development here is more along the lines of Mallord Street, extremely distinctive properties being mixed with more repetitive ones, which indeed fit better with the character of Old Church Street as discussed above. The houses on Elm Park Road and at nos. 103-105 (odd), 115, 119-123 (odd) and no. 123a Old Church Street could be said to be in the latter category: attractive buildings contributing to the special character and appearance of the area without being overly distinguished. **No. 1 Mallord Street** introduces strong shapes in its large and prominent studio window and an inventive parapet skyline. **No. 117 Old Church Street** (listed grade II) by Halsey Ricardo combines dark bricks and de Morgan tiles in a powerful composition with giant pilasters and unequal gables.

3.48 The finest group, and arguably the most fascinating composition in the conservation area, lies between Mulberry Walk and Mallord Street and consists of a picturesque partnership between three very different buildings. **Nos. 113 and 113a with no. 22 Mulberry Walk** advertise the artistic quarter (see *Artists’ Studio* section). Two floors of two-storey studio windows turn the corner and are prevented from colliding with Mulberry Walk façade of four traditionally-scaled floors by a tall brick panel unbroken above the basement except for a small Venetian window. A strong cornice completes this confident composition. On the far corner stands Mallord House **nos. 2-4 (even) Mallord Street** by Ralph Knott, the architect of London’s County Hall for the artist Cecil Hunt. This is another large building but of reticent severity: individual leaded casements are fitted flush into the
minimal brick surrounds while the central bay of the Mallord Street elevation scarcely breaks forward. Ornamentation is restricted to the entrance, to the hunting scene on a large lead hopper head and to a circular window high in the gable which, with the big central chimney stack, produces a powerful skyline. In between, nos. 107-111 (odd), a three bay composition of more modest proportions, would be crushed between these architectural bookends if it were not for the strong horizontal line provided by a continuous first floor balcony, the pediment over the central bay and, soaring out of the roof, four astonishing chimneys which provide the focus for this remarkable and picturesque group which is made all the more distinctive with its projecting swan sculptures at second floor level.
Chelsea Park Gardens

3.49 Chelsea Park Gardens has an atmosphere found nowhere else in the conservation area. It relies very much on the diversely styled ‘Norman Shaw’ influenced dwellings, the large number of trees and greenery and the gardens with informal boundaries. Together these factors contrive to produce a garden suburb character. The contrast with the urban landscape of Beaufort Street could not be more pronounced. As far as records show, Chelsea Park Gardens was designed by the architects Elms and Jupp who had been involved with development in The Vale. Building probably occurred between 1914 and 1923. Dwellings tend to be in the arts and crafts style in a variety of traditional themes and stylings. Diversity also exists in plan forms but there is a degree of formality in the way the houses have been laid out. In design the buildings tend to be two-and-a-half storeys high, the upper storey often contained within the roofline. The brick used is a dark heather colour and the buildings display similar colour contrasts as those of Mulberry Walk and The Vale.

3.50 Essentially the development can be divided into a number of sections. Nos. 4-30 (even) were built between 1915 and 1930 and have a particular characteristic in contrast with the remainder of the Chelsea Park Gardens: bay windows reach to the top of the second floor which when repeated throughout the properties establishes a strong visual rhythm and sense of formality. The distinctive roof forms help distinguish the semi-detached pairs from each other utilising either dormer windows and pitched or Dutch gables. The common hedged open green in front of nos. 4-30 contributes to the particular atmosphere of this area. The garden wall that fronts onto the pavement of Beaufort Street that encloses the communal garden area has red brick gate piers with rustication that celebrate the entrances to the access road and give the development a more
exclusive and private appearance. **Nos. 32-94** (even) are unique to the conservation area in that the method of enclosure is very different from the classic garden and railing formation found elsewhere. Instead, a layered effect has been given by houses standing back from the road behind a small common garden enclosed by a dwarf front wall. Entry is achieved by passing through gates decorated on either side by delightful ball finials. Once through the gate one finds oneself facing informal cottage gardens. The picturesqueness resulting from the sheer diversity of trees, plants and shrubs is striking and remarkable for such a compact space.

3.51 The greatest contrasts are shown by **no. 9-39** (odd), grouped around a formal communal garden. The north terrace contains the plainest fronts in the whole development while the individual houses at **nos. 11 and 27** are special for the opposite reason. The southern terrace perhaps contains more variety than the others and is most akin, albeit in a more simplified way, to the earlier developments in The Vale, Mallord Street and Mulberry Walk in this respect.

3.52 Chelsea Park Gardens has been fortunate in that the overall character of properties has generally been respected over the intervening years, however, there have been some undesirable alterations. Fenestration changes are especially destructive when the small-pane windows with their characteristically defracted light pattern have been lost. Head-on forecourt parking in gardens is another unfortunate development. The imposition of large blank picture windows, garages and modern front doors in some of the dwellings has robbed properties of their special “arts and crafts” characteristics. Harm has also been caused by the repointing of properties with cement mortar. In many cases this has buttered over the corners of bricks and the undulating tiled string courses resulting in the bricks losing their definition and greater emphasis being given to the joint creating an untidy and less attractive
appearance. Another form of pointing that has been introduced and is equally as harmful is the use of heavy weather struck joints. This creates a hard straight edge to the bricks and creates shadow lines resulting in the façade appearing darker and as a consequence detracts from the vibrancy of the brick.

**Chelsea Park Dwellings**

3.53 Behind the Porticos (nos. 374-384 (even) ) on King’s Road lies Chelsea Park Dwellings a quiet and beautifully maintained residential enclave that was built in 1885 and is accessed via a covered carriage from King’s Road. The block to the north is three storeys in height with each of the six bays finished with a gable, the ones set in from each end clad in clay tiles. The elevation is finished in painted stucco and at each floor level there is a balcony that stretches across the façade which is enclosed with simple iron railings. The windows comprise vertical sliding timber sash windows set within stucco reveals with ashlar decoration. The front entrance doors are of timber construction with the top half glazed and set within Gothic arched reveals. Enclosing the eastern and western sides of the attractive paved courtyard are two two-storeyed red brick dwellings. These attractive houses contrast strongly with the stuccoed elevations of the houses on the north side. The dwellings have pitched roofs with
decorative gables above the first floor windows. The windows themselves are also vertical sliding sashes and are set within plain brick reveals with cambered arched heads. The central entrance door is of the vertically boarded type and is set within an ornate brick decorative arch. The contrast of this development with King's Road is striking.

**Chelsea Square**

3.54 The redevelopment of Trafalgar Square as Chelsea Square began in the late 1930s as the original leases came up for renewal. The architect was Darcy Braddell who cloaked a wide variety of plan forms within restrained elevations of purple brown brick with red brick dressings and hipped roofs in green pantiles. Some external elevations are relatively plain, nos. 19-21 (consec) are typical of a common type in contrast to the strong three-dimensional qualities of the south façade to nos. 28-33 (consec), possibly the most attractive of all the redevelopment work in the square. Throughout there is attention to detail, particularly around entrances, and varied provision for the motor car in courtyards and rear yards. Nos. 12-17 (consec) have attractive bow windows fronting the street and their entrances discreetly located within the covered carriage ways which are accessed via large decorative rounded arches constructed from moulded brickwork with alternating brick spandrel panels supported on corbelled lintels.

3.55 The houses look most impressive in three-quarter views of their frontages; views across the square show their relative failure to enclose the large area of the garden, while their rear elevations show roof alterations and tank
housings which the plainness of detailing cannot hide or mitigate.

3.56 At the south-west corner stand two remarkable houses by Oliver Hill. Both are listed, no. 40 as grade II* because of the certainty of an intact interior. No.39 if anything looks the more fascinating because of the possibilities of its cruciform upper storey. The two are linked by original screen walls which now flank a modern garage block with an attractively lively mansard upper storey. The properties contrast strongly with the purple brown brickwork of the other houses within the square being rendered and painted white and have spacious garden settings.

3.57 At the north end of the square a two-storey mews terrace, yet another variation on the garaging theme, looks through important mature trees to the Hall of Residence (see Other Significant Buildings section) of Brompton Hospital. This powerful Victorian building is flanked to the west by the former fire station of 1892, an imposing monument to civic pride in brick and terracotta with a vertiginous central gable backed by a cupola (see Other Significant Buildings section). The adjacent Trafalgar Chambers matches its bulk in long views from Chelsea Square, but is plainer in appearance being constructed from a red brick. The elevation is embellished with a dentilled cornice to the parapet and has bracketed balconies enclosed with simple iron railings at all floor levels. The building, although plain in design still has attractive qualities and does not compete with the more ornate detailing of surrounding buildings.
Manresa Road

3.58 As with the north side of Chelsea Square, the south is bounded by tall institutional buildings in which the former college building makes most impact with its bold stone detailing in substantial brick facades (see Other Significant Buildings section). The former public library directly to the south also adds its own element of civic grandeur and is now used as a private school (see Other Significant Buildings section).

3.59 Facing the former college buildings are nos. 1-6 (consec), a neat terrace built in the 1960s which though well-proportioned lacks the scale and presence of earlier developments, such as nos. 80-92 (even) Old Church Street. The houses are two storeys in height with mansard roofs containing living accommodation. They are built from a multi red brick laid in stretcher bond that is enlivened on the ground floor with a canted bay with copper roofs. The houses are two windows wide with vertical sliding glazing bar sash windows those above the bays of the tripartite type. The small front gardens are enclosed with a traditional frontage of timber posts and chains on a low brick wall. An effective feature of this terrace is the inclusion of a larger house at no. 6 which has little impact to the rhythm of the design.
Dovehouse Street

3.60 This street effectively marks the eastern edges of the large area of interlocking residential streets, the majority of which are in Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area. To the east, hospital buildings and St. Luke’s Church and churchyard intervene before the residential pattern characteristic of Chelsea is resumed. The particular combination of housing and institutional buildings gives a distinctive appearance to the street although without Manressa Road’s more collegiate flavour (possibly bestowed by the proximity of Chelsea Square) or the greater intimacy achieved where houses line both sides of the road, as in Astell Street, for example. The Chelsea Hospital for Women which was built just before the First World War has presence and scale with its prominently projecting pedimented entrance bay (see Other Significant Buildings section).

3.61 The nurses’ home directly to the south was designed by Young and Hall and built in the 1920s and in contrast has a plainer appearance. It is three storeys in height with attic rooms lit by flat roofed dormer windows set into a hipped red tiled roof. The building is domestic in character and much more modest in style and size than the hospital with a more conventional Georgian style which has a balanced composition of nine bays. The building is constructed from red brick laid in Flemish bond and has vertical sliding glazing bar sash windows set within plain brick reveals with gauged brickwork heads, those to the ground floor with keystones and tiled heads to the floors above. The main entrance door is centrally placed with a two leafed panelled doors with transom light above set within a decorative stone architrave surround with corbel bracketed head that supports a small balcony above. Additional visual interest has been provided with a stone eaves cornice, brick quoinns to the corners and banded brickwork to the ground floor. The building is finished with an attractive run of iron railings along the first floor. The building is set back from the street frontage.
behind an undulating red brick wall with iron railings.

3.62 Dovehouse Street lacks attractive terminating features at either end. In this context the architectural variety in roofline and facing materials of nos. 53-109 (odd) (designed by Austin Blomfield) is a welcome addition along with the mature planting to their front gardens. The centrepiece is a three-storey pedimented gable mimicking the hospital entrance opposite, set in a two-and-a-half-storey terrace roofed in warm red tiles. Two unassuming linking blocks join up contrasting end sections. To the north flat-topped mansards with prominent party walls frame a terrace where the upper floor is clad in the same green slate as the roof. Proportions are happier at the southern end where green slate forms rear mansards which with segmentally-headed first floor windows and dormer helps create a rather French flavour. The whole terrace is flanked by garages under large mansards containing studios, another traditional Chelsea feature which adds character and interest while extending the range of accommodation available.

