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
1.5 Kensington Square Conservation Area was first designated on 28 January 1968. It was the second conservation area in the Royal Borough and one of the earliest in the country. The designated area included not only the square itself but the buildings in Ansdell Terrace and South End from the outset. The conservation area was extended on 17 October 1979 to include the former Barkers, and Derry and Toms department stores in Kensington High Street whilst the remainder of Abbots Court was added in 1980 and Young Street in 1983.

1.6 The conservation area is one of very high quality and great conservation value in recognition of which, almost all of the buildings around the square are listed as are the former department stores with the former Derry and Toms (nos. 99-121 (odd)) being listed at the higher grade II*. The area is also interesting due to the number of illustrious and notable people who have lived here, some of whom are celebrated with blue plaques (see History section and www.historicengland.org.uk for more information).

1.7 Garden square development is a key feature in the architectural history of London as a whole and Kensington Square was the first square to be built outside the centre of London and it is the sixth oldest square in the capital, after Bloomsbury, Leicester, Red Lion and Soho Squares and Lincoln’s Inn Fields. Kensington Square was laid out by Thomas Young in 1685 and some of the houses were built by him and some by others. The last houses to be built were in the north-west corner, nos. 33-35 (consecutive) in the 1730s. The original houses were probably built to two storeys in brick with a garret but they were all extended and some refronted or even rebuilt predominantly between the late eighteenth century and the early part of the nineteenth century. The two houses which have retained a likeness to their early ‘William and Mary’ appearance are nos. 11-12.
1.8 Redevelopments in the 1870s include the Queen Anne Revival houses and the Chapel and Convent of the Assumption, although the convent (but not the chapel) was built on land that was part of an earlier bowling green and ‘Spring Garden’ and didn’t cause any demolitions. This site has its own separate character comprising the historic Gothic convent buildings, trees and green space, of which the latter echoes the historic garden.

1.9 The square as seen today along with its houses and trees form a very attractive grouping with a strong sense of historic character in which the small variations between the houses combine in a harmonious way displaying approximate uniformity whilst retaining an interesting degree of individuality. The trees offer a foil to the houses and an ever changing veil through which they can be glimpsed to a greater or lesser degree depending on the time of the year.

1.10 Outside the square, the character varies hugely from the large former department stores and their striking, stone-clad, Art Deco designs to the smaller stock brick buildings of South End with its village centre character. South of the square the houses were smaller and developed opportunistically, some being converted from stables (South End) and others being built in back gardens (Ansdell Terrace).

1.11 The conservation area has great heritage significance and the buildings and features within deserve all efforts for preservation and enhancement of its historic and architectural character and appearance.
Location and Setting

1.12 Kensington Square is located in centre of Kensington in postcode area W8 and in the Royal Borough’s Queen’s Gate ward. It is surrounded on three sides by other conservation areas (Kensington, Kensington Palace, Kensington Court and De Vere) but to the west are late twentieth century flats and hotels that are not located in conservation areas.

1.13 Kensington Square is one of the earliest surviving parts of the borough having been built towards the end of the seventeenth century, however the surrounding development seen today is all of a later date with much of it also being taller. For example, the houses in De Vere Conservation Area were developed from the 1830s and the buildings on Kensington High Street and Kensington Court were built in the late Victorian period.

1.14 The upper storeys of the former Barkers department store and the hotels and flats to the south-west project undesirably above the rooftlines of the conservation area whereas elsewhere the roofscape of the square is the terminating feature with only sky above.

Fig 1.3: Conservation area context map
2 Townscape

Urban Form/Street Layout

2.1 Kensington Square was laid out in 1685 by Thomas Young and the surrounding streets (Derry Street, Young Street and South End) were all evolving at that time as part of Young’s scheme. The scheme was designed so that the ‘polite’ houses were set around streets overlooking a central square that could be used by the occupants of the houses.

2.2 Derry Street (originally King Street) and Young Street were smaller side streets, as they remain today, feeding into the late seventeenth century Kensington Square, the original housing having been lost to the department store buildings. South End gave access to the rear gardens and stabling for the houses on the square but related also to the village in this area. Ansdell Terrace is unusual as this terrace was built in the back gardens of nos. 11-13 (consec) and was intended as artisan flats relating to the lower status area behind the square. Thackeray Street was laid out in 1900-01 thus creating a third access in and out of the square, but the fourth corner was definitively blocked with arrival of the railway in 1866 and the growth of the convent.

2.3 The grain of the building plots is mostly fairly regular, although the houses are not all the same width or height, but their character as terraced development with gardens to the front and rear is homogenous. Houses are three or four storeys high with the late Victorian buildings being taller. The varied rooflines around the square form an important part of the character of the conservation area in contrast with the uniform parapet roofline to the houses in Ansdell Terrace which are key in this part of the area.

2.4 To the north of the square, the character changes dramatically with the two large detached department stores that tower over the square and create an unfortunate setting on the north side, particularly where the stores have been extended. Their impact is concentrated on the High Street where their large footprint is in keeping with the commercial character.
There are a surprising number of uses in the conservation area given its small size. When built, Kensington Square was intended for residential housing only and today this remains an important feature of its character. However, this domestic use has been threatened over the years, firstly by private schools, most of which have reverted to residential use; and perhaps more harmfully, by the proximity to the department stores on the High Street. Barker and Company once owned a third of the houses on the square which they either used for offices, staff flats or for development in the back gardens.

Today some offices remain. Heythrop College occupies buildings next to the Maria Assumpta Chapel and former convent with a large garden joining them. No. 13 is clearly in office use and this has an impact on the character of the conservation area by not having a domestic-style front garden with hedging, planting and railings, as well as having office furniture and lighting visible through the windows. As a positive contrast, no. 16 Kensington Square, which used to be the Maltese High Commission, retains its domestic features and character without being visually intrusive.

The east side of the square contains the greatest variety of uses beginning in Young Street with offices and a cafe and continuing along the square with a pub, a former mews and finishing with mansion flats containing shops and cafes at ground floor. South End originally contained stables and the Gothic building on the south side had a use associated with the convent for which it was built.

Gardens form an important land use in the conservation area, not only the garden square itself, but also the front and back gardens which consist mostly of undeveloped land available for
planting, nature and outdoor enjoyment by home owners. Gardens are a key feature of terraced housing and make an important contribution to the character of the conservation area.

Fig 2.3: Present day land use map
Green Spaces

2.9 Green space and planting make an extremely important contribution to the character of the conservation area as it is not only an essential part of the original design of the area, but an attractive foil to the hard architecture as well as an environmental habitat.

2.10 Behind the houses are long gardens that create a similar lush and verdant setting that is of great importance to the balance of the conservation area, but some gardens have been incongruously curtailed due to department store development on the north side and development to the west.

The Garden Square

2.11 The square was originally built without railings and was freely accessible but enclosed when the department stores began encroaching on the square (see History).

2.12 The garden square is the focus of the development and is one of the earliest such squares in London and the first in Kensington. Its purpose and appearance remain just as important today and it is still surrounded by high status houses that overlook the changing beauty of a planted area which in turns creates a soft, natural setting that contrasts with the hard building materials. The square has a very open character which brings it all the more into the public realm with people walking through the square being able to view it as well as the users.

2.13 Mature London Plane (Platanus × hispanica) trees line the edge of the square and a gravel path runs around its perimeter with mixed borders being laid out in the centre and at the corners where there are benches for contemplation. Further into the square there are good examples of Tulip Tree (Lirodendron tulipifera) and Weeping Ash (Fraxinus excelsior ‘pendula’). On the east side of the garden you can find a venerable Indian Bean tree (Catalpa

Fig 2.4: Green spaces aerial photo (2015)

© Getmapping PLC 2015
bignonioides) that has half fallen and has been successfully propped up for many years.

**The Roof Gardens**

2.14 A highly unusual piece of green space is the roof garden at the former Derry and Toms building. See also *Derry and Toms* in the *Kensington High Street* section.

2.15 The roof gardens are divided into three areas each containing mature and semi-mature trees. The woodland garden has examples of mature English and Red Oak (*Quercus robur* and *Quercus rubra*); Hornbeam (*Carpinus betulus*) and Silver Birch (*Betula pendula*) which are amongst the largest trees in this garden.

2.16 The Spanish garden has numerous small Cypress and Olive (*Cupressus & Olea*) trees growing either side of the long water feature with Chusan palms (*Trachycarpus fortuneii*) growing at the north end of this garden.

2.17 The Tudor garden possibly has the lowest number of trees of the three but many of these such as Limes and Liquidambars are relatively young and will mature into fine specimen. There are excellent mature climbing shrubs such as Wisteria growing along the walls here.