3.63 Nos. 27-51 (odd) south of this main terrace incorporate green slate which is used less obviously on pitched and parapeted houses. They are grouped around a courtyard and sharing a sunken garage court with the houses on Manresa Road. These houses formed part of the same development that was built in the 1960s and they share the same architectural detailing to their elevations.

3.64 Two more short terraces complete this block to the north. Nos. 113-117 (odd) is a short terrace of three small double fronted houses. These modest two storey houses are attractively detailed with red brick with contrasting grey brick window reveals with yellow gauged brickwork heads to the two outer houses. Greater emphasis has been given to the central houses which have stone finishes and a broken pedimented entrance. The block of flats at nos. 119-131 (odd) by contrast are plainer,
being constructed from a buff brick with little embellishment except for some yellow tiling to the heads of the ground floor windows and the surround to the window above the entrance, and a stone band above the first floor windows. The bulk of the building is broken up with the central portion of the building stepping forward and made more pronounced with flanking terraces to the second floor flats.

3.65 Nos. 147-153 (odd) Dovehouse Street can be seen on Thompson’s map and is reminiscent of the terraces on Park Walk. This attractive group happily survive in very good order although their surroundings have altered out of all recognition. The Crown public house on the corner has a long association with the sale of ales and spirits although for most of its life - and at least since 1869 - it has been a “beer shop”, only becoming a public house after the war. On the other corner the Princess of Wales public house has been in existence since at least 1852 but the present building is of inter-war date and sits oddly, although effectively, between two older gables and has now been converted to a restaurant. The three Georgian terraced houses, now one address no. 149 Dovehouse Street, are three storeys in height over a lower ground floor and finished with a mansard roof addition. The buildings are constructed from London stock brick laid in Flemish bond and are finished with a simple brick parapet with stone coping. The houses are two windows wide with vertical sliding six-over-six sashes set within plain brick reveals with gauged brickwork heads. The front entrances have traditional six-panelled entrance doors with transom lights above set within pilaster surrounds. The front railings that enclose the lightwells are to a simple design with spear tips and urn finials to the standards. This small group of buildings brings welcome colour and variety of built form to the conservation area at a point where institutional uses start to dominate the street scene.
Shared Features of Housing

Windows and Doors

3.66 The architectural treatment of front windows and doors are key features of all houses in the conservation area. Existing styles of doors in the area, by and large, manage to reflect the architectural style in which they are set.

3.67 Door design is varied and quite often differs from house to house. These range from the fairly standard Georgian six-panelled and Victorian four-panelled style doors. Examples include the late Georgian houses at nos. 15-29 (odd) Park Walk and the Victorian houses at nos. 4-13 (consec) Carlyle Square. The houses that were built in the early part of the twentieth century and those in the 1950s and 60s stuck to these formats and also introduced slight variations to panel positions introducing rounded heads and half glazed doors etc. In each case the door panels are heavily moulded and typical of their period adding variety and character to the conservation area.

3.68 The doors are either positioned within decorative surrounds, plain brickwork reveals, rusticated stucco reveals or porticos, many with transom lights above or glazed side panels. Doors to the lower ground floors, where they exist, in the front lightwells tend to be less formal and plainer being of the four panelled type without mouldings.

3.69 Windows, and in particular the pattern of their glazing bars, make a significant contribution to the appearance of the elevations of an individual building, and can enhance or destroy...
the unity of a terrace or semi-detached pair of houses. The conservation area reveals a wide variety of window styles, but it is important that a single pattern of glazing bars should be retained within any uniform architectural composition.

3.70 As a general rule, in the Georgian and early-mid Victorian terraces, each half of the sash was usually wider than it was high but its division into six or more panes emphasised the window’s vertical proportions. Such glazing patterns are found in many of the terraces including those that were built in the twentieth century, for example nos. 147-151 (odd) Dovehouse Street, nos. 4-26 (consec) Chelsea Square and nos. 3-25 (odd) The Vale. The mid-late Victorian houses, for example at nos. 26-48 (even) Elm Park Road and nos. 27-34 (consec) Carlyle Square, had a much simpler glazing pattern, with one pane of glass to each sash or a two-over-two configuration, sometimes with margin lights, such as those found at nos. 6-24 (even) Elm Park Road.

3.71 The larger classically designed houses have windows that reduce in size and have simpler surrounds as they rise through the building with the most decorative windows being on the principal floor levels. Some terraces and houses, such as nos. 52-68 (even) Elm Park Road and nos. 1-3 (consec) and nos. 40-42 (consec) Carlyle Square have French windows with balconies at first floor level.

3.72 Other common windows found within the area are side hung casements with glazing
bars which can be seen at nos. 63-103 (odd) **Dovehouse Street**. Many of the windows in Mallord Street, Mulberry Walk and Chelsea Park Gardens also have side hung casements of either timber or metal with leaded lights of which nos. 9-15 (odd) **Mallord Street** are particularly attractive.

3.73 The windows, like the front entrance doors, are quite often set within decorative surrounds and range from simple stuccoed architraves, such as those found at nos. 2-24 (even) and nos. 5-19 (odd) **Elm Park Road** to more ornate examples which incorporate pediments and bracketed cornices, such as those found in Carlyle Square. The most common window reveals are of brick which are quite often enhanced with contrasting bricks and gauged brickwork heads. Good examples of these can be seen throughout the conservation area with those to nos. 1-29 (odd) **The Vale** being particularly good examples.

3.74 Steps up to the front doors are a strong characteristic of most of the conservation area but have often been altered over time. Each group of houses or terrace would have used the same material for the steps: large stone slabs or small tiles, but not the newer finishes, such as marble or square ceramic tiles of modern dimensions seen in many places today.
Side hung metal casements with leaded lights, Chelsea Pk Gdns

Bespoke metal windows, Mallord Street

French doors, Carlyle Square

Original Portland stone steps, Elm Park Road

Geometric tiles to steps and pathway, Carlyle Square

Red herringbone tiling, The Vale
3.75 The front elevations of houses in the conservation area were designed to be the most formal and decorative. Side elevations were usually constructed with less ornamentation and used cheaper construction materials, such as stock brick. This practice often continues on the rear elevations where ornamentation was unnecessary to the more secluded parts of the buildings. This is true in most parts of the borough and is also the case on some late Georgian and Victorian terraced houses found within the Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area. The vast majority of rear elevations, however, have been treated differently and have a more formal appearance using good quality facing bricks with contrasting brick/stucco decoration and a more uniform and balanced fenestration. Greater emphasis has been put on the gardens as an amenity space and as a consequence their setting has been improved by creating more attractive rear elevations that consider the views across gardens onto the rears of houses.

3.76 Rear elevations were designed as a piece with their neighbours and builders employed matching designs and details across the whole terrace or groups of houses.

3.77 The fact that the rears of some of the terrace houses are less decorative does not mean that they do not make a positive contribution to the conservation area. On the contrary they are a key feature of Georgian and Victorian house design and wherever original form or historic uniformity remains, these make a very positive contribution to the architectural and historic character. Many rear elevations are visible from the side streets bringing them clearly into the public realm. All rear views are enjoyed by surrounding neighbours and these factors make them a strong component of the character of the conservation area.

3.78 The rear elevations of the late Georgian and Victorian terraced houses found within the area are relatively simple with yellow
stock brick elevations. Closet wings, where they exist, usually project approximately half way across the rear elevation of each house. These are generally attached to each other as pairs or singularly to each house. This leaves the characteristic void between structures which have now frequently been infilled at lower ground floor level with conservatory type extensions. This relationship of projection and void creates rhythm and uniformity to the rear and is highly characteristic of this type of terraced houses in the conservation area, such as the rears of nos. 15-31 (odd) Park Walk, nos. 6-24 (even) Elm Park Road and nos. 86-122 (even) Beaufort Street.

3.79 The rebuilding of these rear elevation of the houses causes harm to the conservation area. It has seen the loss of original yellow stock brickwork which had settled and weathered to an attractive patina. New construction works appear in stark contrast to neighbouring properties having quite often involved the removal of the half-landings of the stairs within the house to create a level floor plate. This results in the characteristic staggered window pattern being lost, harming the fenestration rhythm at the rear and can be to the detriment of the terrace and conservation area.

3.80 The height of the closet wings is characteristic of each group, with some houses having wings of only one or two storeys, while others extend to the eaves of the main house having been built upon over the years. Typically though closet wings finish at least one storey below the roof parapet or eaves line.

3.81 Where later extensions have infilled the void between closet wings, a solid and flat appearance is created that harms the pleasant
articulation of the rear. Where individual rear elevations have been painted so that they stand out from the others, they harm the regular appearance of the whole group.

3.82 The Victorian detached and semi-detached houses on Carlyle Square are good examples of the more formal rear elevation. The rears of nos. 29-39 (consec) can be seen form Old Church Street and show a balanced fenestration, level floor plates, and decoration in the form of rounded arched windows and stucco architrave surrounds. These can be seen in contrast to the earlier Georgian properties directly to the south at nos. 40-42 (consec) which reflect the plainer and more utilitarian appearance described above. The majority of other houses erected during the early-mid twentieth century also have more formal garden elevations. Good examples of these can be seen in The Vale, Mulberry Walk, Mallord Street, Chelsea Park Gardens and nos. 63-68 (consec) Chelsea Square. The rear elevations are enjoyed from public vantage points, the rear gardens themselves and from the upper stories of overlooking buildings. Ill-conceived rear extensions can seriously harm these more formal rear elevations to the detriment of the conservation area.
3.83 There are a number of original roof forms in the conservation area:

- Hipped roofs
- London/butterfly roofs hidden behind parapets
- Pitched roofs with dormers
- Original/later mansard roofs

3.84 Hipped roofs are some of the commonest roof forms and can be seen throughout the area. Good examples can be found in Carlyle Square on the detached and semi-detached houses. The roof coverings vary in material with the most common being natural slate and clay roof tiles and the distinctive terraced houses in Chelsea Square with their attractive green glazed pantiles.

3.85 Traditional London/butterfly roofs are not common in the conservation area with many having been altered to form mansard roof extensions on the Victorian terraced houses. Where they are present they are formed by two pitched roofs that slope away from each party wall and downwards towards the centre of the house. The roof form is concealed from the front by a parapet, but the distinctive butterfly effect can often be seen to the rear of some of the houses where the roof form undulates against the skyline. A good example of this can be seen to the rear of nos. 15-31 (odd) Park Walk.

3.86 Houses that were originally designed with loft and attic spaces have plain roof slopes that are pitched from a ridge running the length of the terrace or house. As with all roof forms, chimney stacks punctuate the roofs at every party wall or at the end of a terrace or individual house. Good examples can be seen along nos. 5-23 (odd) The Vale and nos. 4-30 (even) Chelsea Park Gardens.

3.87 Good examples of original mansard roofs can be found at nos. 12-17 (consec) Chelsea Square with their attractive green glazed pantiled roof slopes and casement dormer windows and the former college building no. 12 Manresa Road, the natural slate roof.
with lead clad dormers of which are partially obscured behind a bottle balustrade. Later mansard roof extensions are present on some of the Victorian terraced houses, such as those at nos. 123-147 (odd) and nos. 86-122 (even) Beaufort Street. The houses on the eastern side have a less consistent roofscape with dormer windows designed to different designs and of indifferent quality that affects the rhythm of the terrace causing harm to the conservation area. The terrace on the western side has more consistency with three equidistant dormers per house. This respects the rhythm of the front façade better but still appears as an incongruous termination to a terrace which would originally have had a plain and consistent slate pitched roof with eaves across the terrace.

3.88 The Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area is fortunate to have retained the vast majority of its original roof forms intact. These are of great heritage significance and make a strong positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area particularly where they are present as a group, providing consistent rooflines and terminations to the buildings.
3.89 The conservation area is enriched by the great number of original boundary treatments which enhance the setting of the buildings they enclose and contribute to the historic character of the streets.

3.90 The three most significant forms of front boundary treatment in the area are cast iron railings, generally found on properties dating from the nineteenth century, posts and chains, important elements of schemes in the first half of twentieth century, and London stock brick boundary walls.

3.91 Railings provide streets with a unified appearance and yet can include a variety of patterns and details so that richness is ensured and visual interest sustained. Cast iron railings not protecting basements were generally removed during World War II.

3.92 Good examples of complete or near complete runs of original iron railings can be found surrounding the front lightwells of nos. 1-3 (consec) and nos. 40-42 (consec) Carlyle Square, the former college building no. 21 Manresa Road, the Royal Marsden Hospital, Royal Brompton Hospital South Block and the Victorian terraced houses either side of the north end of Beaufort Street to name but a few. Large runs of railings can also be found around the communal gardens of Chelsea Square, Carlyle Square and St. Andrews churchyard.

3.93 Railings serve not only to prevent passers-by from falling into basement areas or intruders from entering garden squares but also to emphasise the unity of a building group without masking it from view. Railing patterns vary considerably between terraced groups due to the different developers involved and the replacement of original sets at a later date.

3.94 Originally the bars of the railings were individually set with lead caulk into a low coping stone. They are generally highly decorative and are painted gloss black which is a strong unifying characteristic throughout the area.

3.95 The post and chain boundaries can be found within Chelsea Square, Mallord Street,
some parts of Chelsea Park Gardens and nos. 80-108 (even) Old Church Street, the arching chains of which are discreet whilst being elegant and attractive.

3.96 Low front boundary walls are also common and are sometimes surmounted with railings set between brick piers. These are common around Chelsea Park Gardens and the terraced houses on the western side of Dovehouse Street. Taller boundary walls are less common but where they do appear they make a positive contribution, such as those that surround the Western Synagogue Cemetery on Fulham Road and South Parade; the wall that fronts onto Beaufort Street enclosing the communal garden to nos. 4-30 (even) Chelsea Park Gardens; the wall to the rear of nos. 27-39 (consec) Carlyle Square that fronts onto Old Church Street and the grade II listed front boundary wall to Sloane House (no. 149 Old Church Street) which is late eighteenth century in date and has rusticated brick piers.

3.97 Unfortunately many boundaries have been altered with the loss of the original configuration. Some of these may have been lost where iron railings were removed to help the war effort. However, many others have been altered, partially removed or demolished in their entirety to provide off street parking. This type of development has often broken up the building line and has led to bland forecourts, and in some cases garages. This has happened across the full length of Mulberry Walk with the setting of many houses now dominated by the car. The rear garden wall on the western side of the Carlyle Square that fronts onto Old Church Street has been breached on a number of occasions to provide garaging and off road car parking.

3.98 Bottle Balustrades are not common within the area but some attractive examples can be found on the north side of Carlyle Square which are of a traditional design and those at nos. 37-39 (odd) on the western side of the square, which have an attractive Celtic knot design.
Many of the Georgian and Victorian houses in the conservation area have original half-basements or lower ground floors which have lightwells that sit either immediately next to the pavement or are set back behind front gardens. As such they create a continuous feature along the street.

The open character of lightwells is an important feature. Many have historic stone slab steps with simple iron ‘D-section’ handrails. Basement doors were originally the servants’ entranceways and were usually tucked under the steps to the main front door. Such doors were designed as part of the house as a whole and were often black painted with four panels and of smaller proportions than the main door. Many original doors have been lost, but where they remain they can provide templates for more suitable replacements and are of high historic value in themselves. Coal cellar doors were usually ledged and braced plank doors painted black. These have often been replaced with inferior and inappropriate plain flush doors. Entrance steps over the areas were originally of stone, but many were later covered with tiles and this trend has continued with usually unfortunate results. The poor treatment and untidy condition of some lightwells also detracts from the appearance of the property and the terrace. Corner sites are especially prominent from the street.

Iron security bars have been installed within the reveals of many lower ground floor windows. These were not part of the original design and can, if not designed sympathetically, be unattractive and intrusive features.
Grade II listed wall, no. 149 Old Church Street

Celtic knot work style balustrade, Carlyle Square

Post and chain fence, Chelsea Square

London stock brick boundary wall to Western Synagogue Cemetery
Front and Rear Gardens

3.102 The greenery, both to the front and rear of some of the terraces, detached and semi-detached houses, is an important feature of the conservation area. Nos. 32-94 (even) Chelsea Park Gardens, as mentioned previously in this text, are unique within the conservation area with the houses set back behind a small common garden which is lushly planted with shrubs and trees and are enclosed by a dwarf front boundary wall. Good examples of front garden trees can be found in Carlyle Square which has some beautiful ornamental trees growing in the slightly larger privately owned front gardens on the north side of the square. Magnolias and cherries in particular are notable along with a large mature fig tree.

3.103 Rear gardens are larger and allow for more mature planting to grow with small trees and larger shrubs. Where these gardens sit next to the street, often where one street bisects another, it allows the greenery of the private space to visually spill into the public realm to form a welcome contrast to the hard surfacing and buildings around. There are many gaps between and around the buildings and this forms an important part of the character of the conservation area. Some of the larger gardens in the eastern part of the conservation area contain excellent quality mature trees including Sycamore, Plane, Oak and Indian Bean tree.

3.104 There is also an attractive array of smaller scale planting throughout the conservation area, particularly behind the ground floor railings of some terraces or on other terraces where the only greenery is provided in window boxes behind traditional pot guards or to the front entrance steps due to the lack of garden space.
Rear gardens to nos. 15-25 (odd) Chelsea Park Gardens

Front gardens to north end of Carlyle Square

Rear gardens to nos. 15-25 (odd) Chelsea Park Gardens

Gardens to the rear of nos. 125-141 (odd) Old Church Street
Other Building Types

Places of Worship

3.105 The conservation area only has one place of worship, St. Andrews Church, which is located on a corner site where Chelsea Park Gardens meets Park Walk. The Church is important to the character of the conservation area as it not only serves the residents' pastoral needs but also creates a landmark of high architectural quality. Given that the church is detached, design consideration has been given to all four elevations, so when viewed from any direction it has an attractive appearance.

3.106 St Andrews was designed by Sir Arthur Blomfield in 1912-13 replacing a much smaller and dilapidated chapel of 1718. The church is designed in the Geometrical Gothic style and is constructed from red brick laid in English bond with stone dressings and steep pitched roofs covered in part slate and part clay tiles. The tower is three stages and is finished with stone dressings and an ashlar broach spire with pinnacles which still houses the strident bell of the original chapel. The main substantial decoration to the elevations is provided through decorative carved stonework that surrounds the main entrance at the base of the south west tower and the fenestration, the large east window of which has stained glass.
Public Houses

3.107 Originally six public houses were located in the conservation area many of which have now been converted to either restaurant or commercial uses.

- **no. 145 Dovehouse Street**: Princess of Wales now restaurant (1930s)
- **no. 153 Dovehouse Street**: The Crown (1830s)
- **no. 298 King’s Road**: The Cadogan Arms (1869)
- **no. 354 King’s Road**: The Roebuck now restaurant (1890s)
- **no. 392 King’s Road**: The Man in the Moon now restaurant (1891)
- **no. 242 Old Church Street**: The Queen’s Elm now shop (1910s)

3.108 Public houses were usually the first buildings to be built in a street to give somewhere for builders to drink and pick up their wages whilst the houses were being built. Today they create focus in the street scene and make a significant contribution to the character of the conservation area both in their architecture and, in the case of those still functioning, their social role.

3.109 Public houses have often occupied their site for many years even though the building may have been rebuilt or changed name. Features that are important to pubs include their traditional hanging signs, coach lamps, tiled frontages, etched windows and granite setts and hatches in the pavement for barrel delivery into the cellar.
Unfortunately not all public houses survive today in their intended use. The new uses in this conservation area have caused the loss of some historic features from the exterior (as well as the interior) and the watering down of their social and neighbourhood function as well as loss of character from the conservation area. Of the six pubs four have now been converted to either restaurant and shop uses.

The upper storeys of public houses were usually more decorative than the rest of the terrace, particularly where the public house is located on a street corner. No. 298 King’s Road: The Cadogan Arms, no. 392 King’s Road: The Man in the Moon, no. 354 King’s Road: The Roebuck and no. 242 Old Church Street: The Queen’s Elm are good examples of this.

The pubs are either stucco fronted or of a brick construction and usually embellished around the window openings with architrave surrounds and pediments and roof parapets which help to distinguish them from the adjoining terraces. Some elevations stand out as more highly decorative than others, such as the former, The Roebuck at no. 354 King’s Road which has a distinctive dome to its corner that sits behind broken pediments with swags and half hipped decorative gables to the streets with bracketed eave cornices. The second floor is also distinctive with its twinned ionic columns that separate the different groups of windows. The former The Queen’s Elm, no. 242 Old Church Street is also highly decorative with a large pediment bracketed gable with centrally positioned semi-circular window. The front façade is also distinctive with its red brick rusticated quoins to the corners and the buff coloured double height faience work to the window surrounds with central spandrel panel separating the first and second floor windows.

Good traditional pub frontages are still present at all the pubs. The only significant change happening to the former The Roebuck, which although retaining its pilaster surrounds,
the pub frontage between has been replaced with bi-folding doors. Particularly nice examples survive at The Cadogan Arms with its red granite pilaster surrounds with Corinthian capitals between which are traditional moulded timber stallriser and Georgian styled glass windows and lantern lights. The pub frontage at Princess of Wales has a similar frontage except the pilasters are fluted timber rather than granite. The Crown is less ornate but still forms an attractive frontage with stallriser and vertically sliding sash windows and decorative console brackets to the fascia sign. Finally, The Queen’s Elm has a distinctive pub frontage with attractive contrasting dark blue faience base with buff colour above with the name of the pub moulded into the faience of the fascia sign. Between the pilasters are canted bay windows with decorative circular and square glazing bars with dentilled decoration to the transom lights.
Buildings with Shops

Fulham Road

3.114 The shops within the Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area make a particularly important contribution to its character. As well as the commercial aspects, they provide the setting for residents to meet socially, while in visual terms their prominent locations and variety in style and finish make for welcome interest in what is predominantly a residential area.

3.115 Original timber shop frontages, where they survive, have historic and architectural significance in their own right as well as making a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Other shopfronts are modern, but most have still been built in timber to traditional designs which conserve the character of the area. Important parts of shopfronts include narrow fascias, timber columns, stallrisers, pilasters, console brackets, recessed doors as well as other historic details characteristic of historic frontages.

3.116 Shops still survive in their original locations and can be found primarily on the northern edge of the conservation area along Fulham Road and on the southern edge along King’s Road.

3.117 The conservation area reaches up to Fulham Road to embrace *The Queen’s Elm* public house and its adjacent terrace nos. 247-267 (odd). The terrace dates from the turn of the twentieth century and forms an attractive group of shops with living accommodation above. The terrace is three storeys in height with attic and is constructed from red brick with stone dressings in the form of quoins and a decorative dentilled parapet course. The terrace comprises eleven units which form a symmetrical façade that is emphasised through its fenestration and inventive gable shapes. The windows come in two forms on the first and second floors; those below dormer windows being paired vertical sliding sash windows set within simple brick surrounds with rubbed brick heads and key stones, and those beneath rendered gables being more decorative with three vertical sliding sashes separated by mullions that are set within double height stucco surrounds with spandrel panels. The windows to the gables and the flat roofed dormers are side hung casements that are split by glazing bars into six panes. The shopfront surrounds remain intact with pilasters and corbels which separate the fascia signs, creating a consistent rhythm across the group. The shopfronts themselves are later in date but are generally sympathetic to the character of the
parent building with mullions and transoms that respect the original dimensions of the narrow fascia signs.

3.118 Nos. 243-245 (odd) is situated between *The Queen’s Elm* public house and nos. 247-267 (odd) *Fulham Road*. The building is three storeys in height with a mansard roof and flat roofed dormers. The façade is plainer comprising red brick work laid in English bond with embellishment added in the form of brick quoins and a string course above the second floor windows. The building is five windows wide and has vertical sliding six-over-six sashes set within plain brick reveals. The attractive shopfront surround is constructed from Portland stone, the design of which incorporates pilasters and a stallriser. The shopfront itself is of metal construction with top lights and decorated at the base of each pillar with a figurine adding visual interest to the street frontage.