**The Former Convent of the Assumption**

2.18 The site of the former Convent of the Assumption has the largest open space other than Kensington Square recalling the presence hereabouts of Thomas Young’s bowling green and ‘Spring Garden’. Mature trees and lawns form an important part of its character with larger specimen overhanging the adjacent underground railway line. Along with many fine Plane trees are good examples of black and white Mulberry (*Morus nigra* and *Morus alba*) as well as a very good example of the uncommon Cork Oak (*Quercus suber*).

2.19 See also *The Former Convent of the Assumption* in the *Kensington Square* section and building descriptions in the *South Side* section.
Gaps

2.20  The buildings in the conservation area are tightly packed with the only space between buildings being the roads and gardens. Spaciousness in the conservation area is provided mainly by the garden square, the grounds of the former convent and the front and rear gardens to the houses. Where garden walls are located next to pavements an important gap is created in the streetscape and these are seen in Derry Street and Ansdell Terrace.

2.21  Views of open sky above the houses prevent the conservation area from feeling overcrowded and this is only compromised on the north side of the square by the extensions to the former Barkers department store and a little to the south-west from the taller hotels and flats beyond the conservation area boundary. The single storey garage at the end of Ansdell Terrace allows views of rear gardens and greenery.

2.22  Gaps between the rears of the former department stores and the houses have a negative impact as they are busy open tarmacked spaces with noisy uses that contribute negatively to the domestic character of the square.

Fig 2.5: Important townscape gaps map
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Gap between nos. 35 and 36 Kensington Square

Gaps at end of Ansdell Terrace

Heythrop College garden

Garden Square
Materials and Finishes

2.23 Materials used in the construction of the historic buildings within the conservation area are either natural ones such as slate and stone (used sparingly) or traditionally and locally manufactured ones such as brick (the predominant building material), stucco and glass. Their original method of manufacture results in a finish that is typical of traditional building materials. The imperfections in cylinder glass and folds/wrinkles in hand made bricks, along with the natural process of ageing and weathering, give the buildings their authentic historic character, patina of age and charm that makes the conservation area so special.

2.24 Traditional materials used in Kensington Square Conservation Area include:

- Stone (-facing materials to the former department stores, dressings, steps, paving slabs, coping stones to walls, but not used to front houses)
- Stucco (architectural ornamentation and render)
- Brick (mixture of hand made bricks in shades of red, brown, plum and yellow as well as yellow stock brick and red rubbers. Brick was used to build all the houses in the conservation area)
- Lime (mortar and stucco, a later addition to the houses)
- Slate, clay tile and lead (roofs)
- Painted timber (windows and doors)
- Painted cast or wrought iron (railings, balconies, pot guards, boot scrapers, bollards)
- Terracotta (chimney pots)
- Glass (thin crown or cylinder glass)

![Materials map (front elevations)](image)

**Fig 2.6: Materials map (front elevations)**

- Mosaic tiles (covering to some steps)
- Granite setts (surfacing in South End and kerb stones to the streets)
Painting

2.25  The appearance of the houses around Kensington Square changed a great deal in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries with brick houses being given additional storeys, roof extensions and stucco frontages. Many houses around the square have retained their fair faced brick frontages which is an extremely strong and important feature of the conservation area. However, those that were given stucco fronts have been painted.

2.26  In the late Georgian period stucco became commonly used to imitate natural English stone at a lower cost and was not necessarily painted at first, but initially given its colour by the sand in the mix and then limewashed at a later date. Usually the intention was to make good quality houses look like Bath or Portland stone, that is to say, either a pale browny-yellow colour as seen in the Royal Crescent in Bath or an off-white colour seen in stone quarried from the south coast and used in grand buildings. Historically these colourwashes were made from lime and natural pigments which gave a soft colouring whereas later synthetic colours (made from the 1950s onwards) such as brilliant white were much harsher and less appropriate for historic buildings. The only means of accurately discovering actual colours used on specific properties through history is through a process of research through deeds, historic records or paint and stucco analysis.

2.27  Of the stuccoed and painted houses in the conservation area, those whose colour most imitates stone contribute best to the harmonious character of the conservation area as they provide a recessive and sympathetic appearance based on historic finishes. Conversely, those whose colours fail to resemble Bath or Portland stone and draw attention to themselves, particularly in the use of modern, deep colours or patterned effects create inappropriately eye catching, individualised finishes which have an intrusive effect and are harmful to the historic and architectural character and appearance of the conservation area.