3.119 Opposite *The Queen’s Elm* public house on the opposite corner looking towards the east is a picturesque group of Victorian shops which turn the corner into Old Church Street. Nos. 2-6 (consec) *Queen’s Elm Parade* is a part three storey, part four story building, comprising shops with residential upper floors. The building is constructed from London stock brick with red brick dressings including double height pilasters to the first and second floors and finished with a hipped clay tiled roof with dormer windows. Directly to the east adjacent to the Western Synagogue is no. 230a *Fulham Road*. This small characterful shop has a plain rendered upper storey and an unusual glazed timber conservatory above the shopfront housing a clock. Directly to the south of Queen’s Elm Parade is a row of two storey shops (no. 112 *Old Church Street*) the upper storey of which was added in 2013. The design reflects Queen’s Elm Parade with London stock brick, red brick dressings and vertical sliding sash windows the upper sash of which is split into six smaller panes with glazing bars. The original shopfront surrounds below are to a consistent design.
across the group comprising part fluted pilasters with floral capitals and corbels that separate the fascia panels. The shopfronts are also original and to traditional Victorian designs with mullions, stallrisers and blinds built into the fascias making an extremely important contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

**King’s Road**

3.120 Like most other thoroughfares of long standing in the borough, that part of King’s Road within the Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area was developed earlier than the residential streets behind yet the buildings evident today tend to be more varied and in general terms more modern than those of the rest of the area. This tendency towards redevelopment is in part because of a desire to maximise income from land with a prominent and convenient frontage and also because of road widening proposals. It is an interesting observation that many of the Victorian redevelopments of the properties mapped by Thompson in 1836 were built so far forward that they had to be redeveloped in their turn whenever road widening took place. The interesting survival behind the attractive shop façade at **no. 296 King’s Road** is of about the same date as the adjacent Carlyle Square properties and is the only remaining example in the area of an earlier King’s Road before commerce and traffic took over. Adjacent to **The Cadogan Arms** public house which with its other neighbour in Old Church Street exemplifies later Victorian commercial development in decorative stucco.

3.121 At the other end of the King’s Road frontage are red brick properties dating from
the early 1890s, including at no. 392 the former *The Man in the Moon* public house and the striking ‘Porticos’ frontage to Chelsea Park Dwellings, nos. 374-384 (even), with its gables and roof terrace above shopfronts framed within two-storey pointed arches. The elevation is constructed from red brickwork with rendered panels giving the appearance of ‘timber’ framing. The shopfronts are now all modern plate glass emphasising the shape of the arch. These are set between original rendered masonry columns which have a small floral motif at the top. Fascia signs are positioned at the springing of the arch obscuring the internal floor plates. Unfortunately, there are a large number of timber batons attached to the brickwork which were added to hold estate agents signs which detract from the elevation.

3.122 In between, a relatively plain block of three late nineteenth century shops, nos. 386-390 (even), sits quietly within the street and does not compete with the more exuberant architecture of the former *The Man in the Moon* public house and the Porticos. The elevation does, however, have some embellishment with double height brick pilasters between the windows and moulded brick window reveals to the first floor. The street frontage has retained most of its original shopfront framing. Original fascias appear to have been lost but the replacements are neatly and tidily inserted above the shop window itself. The shopfronts themselves are later replacements which have some traditional elements, such as timber mullions and stallrisers.

3.123 Next in the historical sequence come the red brick facades between Old Church Street and The Vale which were built in the 1910s and 1920s. Most attractive is the bank at no. 300 on the Old Church Street corner, where a stone turret projects between brick gables above a rusticated stone base. Next door the gables and the stone dressings of nos. 302-318 (even) continue while between no. 320-340 (even) simple three-storey brick facades of appropriate
height provide an effective contrast to the moulded stucco of Paultons Square. All these premises were designed as shops and in most cases the original pilasters and fascias survive intact as an appropriate frame for the diversity of shop styles.

3.124 Apart from no. 354, the former The Roebuck public house, the block between Beaufort Street and The Porticos (nos. 374-384 (even)), nos. 356-372 (even) are two storeys in height. This row of shops is modern in date having been built in 2008 replacing single storey shops from the first half of the twentieth century (see Recent Architecture section).

3.125 Moving across Beaufort Street are two neat, well-mannered, interwar premises in the same block as The Blue Bird Garage, a grade II listed building. No. 352a is three storeys in height constructed from red brick with steel casement windows with margin lights set within double height stucco surrounds, the windows separated by decorative spandrel panels. The shopfront surround pilasters are constructed from brick with recessed panels and stone capitals that support a fascia panel above with a cornice moulding. The shopfront itself is modern incorporating a metal frame with mullion and transoms. Next door at no. 352 is an old dairy shop. This property is four storeys in height and is constructed from a semi-engineering brick laid in Flemish bond. The building is two windows wide with steel casement windows that have mullion and transoms with leaded lights that sit within plain brick reveals with soldier coursed heads and keystone details to the second floor. Greater emphasis has been given to the first floor with a canted bay window and a sculptured cows head, an important feature that acts as a visual reminder of the building’s former use. The shopfront appears to be original with plain pilasters that support a fascia with dentilled cornice that sit around a moulded frame with central door access and stallriser.
Adjacent to the The Blue Bird Garage (see Other Significant Buildings section) is a pair of residential blocks at no. 350 King’s Road known as Mulberry Court, which are set forward to the right and left of the garage. These blocks are four storeys in height plus attic and are three bays wide with three-bay returns to the right and left hand sides. The flats are constructed from red brick laid in Flemish bond and have painted stucco decoration in the form of quoins to the corners and a decorative over sailing eaves cornice. The attic mansard is covered in natural slate and has three square headed corniced dormer windows the central ones of which are pedimented. The windows comprise steel casements with leaded lights that are set within contrasting red brick reveals with gauged brickwork heads and tiled keystones. The first floor windows and the central windows to the second floor are more decorative with stucco surrounds. The shop frontages differ slightly between blocks. The western block has plate glass windows and a late twentieth century fascia to the ground floor whilst the eastern block has its original moulded Mullions and transomed windows, stallriser, original margin glazing and central square headed pilastered and corniced entrance. The residential blocks are important elements of the overall scheme for the site framing the garage building and enclosing its forecourt.
Artists’ Studios

3.127 Artists’ studios are an important part of the historical development of Kensington and Chelsea and contribute to the character of the conservation area both in their distinctive architecture and the role they play in the life of the artistic community.

3.128 Chelsea has been popular with artists since the beginning of the nineteenth century with purpose-designed studios being built or added to houses in the streets. The area covered by the Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area is no exception and studios started to be introduced in the 1880s in Elm Park Road and the early part of the twentieth century in Mallord Street, Mulberry Walk, Old Church Street and finally in the 1950s in Dovehouse Street.

3.129 The late Victorian artists’ studios were often built in a variant of the Queen Anne Revival style, many of them in red brick with terracotta details. However, the area has more variation in its style given that many studios were built after this period. Typical features include their large north facing windows to provide even light; and roof lights which may also continue onto the roof as glazed panels.

3.130 Nos. 74-78 (even) Elm Park Road form a small group of three artists’ studios and are the earliest to be built within the conservation area in the 1880s. The group add variety to the architecture of Elm Park Gardens and make a significant contribution to its character and appearance. No. 76 was designed in 1883 by J.P. Seddon as a studio-house for Paul Naftel and his wife and her family, several of whom
were painters of some repute. The building is the most distinctive of the three having a wider street frontage and Gothic influences. The building is three storeys in height with attic and lower ground floors. The building is constructed from red brick with painted stone decoration and a red clay tiled roof with decorative ridge tiles. The three storey tower element has a steep pitched hipped roof that is finished with a small Gothic arched dormer window and finial to the ridge. The elevation has an impressive double height window with a small pointed arch within the gable that extends into the roof space. The other fenestration comprises vertical sliding timber sash windows which are set within red brick reveals with decorative stone sills and gauged brickwork with white stucco spandrel panels. The large ground floor window and windows to the tower element on the first and second floors are divided by ornate pillars with capitals. The front entrance door is of a traditional six-panelled design set within a painted stucco surround. Unfortunately the original design of the building is slightly compromised by two unfortunate dormers to the roof either side of the double height studio window and the use of reflective glass.

3.131 Nos. 74 and 78, also built c.1884 and were occupied by landscape painters. These houses are four storeys in height and are constructed from red brick with clay tiled roofs. The buildings have a distinctive appearance with their Dutch styled gables, the windows of which light the internal attic spaces. No. 78 has a large full width bay window to the first floor lighting the original studio space whilst no. 74 has a more conventional residential style fenestration but a large canted bay window to the first floor. Each of the bay windows have doors that open onto a narrow balcony and are enclosed with decorative iron railings. The entrances are more ornate than no. 76 with no. 78 being a six-panelled door set back within a recessed porch with Tudor arched stone opening and mullioned transom light above. The entrance at no. 74 by contrast projects slightly forward from the elevation with the six-panelled front door set within a stucco pilaster surround with corbels and finished with a dentilled cornice above.

3.132 An interesting studio survives at no. 125 (nos. 8-9 Bolton Place) Old Church Street. The studio comprises two early nineteenth century terraced houses that were adapted in 1909-10 for Evelyn and William de Morgan. The building now appears as one architectural composition finished in stucco with a white painted finish. It has a mid-Victorian appearance at upper ground and first floor levels with its portico and French doors with corbelled corniced heads that open onto a front balcony enclosed with ornate cast iron railings. The second floor,
however, is characterised by a large double height window with glazed panels that angle back into the hipped slate roof, a characteristic of many artists’ studios in the borough.

3.133 The Vale was extended northwards c.1909, with picturesquely grouped neo-Georgian houses along the west side. Mallord and Mulberry streets were added to link it with Upper Church Street and several studios were built in this group of streets before and after the First World War.

3.134 An attractive artists’ studio is located at no. 1 Mallord Street which is located on a corner site with Old Church Street. The building is constructed from a dark multi red brick with contrasting red brick dressings to the window reveals. The roof level is finished with a gable end to Old Church Street and a distinctive chimneystack incorporated into a rounded gable, the result of the chimney flues extending up and over the windows below. The elevation fronting onto Old Church Street is traditional at ground and first floor levels with its six-over-six vertically sliding timber sash windows the one to the ground floor being of the tripartite type. The studio space to the second floor is lit by a double height window which also has a tripartite design, the central window being split by mullions and transoms and the central section having a rounded arched head. The ‘flank’ elevation to Mallord Street is much plainer but with centrally positioned windows and front entrance door.

3.135 In Mallord Street, no. 28 was designed in 1913-14 like a Dutch cottage by Robert van ’t Hoff for Augustus John. The building is
constructed from a yellow stock brick laid in English bond with a pan tiled roof with parapets to the gable ends. The front elevation appears as a single storey dwelling with dormers to the attic rooms, over a high half basement. The elevation has a symmetrical elevation with the entrance reached up by a double flight of stairs and flanked by metal windows with glazing bars and overlight of an original decorative pattern with similar designs to the glazing bars of roof dormers. Augustus John’s large studio space is located to the rear and not visible from the street and is lit by full height windows and large rooflights.

3.136 The distinctive building at no. 22 Mulberry Walk and no. 113 Old Church Street was built as a double house with two studios for John DaCosta, a children’s portraitist. The building occupies a prominent corner site and is constructed from grey brick with red brick dressings and a hipped red clay tiled roof with attic dormers. The building has a large canted corner as it turns the street into Mulberry Walk which along with the elevation fronting Old Church Street has substantial studio windows that are split with glazing bars. In contrast the elevation facing Mulberry Walk has a more residential characteristic with regular fenestration that is four windows wide with six-over-six vertical sliding timber sashes except the portion connected to the artist studio which is distinctly blank and only broken by a Venetian style window at second floor level.

3.137 The last artists’ studios to be built in the conservation area were during the 1950s forming part of the new residential development comprising nos. 63-111 (odd) Dovehouse Street. The development was designed by Austin Blomfield, who included at the request of the London County Council a number of artists’ studios into the design that were incorporated at either end the terrace, comprising nos. 53-61 (odd) and nos. 105-111 (odd). The units are accessed through pedimented arched gateways that lead into a courtyard area to the rear. These two courtyards are flanked to the street with groups of garages having mansard studios above and one storey studio buildings in the back thus providing the mix of studios and houses to continue the local Chelsea tradition. The studios and courtyards add variety and visual interest to the terrace and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
Nos. 53-61 (odd) Dovehouse Street

Arched gateway to courtyard, nos. 105-111 (odd) Dovehouse Street

Nos. 105-111 (odd) Dovehouse Street
Mews

3.138 The original mews buildings comprised a row of stables, with carriage houses below and living quarters above. These were built around a cobbled yard or along a street, behind the large terrace houses. They have now all been converted to dwellings, a large proportion of the conversions happening after the First World War when fewer families were able to afford large houses. This has led to the introduction of often inappropriate doors and windows, the removal of ornament and in some instances the natural stock brick elevations being painted.

3.139 The mews were built to front directly onto the street and never had basement levels. The ground floors had pairs of double timber doors, painted and side hung, often on large cast iron Collinge hinges. The mews were surfaced with hard wearing granite stone setts and where these have survived they have been worn smooth. They either fall to a central gully for drainage or are cambered with gullies at the sides of the street.

3.140 The mews were never designed as formal decorative terraces and have a more functional appearance which reflects their former use but now create characterful and quiet enclaves away from noisier and busy streets.

Henniker Mews and Elm Park Lane

3.141 There are two traditional and characterful mews within the area; Henniker Mews accessed from Callow Street and Elm Park Lane (formally Elm Park Garden Mews) which is accessed from both Beaufort Street and Elm Park Road.

3.142 On entering Henniker Mews one is struck by the remarkable difference in character from Elm Park Road. The entrances north and south are marked by brick entrance piers which are constructed from stock brick with red brick dressings and finished with a pyramidal capping stones. Later iron gates have been introduced.
between the piers that unfortunately create a visual barrier to Callow Street. Principally there is an absence of traffic noise, and dwellings are altogether on a much more intimate scale. The mews dates from the 1880s and is two storeys in height with traditionally pitched slate roofs that are built from gault brick with red brick dressings. The windows to the first floor are vertically sliding timber sash windows set within plain brick reveals with gauged red brick heads. The houses have simple embellishment in the form of red brick dressings that include string courses and a dog tooth eaves course. An important contribution to the charm of the development is the survival of the original granite stone setts which hint at the buildings former origins as a mews. Over the years many owners have introduced their own individual style to their dwellings with alterations to the fenestration, carriage and front doors and the painting of brickwork which has produced a restlessness to the streetscape.

3.143 Elm Park Lane, formally known as Elm Park Gardens Mews, also has a quiet and secluded atmosphere. It is accessed at the southern end from Elm Park Road via attractive pedestrian arches and piers to the access road. These are flanked by the end walls of the mews houses which have been embellished with recessed panels of brickwork formed with large elliptical arches with gauged yellow brickwork with a keystone supported on brick pilasters. The bottom of the parapet is decorated with moulded brickwork with a roundel motif pattern that adds visual interest to the street which is dominated by much larger and more formal terraced housing. The northern entrance onto Beaufort Street is much plainer appearing as an access road between nos. 122 and 124 Beaufort Street. The mews was constructed in the 1870s and is also two storeys in height with pitched slate roofs. The buildings are constructed from London stock brick which has now largely been painted. The mews character is still very much present which is
further complemented by the survival of more of the mews’ original appearance including details, such as strap hinges on doors, dentilled eaves details and string courses and an unbroken roofline being particularly important. Unfortunately, there has been some rebuilding work, and the modification to the elevations with fenestration, carriage and entrance door alterations has disrupted the original rhythm of the mews houses to their detriment. The loss of paving setts for tarmac is also regrettable. However, stone setts remain on either side to form a visual boundary between dwellings and the street and hint at the Lane’s previous function and origins.
Other Significant Buildings

3.144 There are many non-residential buildings in the Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area that do not fit into the previous categories, but are nonetheless important historic buildings both in their own right and in relation to the historic and architectural character of the conservation area as a whole.

Royal Marsden Hospital, Fulham Road (formally the Free Cancer Hospital)

3.145 The Royal Marsden Hospital was designed by David Macotta of John Young and Sons and built in 1859-60. It opened in 1862 but was soon enlarged in 1881-3 with new wings. This building formed the nucleus of the enlarged hospital, by Alexander Graham in 1885. This new building introduced a red brick façade with stone dressings that mixes both Jacobethan and Baroque elements. The building we see today has been greatly altered, but elements of the original 1885 facade can still be seen in the first three storeys over basement which has stone canted bay windows, mullion and transom windows and a central stone entrance with segmental pediment. The original eaves line can still be seen in the form of the dentilled cornice that now appears as a string course with later red brick storey above. A substantial southwards extension of the east wing was undertaken in the early part of the twentieth century and is in a plainer red brick style with stone dressings. Further additions were added again in the 1930s and can be seen in the red brick four storey wing with attic, opposite nos. 119-131 (Dove House) Dovehouse Street. New extensions were also added to the western side of the hospital along Dovehouse Street in the 1960s with the Wallace Wing, a more contemporary curtain walling type addition that contrasts with the more traditional red brick architecture. To the rear of the site the former St. Wilfrid’s Convent building constructed from London stock brick with slate hipped roof can still be seen from the junction with Cale Street which now forms part of the hospital complex. The front boundary of the block facing Fulham Road has large ornate stone entrance piers with recessed panels, frieze and capping stones between which are ornate iron railings that are set into a stone plinth.
Royal Brompton Hospital South Block, Fulham Road

3.146 The Royal Brompton South Block was designed by Thomas Henry Wyatt and built between 1879-82. The building has four main storeys with an additional mezzanine floor in part of the tall ground storey and extra floors within the roof. It is designed in a conventional Queen Anne style in red brick with terracotta bands and dressings with shaped gables at each end and a Dutch gable to the centre. Further articulation is added with two octagonal turrets at the angels of the projecting bay between which sit a triple height oriel bay stone window. The main entrance door sits within a blocked columned pilaster surround with pediment and side windows. The elevation has been harmed with large plant being placed at the front of the building with full height flue that terminates at roof level. The block also has a modern style roof addition which has created an unsympathetic ‘boxy’ termination to the building. The new block to the west between the original South Block building and the former Women’s Hospital is discussed under the Recent Architecture section.

Chelsea Hospital for Women, no. 237 Fulham Road

3.147 The original Chelsea Hospital for Women, which was located at no. 178 King’s Road, moved to a new building at no. 237 Fulham Road in 1883. This building still survives today but now forms part of the Royal Cancer Hospital and the Institute of Cancer Research. The building is five storeys in height over a lower ground floor. The front façade was remodelled in 1938-39 by Henry Tanner and leaves little trace of the Renaissance-style facades. The elevation is now constructed from red brick laid in Flemish bond with simple red stone bands across the windows at all floor levels. The original windows have been replaced with metal casements with top lights which have a modern appearance at odds with the period of the building. Some embellishment has been added to the elevation with stone cornices above the upper ground floor entrance and adjacent windows also above the third floor of which has pilaster details to the corners. The front entrance and flanking windows project forward along with the lower ground floor with the returns and flanking elevation having rusticated banded brickwork. The east and west elevations are more ornate and are the remaining parts of the original Renaissance building with decorative...
window surrounds and greater embellishment with cut and moulded brick and stone work. The most recent and damaging alterations to the building have been the addition of a glazed roof storey and the erection of a glass screen and bridge that connects to the modern wing of the South Block. The building still has a lot of interesting features as well as making a positive contribution to the history of the Hospital site and the character and appearance of the conservation area. It also forms an attractive back drop to the adjacent Western Synagogue Cemetery within oblique views looking east along both Fulham Road and South Parade.

3.148 The South Block, former Women’s Hospital and Royal Marsden Hospital form an important group of Victorian hospital buildings and an attractive northern boundary to the conservation area.

Nurses Accommodation Block, South Parade

3.149 The nurses’ accommodation block is located behind the Royal Brompton Hospital South Block on South Parade. This attractive building fronts onto Chelsea Square and forms an important and attractive back drop to the northern end of the square. The building was designed by Edwin T. Hall and was built in 1898-9. The building is long and shallow and was originally four storeys in height over a lower ground floor with additional rooms behind a large segmental gable in the centre. The elevation has been designed in a transitional style between Queen Anne and free classicism and is constructed from red brick with Portland stone dressings. Articulation has been introduced into the façade with projecting full height bays that are terminated with stone bottle balustrades. The fenestration comprises vertical sliding sash windows, the upper sashes of which are divided into separate panes with glazing bars and set within decorative stone reveals. The main entrance positioned in the centre of the terrace at the bottom of the Dutch gable comprises a circular portico with Tuscan columns that is flanked by three storey stone bays with mullions between the windows that are also terminated with bottle balustrades. The slated roof has an eaves overhang between the gables and projecting bays, the slope of which is punctuated by recessed dormer windows. The front lightwell is enclosed with ornate iron railings that are set into a stone plinth and are positioned between red brick piers with moulded capping stones.
The former Chelsea Polytechnic Institute

3.150 The college was designed by J.M. Brydon and completed in 1895. Its long ornate façade creates an attractive and impressive entrance leading into Chelsea Square. It is designed in an ornate Georgian style of red brick laid in Flemish bond with Bath stone dressings. The building is part two and three storeys in height over a lower ground floor with a mansard storey. The balanced composition creates a striking elevation with great emphasis being given to the two bays containing the entrances. These are three full storeys in height over a basement and have block columned pilasters to the entrances with segmental pedimented hoods above. The first floor is embellished with large pilasters with volute capitals that support a dentilled cornice above. The windows are vertical sliding sashes with glazing bars that sit within stone architrave surrounds, those to the upper ground floor to a blocked design and those to the first floor with segmental pediments. The roof parapets are finished with bottle balustrades behind which sits a mansard roof covered with natural slate that is punctuated with arched dormer windows clad in lead with side hung casement windows with glazing bars. The front lightwell is enclosed with ornate iron railings that are set into a stone plinth. Emphasis is given to the entrances with red brick piers with block stone detailing that are terminated with obelisk finials which flank the rounded stone entrance steps. In 2006 the college buildings were converted into flats which saw the front elevations retained and the later college extensions demolished. The new rear extensions complement the Victorian architecture with a more restrained stone clad addition that does not compete with the ornate architecture of the original building.

The former Chelsea public library

3.151 The former public library adds its own element of civic grandeur to the street and complements the adjacent college building directly to the north and the entrance into the conservation area from Manresa Road. The setting of the library, however, is harmed by the high rise block that is Mansion Hall to the south which dominates it in both views looking both north and south along Mansresa Road. The library was also designed by the architect J.M. Brydon in 1890. It is three storeys in height above a lower ground floor and is constructed from red brick laid in Flemish bond with ornate Bath stone dressings. The building is five windows wide with round headed windows set within rusticated surrounds to the ground floor and the first floor windows with round headed
stone relieving arches containing square headed openings in brick with prominent keystones. The building is finished at roof level with a stone bracketed and dentilled eaves cornice above which sits a hipped pantiled roof with tall chimney stacks either side. The grand front entrance is constructed from stone and comprises a semi-circular portico with Ionic capitals that support a stone entablature copper dome. The front boundary that encloses the front lightwell comprises stone bottle balustrades and plinths that are set between red brick piers with capping stones. The library was converted to a private school around 2006 and has been sympathetically repaired and separated from the former college building.