2.28  In South End, most of the houses are built in stock brick, however, one has been refronted in stone whilst no. 19 has had its bricks painted for some years. In 2016, this house was painted in red and white stripes and following enforcement action by the Council, the stripes were covered with plywood site hoarding. As this street is predominantly built in stock brick (as is no. 19), such insensitive painting (as well as the hoarding) is severely harmful to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area and draws attention to just one house rather than integrating with the historic townscape which here is predominantly fair-faced stock brick.

2.29  In Ansdell Terrace, the uniformity of the whole terrace is a key feature of this part of the conservation area and the stucco to every ground floor elevation is consistently painted white which enhances the terrace as a single entity, conceived as one coherent structure.
2.30 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
2.31 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
2.32 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
2.33 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
2.34 Negative buildings are those which are out of keeping with the prevailing character of the conservation area.
3 Architecture

3.1 Development of the conservation area spanned a long period between the laying out of Kensington Square in 1685 to the construction of the two former department stores in the 1930s. The architectural focus of the conservation area is the square with its Georgian and Victorian houses, but the character to the north and south varies considerably with the larger buildings on the High Street and lower-height, former stables on South End which are now small houses. The Maria Assumpta Chapel and former convent also create an area of separate character to the south-west of the square.

Kensington Square

3.2 The building of Kensington Square was the idea of wood carver and joiner, Thomas Young who bought the land for development in 1682 in a location that was then just a string of buildings along Kensington Road (now High Street) and surrounded by market gardens. More than twenty builders were involved in erecting the houses which proved hard to sell initially and must have been saved from failure by William and Mary choosing to relocate their palace here in 1689.

3.3 The houses were originally built in hand made brick that varied in colour from reds, browns and yellows giving an attractive texture. They were originally two storeys plus garret, but all have been extended upwards and some have been stuccoed in imitation of stone which was the fashion in the late Georgian period. Nos. 11-12 have been the least altered and give an idea of the appearance of the houses in William and Mary’s reign.

3.4 The houses are arranged in terraces around the square and each house is slightly different from the next creating pleasing historic variation whilst maintaining a complementary and composed architectural character. The general design of each house is between two and four windows wide with a parapet roofline, a half-basement and usually, a front door to one side accessed up a short flight of steps over the open front area. Partly due to roof additions, the houses vary in height although most are of three main storeys (over half-basement) and some are four storeys (over half-basement) although the flats are taller.
3.5 Due to the special architectural and historic interest of the buildings around the square, almost all are listed at grade II.

EAST SIDE

3.6 The east side of the square has a mixed character containing several different building types and uses starting with The Greyhound pub, then Baron Grant’s former stables, two Queen Anne Revival houses, terminating with the five storey Abbots Court flats with shops and a restaurant to the ground floor. This diversity makes a strong contribution to the life and architectural character of the conservation area.

3.7 No. 1 The Greyhound public house was built on the site of an earlier pub (of the same name, but different design) in 1899 to designs of architect, Mr Dobb and built for John Barker and Company. It was rebuilt again after a gas explosion in 1977 with the quality of the project being recognised by an Environment Award from the Royal Borough.

3.8 It is an attractive, deftly designed building with effective and controlled use of decoration. The most prominent features are the first floor shallowly splayed window bays with scrolled pediments and fluted pilasters. Windows have a narrow row of square panes to the top which are very distinctive and the second floor windows have brick gauged arches cut in an ogee shape and similarly designed aprons below. The roofline consists of a parapet that conceals the roof successfully with a decorative pediment that announces the dates and name of the pub as...
its crowing feature. Urn finials sit at either end of the parapet.

3.9 The pub frontage to the ground floor also repeats the reeded pilaster, small window pane and ogee apron motifs and is set between carved and polished red granite columns with stylised Ionic capitals and a wide fascia dividing the ground and first floors. The polished mahogany frontage projects out as a bay with curved glass to the sides over a curved polished granite plinth. The doors are set back from the central bay giving the frontage a lively appearance. Other important features include the hanging sign, large coaching lamps, mosaic entrance steps and welcoming hanging baskets.

3.10 No. 3 was built in 1874-75 as the entrance to the stables serving Kensington House, a huge mansion that was built for Baron Grant, both being designed by architect, James Knowles junior. The mews were accessed through the arch and consisted of sixteen stalls, four loose boxes and a large coach house. The frontage building that survives today was the coachman’s house.