The Chelsea Hospital for Women, Dovehouse Street

3.152 The hospital for women was constructed in 1916 replacing the smaller women’s hospital on Fulham Road which is now occupied by the Institute of Cancer Research. It was designed by the architect Keith Young who is famous for his work in hospital architecture. The building is the most striking within Dovehouse Street and is to a carefully executed classical design with central pedimented portion linked with wings to the pedimented end pavilions. The building is three storeys in height over a lower ground floor and is constructed from red brick laid in Flemish bond with white stone for quoins and, key stones, the main window architraves, pediments and string courses. The central stone portico with square and rounded columns provides access to a two leafed timber panelled door with side and
transom lights that are set into a stone surround. The clever design gives the building an air of some public importance whilst also retaining a domestic scale that would have been comforting to patients and visitors. The building relates well to the later terraced houses opposite and the long façade helps to screen the plain monolithic Brompton Hospital block to the rear from Dovehouse Street.

The former Fire Station, South Parade

The former Fire Station situated on the north side of South Parade was built in 1892. This attractive and ornate building is four storeys in height with two storeys in the roof and constructed from red brick with sandstone dressings. At the centre of the building is a two storey gable with date flanked by ornate wrought iron ties. The gable is finished with a keyed oculus window and pediment above. At street level there are two central doorways for engines that are constructed from timber and three quarter glazed and painted fire engine red which sit within segmental brickwork with stone heads. The fenestration varies across the façade with mullions and transoms to ground and first floor windows, with pediments, bearing tools of the fireman’s trade in relief. The pilasters between are capped with fireman’s bells in stone reinforcing the original function of the building. The windows above are vertical sliding two-over-two sashes set within brick reveals with applied pilasters and decorated stone with brick heads.

3.153 The former Fire Station, South Parade
The building is finished with a stone cornice and a tiled mansard, the dormers windows of which are set behind bottle balustrades. The roof is finished with a cupola of timber and lead and crowned with a ball and spike finial.

The Blue Bird Garage

3.154 The Blue Bird Garage (grade II listed) is situated at no. 350 King’s Road and is a monument to the early promise of the motor car. The survival of so much of the garage and original faience details to the front boundary, also grade II, is a delight and they make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The side elevations to Beaufort Street and The Vale are strictly utilitarian but respect the scale of these streets. The two residential blocks and shops known as Mulberry Court formed part of the same development and frame the garage and enclose the forecourt.

3.155 The garage was designed in 1924 by Robert Sharp. It is constructed from a reinforced concrete finished with painted stucco and a pitched slate roof with ridge lantern light set back behind a parapet. The plain side elevations to Beaufort Street and The Vale are of a red brick construction laid in Flemish bond with painted concrete lintels to the openings.

3.156 The garage is of two storeys in height and seven bays wide separated by giant pilaster strips. Entrances to the end bays are through wide segmental headed openings with prominent keystones and white tiling above with blue border and a centrally positioned globe lamp. The floor to ceiling height glazing to the ground floor and the glazing above is full width between the pilasters and has been divided up attractively into three parts by mullions with thirty-five panes to ground floor and twenty-one panes to upper floor of each bay. The top of the facade is finished with a cornice above the first floor with paired modillions above pilaster strips and a parapet that rises at the centre bay to form a stepped central feature. The front boundary that encloses the forecourt of the garage comprises a wall and gate piers that are constructed from white faience. The low wall has five square piers and taller terminal piers which all have blocky moulded tops. Each of the intermediate piers have decorative globe light stands on top of capitals. Additional decoration and emphasis is given to the two end piers which carry moulded blue faience blue bird motifs and more robust globe light stands. Ornate metal railings are set between the piers completing this architecturally pleasing period piece. The garage was converted in the late 1980s to office, retail and restaurant uses.
3.157 The conservation area was completely developed by 1950 leaving little or no room for later development. In the few instances where new buildings have been erected these have generally involved the demolition and redevelopment of existing buildings. These more recent buildings often stand out in comparison to the well-established buildings with their more traditional detailing.

3.158 Following bomb damage in World War II no. 102 Beaufort Street was rebuilt in 1957. Rather than reinstate the façade of the terrace with a facsimile of the former Victorian house it was rebuilt as flats in a contemporary design of the day with large steel windows with glazing bars and balconies with railings. This building appears incongruous within the terrace and detracts from its more uniform rhythm.

3.159 An interesting change in the morphology at the western end of Elm Park Road is the loss of the Church Hall and its replacement with nos. 2-4 (even) Elm Park Road in the 1980s with a modern replica of the semi-detached pair design of neighbouring properties. On first glance it blends in well with the other town houses and preserves the visual continuity of the road and the conservation area as a whole. Closer inspection, nevertheless, reveals a certain crudity in the replication of details, and the incorporation of garages to the lower ground floors results in unsightly gaps in the street frontage.

3.160 On the southern side of Chelsea Square are two new dwellings, nos. 36 and 38, which were built in the 2000s and the 1990s respectively. The large detached houses are
The houses reference the adjacent 1930s houses by Oliver Hill rather than the more numerous neo-Georgian purple brown bricked houses found within the square.

3.161 The western extension of Brompton Hospital’s South Block was undertaken in the 1990s replacing a 1960s laboratory block. The new design introduced a façade that respected the building line of the street improving on the previous block which had set back upper storeys. The new block is seven storeys in height, the first six floors of which are constructed from brick with the top storey constructed from glass and set back from the façade. The materials introduced are more respectful to the neighbouring buildings introducing red brick framing with contrasting recessed red brick panels to the window reveals that help to add some articulation to the façade.

The fenestration comprises bronze anodised aluminium window frames with decorative spandrel panels to the first floor. A substantial glass slot set slightly off centre divides the façade into two parts lighting the foyer and upper storeys whilst also helping to break up the elevation and provide visual interest. The roof parapet is finished with over-sailing bronzed anodised aluminium solar louvres. A glass bridge connects the extension to no. 237 Fulham Road the former Chelsea Hospital for Women. The building does not make an architectural
statement and respects the bulk and massing of the existing hospital buildings on the south side of Fulham Road.

3.162 The block between no. 354 and 374 (even) King’s Road, a modern two storey terrace of shops was built at nos. 356-372 (even). These were built in 2008 replacing single storey shops that were constructed in the early part of the twentieth century. The building is constructed from a multi red brick laid in Flemish bond that is visually broken up with various sized windows and gables. The central three bays are rendered and capped with a rainwater hood above. The shopfront surrounds are of red sandstone and the shopfronts themselves are of a frameless glass construction with low stall risers. The development adds variety to King’s Road with its lower height helping to create a more interesting skyline.

3.163 Later infill development has also taken place at nos. 1 and 3 (a small inter war red brick property) Elm Park Road on the northern side of the road. The current building nearing completion at no. 1 was built in 2014-16 on the site of a 1950s house. The design is unashamedly modern that contrasts with the late Georgian and Victorian architecture that surrounds the site. The building comprises two rectangular blocks, the one adjacent to no. 3 of three storeys and a lower block of two storeys on the western side. The house is constructed from a yellow stock brick laid in stretcher bond with little embellishment except for bands of stone/precast concrete and timber-framed plate glass windows with timber infill panels. The boundary comprises a London stock brickwork laid in Flemish bond that is finished with a brick on edge coping.
4 Public Realm

Formal Green Spaces

4.1 There are no publicly accessible green spaces within the conservation area but there are two larger private communal garden squares at the centres of Carlyle Square and Chelsea Square. Although these are not accessible to the public they do make a positive contribution providing visual amenity within the streets which can be enjoyed by the public when moving through the area.

4.2 On a much smaller scale there are also three other communal gardens located at Queen’s Elm Square, the rear garden behind nos. 9-42 (odd) Chelsea Park Gardens, and the garden to the front of nos. 4-30 (even) Chelsea Park Gardens. These well maintained and lushly planted spaces also make a positive contribution providing visual amenity in the same manner as the larger formal squares.

4.3 Similarly, another important green space is the Western Synagogue Cemetery which fronts onto both Fulham Road and South Parade. Established in 1816 and extended to the whole of its current site by the middle of the nineteenth century, the cemetery is inconspicuous behind its brick walls although it forms a breathing space in the dense fabric of Fulham Road and its mature trees and monuments are a most welcome feature in longer views.

4.4 The churchyard to the south of St. Andrew’s Church which acts as a play space for a nursery school is also important. Although the lawned area has been replaced with artificial grass it is enclosed with mature trees and planting which combined with the boundary railings and red brick piers with decorative capping stones to create an attractive frontage that contributes to the setting of the church and visual amenity of the area.
Communal garden to the frontage of nos. 4-30 (even) Chelsea Park Gardens

Communal garden rear of nos. 15-25 (odd) Chelsea Park Gardens

Chelsea Square looking west to east

Communal garden to the frontage of nos. 4-30 (even) Chelsea Park Gardens

Western Synagogue Cemetery, Fulham Road
4.5 In general, there are small areas within the conservation area with a concentration of both private and publicly owned trees.

4.6 Some notable streets with good street tree planting within the conservation area include Dovehouse Street with a long row of the Yoshino Cherry Prunus x yedoensis growing along the eastern side of the street. Perhaps, unsurprisingly, these trees look beautiful when flowering in late March and early April.

4.7 A much more formal avenue type planting of London Plane trees Platanus x hispanica is

4.8 There are two particularly good mature specimens of the Japanese Elm growing as street trees, one is on Elm Park Road close to the junction of Old Church Street and the other dominates the south west corner of Chelsea Square.

4.9 There are some good young specimens of the fastigiate English Oak growing.
Garden Squares

4.10 Both of the garden squares, Carlyle Square and Chelsea Square, have a good number of trees in each garden. Although the smaller of the two Carlyle Square has a very wide variety of tree species, mainly planted around the garden boundary, there are examples of Plane, Lime, Tree of Heaven, Beech and Foxglove Tree often inter-planted with smaller ornamental species.

Chelsea Park Gardens

4.11 An almost unique street in the Royal Borough with a screen of vegetation separating the highway from the properties. Although largely dominated by shrubs there are some nice ornamental trees found in this group including Crab Apple, Hawthorn and Cherry.

4.12 The mature London Plane tree in the grounds of St. Andrews Church dominates the skyline at the end of Chelsea Park Gardens.

There is another good example on the south side of the street.
4.13 When first paved, most of the area’s footways would have been covered with riven York stone slabs of various sizes. This expensive material is of a high townscape value and has survived in the eastern perimeter of Chelsea Garden Square and down the main western pavement. Today, the pavements are surfaced with new sawn cut York stone or concrete paving slabs which are edged with granite kerb stones. The sawn York stone complements the architecture and is an improvement on the less expensive concrete paving slabs which have a grey uniform appearance.

4.14 The carriageways are surfaced generally with bituminous macadam or hot rolled asphalt with some roads with granite sett borders, such as in Mulberry Walk, Mallard Street and Chelsea Park Gardens. Henniker Mews and the outer borders to the tarmacked road in Chelsea Park Gardens have granite stone setts that are original to the mews which were used because of their hard wearing properties that would not be worn down by horses’ hooves and metal rimmed carriage wheels. Granite stone is also present at some crossover points, such as no. 62 Old Church Street and the entrance and exit points to Queen’s Elm Square. These are important features and are of significant heritage value to the conservation area.
4.15 The conservation area contains various items of historic and reproduction street furniture that have design and historical interest in their own right and enrich the character and appearance of the conservation area. Unnecessary clutter and unsympathetic styles have been mostly avoided.

4.16 Original Victorian cast iron lamp posts have not survived and have now been replaced with traditional style lamp posts with ‘lanterns’ and decorative metal ladder supports. Although much taller than their original counterparts their consistency of design helps to unify the streets and complements the architecture of the area. The lamp posts in Beaufort Street are also new but are to a traditional swan neck design that complements the street. More contemporary lamp posts of stainless steel designs are present on the main thoroughfares of King’s Road and Fulham Road. Dudmaston Mews has some Victorian style wall mounted lanterns which complement and contribute to the character of this service road that serves the hospital buildings to Fulham Road.