3.11 It is built in gault brick with tuck pointing and Bath stone dressings although these have been painted which rather downgrades them to the appearance of stucco. The roof balustrade has been reinstated with anthemion acroterion and a decorative chimney stack can just be seen. Windows are plain sashes and the arch that had solid gates for years is now open again. The stables behind were demolished in the 1950s and modern offices now take their place around a courtyard.
3.12 No. 4 was built in 1837-38 on the site of the original house and the top storey was added in 1875 or 1883, years when additions were recorded to the house. The house is built in yellow brick (either stock or gault) brick and is one of the narrower houses, at two windows wide, but also taller at five storeys over half-basement. The windows are set in unadorned openings and are mostly Georgian paneled with the exception of those to the ground floor which are plain glazed sashes. The front door is four panelled and has a simple moulded stucco surround.

3.13 Nos. 5 and 6 were refronted and rebuilt (respectively) even later, in the 1870s, and in a style that completely departs from the early Georgian origins of the square. They were both built in the Queen Anne Revival style, to the designs of architect, Goldie and Childs who also designed the Convent of the Assumption buildings and the Maria Assumpta Chapel on the south side of the square. The owner of nos. 5 and 6 was John Horne Payne, a barrister and speculator who also commissioned the same architects to design no. 16. He lived at no. 20 and subsequently at no. 16.

3.14 No. 5 displays Horne Payne’s initials and the date 1876 in a stuccoed plaque to the third floor. This house is the larger and wider of the two and has slightly more detailing such as the wrought iron balcony, the stucco plaques, pediments over the windows, dentillation and a wider pediment at roof level. No. 6 (built 1877) is only two rooms deep but copies elements of the design such as the contrasting red brick
piers, gauged flat arches and keystone. The windows to the ground floor and second floor are particularly attractive with those to the ground floor being arched and both sets have decorative glazing bars to the upper panes. **No. 6** also has a charming Juliet balcony at first floor. These are two of the tallest houses in the conservation area but their distinctive rooflines mitigate their height and add joyfulness to the square.

**3.15** **No. 7** was first built in 1686, but almost comprehensively remodelled in 1808-09 and its frontage updated c.1850-60 although it is said to contain vestiges of the original house internally. Externally, its symmetrical stuccoed frontage has a Regency style, but the Survey of London (volume 42) suggests that at that time it might have had a frontage of five windows wide which was reduced to four in the mid-Victorian period - the bracketed cornices, single glazing bar windows and cast iron balcony railing all appear to be of this date. This is one of the few wide, symmetrical houses in the square. The rear elevation is also rendered and the back windows are of early nineteenth century style with narrow glazing bars. The changes to the front nonetheless form a coherent design that contributes positively to the character of the area.

**3.16** The east side of the square is terminated by a much later building, Abbots Court, a large red brick mansion flat block, which makes a great success of turning the corner into Thackeray Street with canted turrets on the corner and at each end of the block. As with other Queen Anne Revival buildings in the square, the block deviates from the prevailing Georgian character, but is of such high quality design and interest in its own right, that it makes a welcome and joyful contribution to the character of the square.

**3.17** See *Thackeray Street* for further details.
This side of the square bleeds into Thackeray Street beginning with nos. 11 and 12, the houses with the oldest outward appearance, and finishes with the commanding complex of buildings occupied partly by the Maria Assumpta Chapel, the Convent of the Assumption and Heythrop College. This side begins and ends with fair-faced brick houses, but contains a varied group of stuccoed and painted houses of different heights and widths as well as two Queen Anne Revival red brick houses; all of which create an interesting group in terms of their rooflines and elevations that is united behind front gardens of even depth and in places, pleasant planting.

Nos. 11 and 12 were most probably built between 1700-02 on what was then a parcel of waste land outside the original limits of the square, so it is ironic that they have survived more than others in the actual square in anything like their original appearance. No doubt it was due to this location that they weren’t required to follow the building line of the square and are set forward allowing two windows in the western flank.

They are a pair of houses built in red brick to three storeys plus dormer windows to the roof and a half-basement. Their style is known as Queen Anne or William and Mary and features characteristic of this include the high hipped roof with small dormers, tall chimneys, deep modillioned eaves, tall sash windows and carved wooden hoods over the doors (that to no. 12 is a copy). The stucco window surrounds were
probably added in the 1870s or early 1880s. The ground floor is stuccoed and there is a flat band between the first and second floor windows. The modillioned eaves continue around the right return, but not the left which has an altogether more sober elevation with a large unpierced expanse of brickwork that creates an appropriate transition into the square when approached from Thackeray Street. The fanlights and wooden door hoods over the four panelled doors are of great interest, however the setting of the houses is let down by the boundary to no. 11 and paving to both front gardens.

3.21 Names of illustrious possible residents are painted on the door hood to no. 11, although it is not certain they lived there. More information is given in Notable Residents in the History section.

3.22 No. 13 was built as a pair of houses in 1850 by builders, William Brass, the date being given on the roundel plaque on the front elevation along with the initials of the freehold owner, John Ebenezer Davis. In the late seventeenth century, this had been the largest house in the square and on rebuilding, the designer sought to give the impression of a single house again. The central porch is therefore wide so that it covers both entrances and the windows on both sides all match although the mismatched later mansard roofs harm this uniform mirroring. The deep modillion cornice divides the second floor from the original attic storey which was once terminated simply by a Classically flat and dignified parapet.

3.23 The first floor windows have a particularly unusual and attractive design as they are divided into three arches by Ionic columns and are surmounted by stuccoed panels containing large anthemion decorations which were a Classical motif representing honeysuckle that was made popular by Robert Adam in the late eighteenth century. The porch too has unusual fluted columns on the inside with Ionic capitals and a garland of fruit and flowers winding around them. The name, St James House was brought here when the houses were converted to offices in 1931, having been the name of the occupier’s former premises.

3.24 No. 14 was refronted in stucco, probably in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth centuries, but is basically the original house erected by William Cross under a long lease of June 1685. It has one of only three projecting porches in the square and is the only one with Roman Doric columns, hence this is an unusual later feature here. The Georgian-paned sash windows have no decorative surrounds and
the neat mansard of three windows was built

c.1975.

3.25 **No. 15** is similarly an original two window
wide house of 1685, to which a ‘modern’ red
brick Queen Anne Revival front was added in
1883 by builders Toten and Sons, probably
inspired by **no. 16**. The Georgian paneled sashes
have been given moulded brick architraves and
there is a broken pediment to one of the first
floor windows. The roofline has been given a
characteristic Queen Anne treatment with an

asymmetric gable and a similarly asymmetric
Juliet balcony has been added to one of
the second floor windows. The ground floor
elevation has an interesting design consisting of
brick pilasters topped with console brackets and
the late eighteenth century doorcase has been
reused resulting in a pleasant juxtaposition of
styles.

3.26 **No. 16** was rebuilt, again in a Queen
Anne Revival style in 1876 (date in pediment)
as a speculation by John Horne Payne (who
lived there between 1892-96) to the designs
of architects, Goldie and Child. It is similar to
**no. 5** on the east side by the same developer
and architect, being three windows wide with
a double tiered gable and the same balcony
balustrade to the first floor windows. However,
the details are slightly different and the biggest
divergence is in the design of the doorcase
which here has a prominent stucco surround and
a pair of double doors. The windows are nine-
over-nine paned except the French windows to
the first floor (which have a Celtic knot design in the upper panes) and the ground floor windows, which are twelve-over-twelve, have stained glass emblems in centrally positioned diamond shaped panes. The house has been partly rendered which makes it stand out even more in the street but harms the character of this distinctive style.

3.27 Nos. 17, 18 and 19 form a group of houses built c.1686, but altered in the mid-late eighteenth century. No. 17 was built by Thomas Young himself and is the largest at five windows wide, whilst nos. 18 and 19 are both three windows wide. When first built, all three houses would have been only two storeys with basements and garrets, but have not only been raised in height in the late eighteenth century, but were also rendered, probably at the same time. Nos. 17 and 18 have stucco architraves around the windows whilst no. 19 has none. Nos. 17 and 18 have had mansard roof extensions whereas no. 19 has an additional storey with a parapet concealing the roof form in line with its Classical idiom.

3.28 All three have good Georgian doors and doorcases: no. 17 has a cornice supported on brackets over a six panelled door; no. 18 has a particularly elegant door with two circular panels to the centre and an unusual rectangular overlight with vertical glazing bars; and no. 19 has a six panelled door with an Adamsesque fanlight and doorcase which has Ionic pilasters and a frieze of swags and roundels. This house also has especially good Georgian ironwork to the lightwell. No. 18 saw the founding of the Kensington Society.