4.17 The road signage is varied ranging from the modern to the historic. The modern steel signs have a white background with the wording picked out in black and the name of the borough in red along with the postcode. These are usually attached to residential railings, walls and onto the sides of buildings. Older signage is also present and makes a considerable contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The cast iron signage can be found on the side of no. 125 Old Church Street, no. 26 Elm Park Road, the flank wall of no. 18 The Vale, no. 32 Chelsea Park Gardens, the flank wall of no. 115 Beaufort Street and no. 354 King’s Road. This comprises black painted signs with white border and road name picked out in white paint.

4.18 There are three red painted pillar boxes in the area which can be found in these locations:
- South Parade adjacent to no. 4 Chelsea Square
- Manresa Road outside no. 15 (former public library)
- Beaufort Street opposite no. 15 Chelsea Park Gardens

4.19 These long established traditional cast iron pillar boxes make a positive contribution to the streetscape are all in a good state of repair and regularly painted.

4.20 Cast iron street bollards are few in number and comprise three designs. Fluted columns with oversailing cap, such as the one on the corner of Dudmaston Mews with Fulham Road; modern heritage bollards which are more squat and decorative with the initials RBKC emblazoned in gold on the front, such as those found in Dovehouse Street close to the junction with Cale Street; and the more traditional Victorian style cannon and ball design, such as the one located...
outside St. Andrews Church on Chelsea Park Gardens.

4.21 There are a fine variety of cast iron coal hole covers within the pavements outside many of the terraced houses where coal was delivered to the vaults beneath. Good examples of which can be seen outside the terraced houses at the north end of Beauford Street, Elm Park Road, The Vale and Carlyle Square.

4.22 Doorknockers, letter plates, balcony rails, bootscrapers and pot guards represent some of those delightful details which not only complete the appearance of a building but also contribute to its period character. These elements make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
Coal hole cover

Bootscraper, Old Church Street

Bootscraper, Elm Park Road

Decorative pot guard, Elm Park Road
4.23 The conservation area is made up of various short and medium views that are constantly changing as one travels through the area. The only building which is seen in longer distance views is St. Andrews Church which terminates the view looking north along Park Walk from the King’s Road. The church spire can also be seen from different vantage points along Beaufort Street rising above the rooftops of the houses in between.

4.24 Medium distance views can be enjoyed along many of the terraces, detached and semi-detached houses that line the streets. Some good examples of these can be found in The Vale with the London Plane trees and Beaufort Street looking across the communal garden onto nos. 4-30 (even) Chelsea Park Gardens and along Elm Park Lane and Henniker Mews. Another attractive view can be had from Fulham Road and South Parade across the trees and monuments of the Western Synagogue Cemetery particularly those looking west towards the decorative red brickwork of the Chelsea Hospital for Women, no. 237 Fulham Road.

4.25 Short vistas within the conservation area are confined to short streets looking onto buildings in other streets that bisect them. These are welcome end stops in the townscape, but were not generally planned and often the houses sit off-centre rather than being framed symmetrically. Good examples of these can be seen in and around Chelsea Park Gardens; Mulberry Walk looking west onto The Vale; Mallord Street looking west onto no. 27 The Vale; views looking north along the east side of Chelsea Square onto The Nurses’...
Accommodation block along South Parade; views looking west along the north end of Carlyle Square onto nos. 119 and 121 Old Church Street, and views looking north along the eastern and western sides of Carlyle Square.

4.26 Views looking into and out of the conservation area offer similar effects, such as the views looking south along Sumner Place onto the Royal Marsden Hospital, Callow Street looking south onto nos. 10 and 12 Elm Park Road and Selwood Terrace looking south onto the former The Queen’s Elm public house and Chelsea Cross at the north end of Old Church Street.

4.27 Other attractive views are obtained across Carlyle Square, Chelsea Square and Queen’s Elm Square through the well tendered communal gardens onto the houses that surround the squares. These gardens can also be appreciated from adjoining streets where they create a welcome verdant green break within the streetscape.

4.28 Many views along the front elevations of terraces allow their architectural compositions to be fully appreciated and make a positive contribution to the area, such as the Victorian terraced houses in Elm Park Road, the north end of Beaufort Street and the terraced houses around Chelsea Square.

4.29 Views of rear elevations of terraces also make a positive contribution. They show a distinct rhythm of closet wings, such as the rears of nos. 15-31 (odd) Park Walk, nos. 6-24 (even) Elm Park Road and nos. 86-122 (even) Beaufort Street. More formal rear elevations also make a pleasing vista, such as the rears of nos. 29-39 (consec) Carlyle Square with their mature gardens as seen from Old Church Street, and nos. 63-68 (consec) Chelsea Square looking north from the eastern and western sides of the square.
View looking south along nos. 293-299 (odd) King’s Road

View looking south onto The Royal Marsden Hospital from Sumner Place

View along nos. 50-68 (even) Elm Park Road

Western Synagogue Cemetery
5 Negative Elements and Opportunities for Enhancement

5.1 The area is well conserved with houses, shops and gardens which are generally well maintained with the streets clean and in good repair. Very few buildings actually have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area and it is generally the smaller changes and development to the existing residential properties, shops and institutional buildings that can cause harm.

5.2 Common alterations to buildings that have caused harm in the area include:

5.3 The attachment of wires, burglar alarms, plumbing, TV aerials, vents, flues and lights to the exterior of buildings. These create unsightly clutter if not sympathetically located.

5.4 Heavy weather struck pointing of brickwork creating larger joints, hard straight edges and shadow gaps making buildings appear darker and placing visual emphasis on the joint rather than the brick. Unsympathetic re-pointing in the past has seen the loss of original forms such as struck, tuck and flush pointing.

5.5 The cleaning of brick buildings can be harmful to their appearance as the fabric can be damaged and the attractive patina of age lost. Terraces which have individual houses that have been heavily cleaned and/or have been unsympathetically re-pointed stand out and result in a less harmonious groups to the detriment of the conservation area.

5.6 The buildings within the area were not intended to have painted masonry finishes. Today many houses have been painted. In some cases where the whole terrace was painted many years ago in a consistent scheme this has become part of the street's character. However, in other places, where individual houses have been painted in a brick terrace or have introduced garish colour schemes to a terrace or a group they have harmed the uniformity and appearance of the conservation area.
5.7 Some replacement windows have introduced modern designs and materials, such as uPVC and aluminium. These have little regard to the original joinery which they have replaced. They do not replicate the profiles and more delicate elements, such as glazing bars or leaded windows. Double glazing of larger one-over-one sash windows result quite often in distortion of the panes in different atmospheric conditions drawing undue attention in the street scene. Similar harmful installations are the use of glass that has a tinted appearance. Both double glazing and ‘tinted’ glass appear as discordant elements in a uniform terrace and harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

5.8 Some original doors have also been replaced. Although the replacement doors tend to be of timber construction they are usually poorly detailed and do not respect the quality and design of the ones they have replaced which were originally heavily moulded. In some instances, the door frames have also been removed and replaced so that the reveal can accommodate more modern standard sized doors to the detriment of the terrace or house.

5.9 Roof extensions that either stand alone in a group of unaltered roofs or that have different designs have a negative impact on the appearance of the buildings and the street scene.

5.10 Exposed plant at roof level adds unsightly clutter and breaks the roof line. Additional clutter is also caused by roof terraces which attract elements such as tables, chairs, railings, trellis, umbrellas and patio heaters all of which can be harmful.

5.11 Front entrance steps have been rebuilt or refaced and sadly many original stone or tile finishes have been lost. Modern finishes, such as standard metric sized tiles, marble, bitumen
or concrete are harmful to the quality and character of the conservation area.

5.12 Lightwells are a feature that is part of the public realm and structures or clutter within these, or modern coal cellars and basement doors, can be seen to harm the character of the conservation area as well as the setting of individual houses.

5.13 The introduction of new basement levels to some of the houses has seen the introduction of a number of unsympathetic rooflights to the street frontage. These draw undue attention highlighting the presence of a new basement as well as adding visual clutter to the street harming the character and appearance of the conservation area.

5.14 The creation of off road parking spaces within front gardens or rear gardens with the loss of boundary treatments creates unsightly gaps within the street and turns soft landscaping into hard forecourts to the detriment of the conservation area. Likewise, the insertion of garage doors within boundary walls also harms the historic appearance of a street.

5.15 The loss of original parts of buildings, in particular features that match in a group of buildings such as cornice mouldings, architrave surrounds and railings, have a detrimental impact on the conservation area.
Insertion of garage through front façade

Removal of front boundary for creation of off street parking

Roof terrace and associated clutter

Modern tile coverings to stone steps

Insertion of garage through front façade

Replacement windows and insertion of garage

Rooflights to front gardens draw attention to basement extensions
Appendix 1: History

6.1 The origins of what is now Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area can be found in the popularity of the little village of Chelsea. By the beginning of the seventeenth century the village and its churches had been augmented by a number of grand houses, among them King Henry VIII’s manor house at the east end of Cheyne Walk and Beaufort House, once the home of Sir Thomas More. As the century progressed, more and more dwellings sprang up along the river and also inland, notably northwards up Church Lane (now Old Church Street) to the Rose Tavern on King’s Road to Chelsea and northwards across King’s Road along Lover’s Walk to the ‘Goat in Boots’ on “the road from Little Chelsea to Knightsbridge”, now Fulham Road. Church Lane itself continued northwards along ‘Duke’s Walk’ to the Queen’s Elm under which Queen Elizabeth I is reputed to have Sheltered from the rain with Lord Burghley. Whatever the truth of the story, the “Queen’s Tree” was recorded in the Parish Books as early as 1586 when an arbour was planted around it, possibly the Nine Elms given as an address in Chelsea as late as 1805. Another lane connecting King’s Road with Fulham Road was evident by the middle of the eighteenth century roughly where Dovehouse Street runs today.

6.2 Between Duke’s Walk and Lovers’ Walk were the ‘Sands Hill’ which had formed part of Sir Thomas More’s estate in the early sixteenth century. On James Hamilton’s Map of Chelsea in 1664 the area was called Lord Wharton’s Park. Lord Wharton gave up his property in 1714 and some four years later Chelsea Park, as the ‘Sand Hills’ came to be called, was purchased to form a mulberry garden by a company with

Fig 6.1: Davie’s map of 1841
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a patent for the manufacture of raw silk. The climatic conditions and soil were apparently suitable for the planting of mulberry trees. The venture however proved unsuccessful, as did another by a Flemish engraver, Christopher Le Blon, who set up a factory for the purpose of weaving tapestries based on seven Raphael cartoons. These cartoons, which remain in Royal ownership, were put on display at the South Kensington Museum (now the Victoria and Albert Museum) in the middle of the last century and are still amongst the greatest treasures on view today.

6.3 Piece by piece Chelsea Park was cut away for building purposes. Park Walk was developed from Lovers’ Walk in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Camera Square and its surrounding area in the early part of the nineteenth century.

6.4 The area in the early years of the nineteenth century had several places of vice and intrigue. Camera Square is referred to in relation to an ‘amusing account of permissive Chelsea during the 1830s. Apparently one citizen wrote to the local press complaining about ‘a heavy headed debaucher’ named Old Chambers:

“… this obscene old wretch is in the habit of bringing home five or six women who he hires at two shillings and sixpence per head per night who all and everyone of them strip, chemises and all, and dance and revel until the morning’s dawn with this old sinner.”
6.5 Nos. 125, 127 and 129 Old Church Street were apparently occupied as brothels and as clearing houses for the white slave traffic.

6.6 By the middle of the nineteenth century, Park Walk/Lovers’ Walk had “degenerated into Twopenny Walk…” After dark from its retirement and seclusion (the area) was dangerous for persons passing that way. St Andrew's Parish Church in Park Walk marks the site where Park Chapel used to stand. The Chapel was provided by Sir Richard Manningham in 1718 as a place of worship in addition to what is now Chelsea Old Church in the original village. Its replacement dates from 1913.

6.7 The conservation area’s frontage to King’s Road was almost entirely built up with villas, terraces, and public houses by the 1830s. It was at this time that King’s Road ceased to be a private highway. As the century progressed development intensified with properties being extended over forecourts and industrial premises springing up behind. An exception, and the only part to survive redevelopment to widened frontage lines from the turn of the century onwards, is Carlyle Square. This is shown as a proposal on Thompson’s admirable map with end terraces facing King’s Road and flanking terraced houses around the Square. Built by the Cadogan Estate and named Oakley Square after a courtesy title of Earl Cadogan, the King’s Road terraces make their great statement but facing each other rather than the main road. It was not until 1855 that the next houses were erected, villas north of the western terrace exhibiting minor differences in architectural detail. Variety is also to be found in the properties at the
northern end of the Square. The remainder are 'semis' with consistent Italianate details, finishing the Square by 1867. The Square was renamed Carlyle Square after Thomas Carlyle, the essayist and historian, who lived at no. 24 Cheyne Row from 1834 until his death in 1881.

6.8 Chelsea Square to the north took even longer to develop. Laid out originally as Trafalgar Square, its north side and the north end of the eastern side were developed by 1836, but only one additional home on the eastern side was completed in time for the Ordnance Survey of 1865. By the turn of the century development was still low key, the southern half of the square being flanked by two large houses and by joinery works and a stone yard.

6.9 In the latter half of the nineteenth century Chelsea Park was further eroded by the development of Elm Park Road and Elm Park Lane; the last vestiges of the Park together with the mansion had disappeared under the “dreadful red and grey hideosities of Elm Park Road and Gardens” by 1894. Properties in Camera Square were demolished to allow the gradual extension of Beaufort Street across King’s Road to join up with Fulham Road. Concern that those less well off could no longer afford to live in Chelsea prompted the building of Chelsea Park Dwellings in 1885 as a charitable foundation managed by a limited company set up for that purpose. The majority of the Dwellings had no electricity apparently until the 1970s, when they survived development plans and were refurbished.
6.10 South of Chelsea Park there existed a cul-de-sac known as The Vale, communicating with King’s Road. It contained four houses, all of which are shown on Thompson’s Map of 1836. According to the Survey of London in 1913 “with their trees and charming gardens they served to remind the visitor of a Chelsea that is now almost gone.”

6.11 This particular area, in contrast to Camera Square, was well discussed at the time in relation to its aesthetic charm and famous patronage. B.E. Martin in 1889 wrote “turning down a rural lane we stroll into The Vale and find a clump of cottages, covered with vines grown about with greenery, flowers blow, cocks crow, an air of country unconcern covers the enclosure.”

6.12 By the end of the nineteenth century Chelsea was the acknowledged arts quarter of London largely because its picturesque riverside, old church and red brick houses appealed to those who rejected the then modern architecture of the stucco terraces of Bayswater and Pimlico. One of the earliest purpose-built studio houses, designed for George Price Boyce by Philip Webb, still stands at no. 35 Glebe Place and its influence on much of what is now Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area is clear. In an account of a meeting between Whistler and the young William Rothenstein we find Whistler admitting disappointment with “long King’s Road… a shabbier Oxford Street.” But he, like many other artists, was captivated by the riverside and its beautiful houses, by the Physic Gardens and The Vale. “The Vale,” he writes, “was then really a vale.”
6.13 At no. 1 The Vale lived William de Morgan, the novelist and potter, and his wife Evelyn, a painter in the pre-Raphaelite tradition. Whistler lived at no. 2 from 1886-1890 and when he left it became the home of two artists, Charles Ricketts and Charles Shannon, whom Oscar Wilde frequently visited.

6.14 While the street pattern in the northern sector of the conservation area had been established by the 1890s, substantial development was still to come in the southern sector with the elongation of The Vale, which eventually joined Elm Park Road, and the building of Mallard Street and Mulberry Walk between 1910 and 1925. The Vale was developed by The Vale Estates Limited over Stanley Works, Camera Gardens and a paddock formerly belonging to Vale Grove. Mallard Street earned its name from the painter, J.M.W. Turner. Mulberry Walk is a reminder of a silkworm farm.

6.15 The development of this area had been described as “intended for occupation by artists, architects, musicians, writers and professional people of modest means.” Many large studios were incorporated and design ingenuity was frequently directed at concealing their existence from the streets. No. 5 Mulberry Walk, home of Arild Rosenkrantz, the stained glass artist, is a good example. Occasionally artists drew up the specification for their own houses, as did Arthur C. Mitchell for his house ‘Vale End’ at no. 32 Mallard Street, designed for him by Charles R.G. Hall ERIBA in 1913. In relation to this particular area E. Burnett in “London Lives On” (1948) wrote, “Chelsea, traditionally an artists’ quarter, retains its fascination for painters and sculptors. It may be imagined that they sauntered through the quiet shade of Mulberry Walk which is close to Mallard Street, brooding upon their work or exchanging reminiscences and problems. Their fame adds lustre to streets and squares.”

6.16 That part of Old Church Street which runs through the conservation area was also considerably redeveloped at this time. No. 143 is the home of the Chelsea Arts Club, a focus for the arts in Chelsea, which celebrated its centenary in 1991. No. 117 Church Street designed by Halsey Ricardo and built in 1914 is one of the more luxurious houses erected since the turn of the century. By this time the shops at nos. 243-267 (odd) Fulham Road had been redeveloped to a symmetrical design while The Queen’s Elm public house on the Old Church Street corner followed after the war.

6.17 Further east, the most significant developments were those associated with hospitals and with education. Along with the development of medical care in the late eighteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries, and of hospital design more notably following Florence Nightingale’s scathing report in 1871, was the growing realisation that special provision was required for women. Doctors Aveling and Chambers opened the Chelsea Hospital for Women in the latter’s own house on King’s Road in 1871. Overcrowding and royal patronage ensured the rapid development at the hospital so that the organisation moved twice to new purpose-built premises, to Fulham Road in 1883 and again to the current buildings in what is now Dovehouse Street in 1916. The nurses’ homes at the Britten Street corner was planned at the same time but not built until 1925.

6.18 A free library for the Borough of Chelsea had been erected on garden ground in Manresa Road in 1890. This lively and robust palazzo was soon joined by the Polytechnic Institute, later Chelsea College and now part of King’s College, University of London, in similar style.

6.19 After the First World War, the houses which form Chelsea Park Gardens were built on the site of Camera Square. Smaller in scale, their appearance is similar to that of small suburban villas. Clearly the promoters esteemed Norman Shaw and the Garden suburb movement. Particularly worthy of attention is the studio house, standing at the junction of Beaufort Street and the southern arm of Chelsea Park Gardens, which was occupied by Sir Alfred Munnings. The tradition of the area being the home and workplace of noted people in the world of art and letters continues to this day.

6.20 Perhaps the single most interesting artistic event in the area took place on 24 January 1922 in the drawing room of no. 2 Carlyle Square, the home of Osbert and Sacheverell Sitwell and their friend, the composer William Walton. This was the first performance of ‘Facade’, the collaboration between Walton and Edith Sitwell intended to fuse music and poetry into an equal partnership. To eliminate the personalities of the performers the piece has been given behind a specially-designed curtain; that for Carlyle Square, as well as for public and private performances in 1922 and 1923 and the several Chenil Gallery performances in 1926, was
painted by Frank Dobson, whose studio was in Manresa Road.

6.21 Trafalgar Square was redeveloped as Chelsea Square in the 1930s to designs by Darcy Braddell. Generally, three stores in a warm purple-brown brick with roofs of glazed green tiles and elegant classical door surrounds, these properties have a greater formality and stiffness than their predecessors in Mallord Street, Mulberry Walk and The Vale. Differing plan forms show a variety of interesting design approaches to the emerging problem of car parking. Garages are created in rear yards, in frontage coach houses, or in central courts.

6.22 The two Modern Movement houses on Old Church Street, completed around the end of 1936, were designed together for their site with kitchen offices linking them along the street frontage but with no division in the garden behind. That at nos. 66 and 68, by Gropius and Fry for Ben Levy and his wife, Constance Cummings, has been greatly altered, notably by the filling-in of a second floor balcony and by the cladding of the exterior. The major alteration to no. 64 (by Mendelsohn and Chaermayeff for a young couple, friends of the Levy’s) concerns the conservatory on its southern façade, which happily leaves the street frontage largely undisturbed. In both house, fixtures, fittings and internal decoration were all conceived as an integral part of the whole.

6.23 Chelsea Park Carlyle Conservation Area’s remarkable and instructive sequence of semi-formal housing schemes ends with the post-war redevelopment of Manresa Park and Dovehouse Street. The first and largest post-war project was the Dovehouse Street terraces designed by Austin Blomfield. The main sections, nos. 53-111 (odd), combined houses, parking, garaging, studios and front gardens in a traditionally Chelsea manner. At either end it is flanked by more modern schemes, that at nos. 23-51 (odd) Dovehouse Street being conceived around a courtyard and linked up to nos. 1-5 (consec) Manresa Road by a sunken rear garage court. The architect was Basil Hughes.
Appendix 2: Historic England Guidance

Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management: Historic England Advice Note 1 (2016)

This guidance sets out ways to manage change in a way that conserves and enhances historic areas through conservation area designation, appraisal and management.


The checklist below has been taken from this publication and has helped to identify the buildings that make a positive contribution to the historic and architectural character of the conservation area.

- Is the building the work of a particular architect or designer of regional or local note?
- Does it have landmark quality?
- Does it reflect a substantial number of other elements in the conservation area in age, style, materials, form or other characteristics?
- Does it relate to adjacent designated heritage assets in age, materials or in any other historically significant way?
- Does it contribute positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets?
- Does it contribute to the quality of recognisable spaces including exteriors or open spaces with a complex of public buildings?
- Is it associated with a designed landscape eg a significant wall, terracing or a garden building?
- Does it individually, or as part of a group, illustrate the development of the settlement in which it stands?
- Does it have significant historic association with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature?
- Does it have historic associations with local people or past events?
- Does it reflect the traditional functional character or former uses in the area?
- Does its use contribute to the character or appearance of the area?

Additional criteria set by the Council:

- Does the building have architectural, historical, archaeological, evidential, artistic or communal significance that contributes to the character or appearance of the conservation area?
- Has the building retained its original design, materials, features and setting or ones that are appropriate to its style and period?
- Does it contribute to the evolution and diversity of the conservation area?
- Was it built by an important local builder or one who also built other significant buildings in the area?

Conservation and Energy Efficiency

Historic England have produced useful guidance on how homeowners can improve energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions whilst still respecting the historic and architectural significance of their properties. For more information follow this link:

https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/your-home/saving-energy/
**Appendix 3: Relevant Local Plan Policies**

The table opposite indicates those policies in the Royal Borough’s Local Plan, which have particular relevance to the preservation and enhancement of the conservation area.

These policies are the primary means through which the Council ensures that proposed development within designated conservation areas preserve or enhance the area’s character and appearance.

This list is not comprehensive and any development proposals will have to take account of the whole suite of policies contained within the Council’s Local Plan. Please consult the Council’s website.

### Chapter 33: An Engaging Public Realm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR4</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR5</td>
<td>Parks, Gardens, Open Space and Waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR6</td>
<td>Trees and Landscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 34: Renewing the Legacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL1</td>
<td>Context and Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL2</td>
<td>Design Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL3</td>
<td>Heritage Assets – Conservation Areas and Historic Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL4</td>
<td>Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL6</td>
<td>Small Scale Alterations and Additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL7</td>
<td>Basements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL8</td>
<td>Existing Buildings – Roof Alteration/Additional Storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL9</td>
<td>Existing Buildings – Extensions and Modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL10</td>
<td>Shopfronts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL11</td>
<td>Views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL12</td>
<td>Building Heights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>