3.29 No. 20 completes this stuccoed-fronted group albeit in a Victorian Italianate style. The house appears to have had a thorough recasting in 1850-1 although some earlier features have been reused such as the four-over-eight and eight-over-eight paned sash windows to the top two floors. It is the narrowest house in the group, the tallest and the only one to have a parapet roofline with no roof extensions visible above it. The ground and first floor windows have been given two-over-two paned sashes and French windows respectively and a bombé cast iron balustrade to the first floor (also seen on the north side of the square). Other additions include the stucco architraves, corbels and pediments to the windows as well as a row of pilasters to the ground floor that are interesting and unusual. The house shares a resemblance with no. 38 in its Italianate, stuccoed design which is located almost opposite on the north side of the square. Although the railings and front door are modern, there are large historic York stone slabs up
to the front door which are of great heritage significance.

3.30 The Maria Assumpta Chapel (nos. 21 and 22) was built in an early French Gothic style between 1870-1 to the designs of architects, Goldie and Child. It is built in stock brick with a symmetrical gable frontage, the upper level of which contains a large Bath stone rose window with an unusual design consisting of trefoils in plate tracery divided by colonettes. The main entrance, with oak double doors and decorative cast iron hinges, is also set under a gable and flanked by granite columns and crowned with a quatrefoil in a gothic arch. Red brick is used for several bands across the elevation as well as a half circle around the rose window and buttresses are incorporated into the design and joined by a row of moulded terracotta plaques.

3.31 The convent was established in London in 1859 at no. 23 which were a pair of very late Georgian houses built between 1837-39. The houses’ simple design in stock brick with six-over-six paned windows, simple parapet design and simple red brick dressings, can still be enjoyed, although the top windows to the left-hand building have been extended giving a top-heavy appearance to a house that is already one of the largest buildings on the square. The rendered gallery was added by Joseph Goldie in 1925 to link the convent’s buildings and caused the removal of the original stuccoed ground floor, entrances and windows. These can be seen in an early photograph of the houses on Plate 9 in the Survey of London (volume 42).

3.32 Attached to no. 23 is a large Gothic building that was built as an extension to the
convent and for a secondary school run by them. It was again designed by Goldie and Child and built in several stages in 1875-76, 1882 and 1888-89. It is a large attractive building constructed using the brick, terracotta and stone palette used in both the chapel and the former houses in a Gothic idiom. The view from Derry Street gives an important glimpse of its large, attractive slate roof with small dormer windows with scalloped barge boards and tall casement windows with delicate glazing bars and iron quatrefoil guards. To the rear, the design of the building can be enjoyed fully. Each row of windows has a different design with the half-basement having cambered heads, the first and second floor windows having pointed red brick arches and the third floor windows having flat heads. The ground windows are the most decorative with pointed arches containing particularly attractive tracery/foiled designs. All windows are casements that are divided into smaller panes by delicate glazing bars. The upper windows are divided by shallow mock buttresses leading to the eaves that are decorated with buff and red terracotta work.

3.33 To the west there is a full height wing to a similar design and beyond that one or two other extensions/structures that were constructed during the dates given above as part of the convent which form part of the character of the building as a whole and therefore the wider conservation area.

3.34 Today these buildings are occupied by Heythrop College and make a strong positive contribution to the historic and architectural character of Kensington Square Conservation Area.

3.35 See also subsequent section, The Former Convent of the Assumption.
3.36 The west side of the square has more uniformity and consistency than the other sides and most of the houses are of fair-faced yellow and red bricks with six-over-six paned sashes and much historic glass which gives a strong Georgian character. The building heights rise from a low three storeys at both ends to a harmonious four storeys in between. Delicate fanlights over panelled timber doors are a delightful feature of this side of the square as are the historic lamp overthrow.

3.37 No. 24 is one of the smaller houses in the conservation area and is occupied by the neighbouring college having been sold by the Convent of the Assumption. A house was erected here in the late 1680s and altered, as many others, in the eighteenth century, with the front door probably being moved to a new side section c.1790 and the house given a villa-like appearance with over-hanging eaves, tall first floor windows and wrought iron window baskets. The front door is a modern but in an appropriate six panelled design (although it should be painted), but the door case is historic and of high significance with a delicate fanlight, reeded surround and slim side lights.

3.38 The house was completely remodelled in 1960-62 for the convent and only the front section retained for its contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The modern side extension beyond the entrance section is of no significance and the boundary railings could be improved by a historic design.

3.39 No. 25 seems to have been erected around 1693-94 and additional storey(s) added in 1791 at which time the house was probably stuccoed too. In 1900, the house was bought by the Crown and let to Derry and Toms as a warehouse and staff dormitory and soon afterwards the cartway was cut through, destroying the principal rooms on the ground floor. The house now has a very flat frontage of modern render and multi-paned sash windows with architraves but the moulded timber door hood and the narrow entrance may date from 1693-94 and are of great significance. The door and fanlight are copies and their stripped, unpainted finish is harmful to the character of the house and the whole square, as pine was always painted and the bare wood has a vulgar appearance. The vehicular access through the ground floor has also harmed the features of the front elevation and is extremely harmful to the character of the square.

3.40 No. 26 was built between 1693-97 by John Kemp of St Martin-in-the-Fields, ‘woodmonger’, who also built nos. 28 and 29.
which also survive (no. 27 having been rebuilt). At two windows wide, it is the smallest of his houses and in contrast to the two previous houses, it is built in red and yellow brick with pale brick flat arches and a neat slated mansard roof extension with two Georgian paned sashes. Most other windows are also six-over-six, but those to the principal floor (the first floor) are four-over-four; and these, along with the handsome doorcase, delicate fanlight and six panel door; are all probably of late eighteenth century date. There is an iron overthrow with lantern and dagger headed railings to the boundary.

3.41 No. 27, the biggest house on the west side of the square, was entirely rebuilt in 1833-4 by George Todd of Chelsea, builder (the architect was probably John Crake), as premises for the Kensington Proprietary Grammar School for Boys. In its heyday, this school also occupied several neighbouring houses, but without rebuilding them. A passage in the basement which gave access to what were the playground and school room forms part of the historic interest of the building but is fortunately largely concealed from view. The building is of yellow brick, four Georgian paned windows wide and has a stucco band between the ground and first floor and a deep cornice below the tall attic storey, no doubt a later addition. As with other houses in the square, the entrance is of great interest and has a pair of doors with a delicate fanlight above in a semi-circular opening. The height of the raised ground floor and number of steps leading up to the door give the building an air of grandeur. The Victorian railings have a spear headed design.

3.42 No. 28 was erected by John Kemp in the mid-1690s and although it was extensively reconstructed c.1967, it displays features compatible with the 1690s style. The ground and first floor are built in red and yellow brick with tuck pointing and banding dividing the storeys whilst the upper floors have been rebuilt in yellow stock brick with gauged red brick flat arches over the windows. These have visible sash boxes that are almost flush with the masonry, a feature that was outlawed by the eighteenth century Building Acts, and therefore of great historic value today. The discreet mansard roof has two small timber dormer windows with three-over-three paned sashes. The six panelled door is slightly recessed in an arched opening with a panelled lining, slender pilasters with lions’ heads at the top and the fanlight dates from either 1814-15 or 1818-19. There is an iron overthrow with lantern to the boundary.
3.43 Behind no. 28 is a small building built in 1846, no. 27a, which was once used as classrooms and later workshops, but was converted to a dwelling in 1933 by architects, Sydney Tatchell and G.C. Wilson.

3.44 No. 29 was also erected by John Kemp in the mid 1690s and is similar in that its lower storeys are in red brick (with restored tuck pointing) and paler red brick dressings, and its upper storeys have been added in yellow brick and the windows are slightly larger. Again, the Georgian paned windows have visible sash boxes and red brick surrounds. The entrance is located centrally, an unusual feature, and perhaps a later change as the pilastered doorcase dates from the mid-to-late eighteenth century but it has been denuded of the leaves to its capitals and the low relief decoration to the frieze (see Survey of London, volume 42, plate 13a) which could be reinstated to enhance the character of the conservation area. The mansard is the largest on the west side of the square and gives the house a slightly top heavy appearance.

3.45 No. 30 was built around 1699 and in the 1750s became a boarding school for young ladies. The house was extensively remodelled in 1820 for Charles A. Hoare who must have added the iron balcony (with Greek Key design), the ground floor stucco (deeply incised to imitate stone) and his coat of arms, a double-headed eagle, to the door case and front elevation (as well as elsewhere inside the house). The French windows have delicate horizontal glazing bars and margin lights and the Georgian paned sashes have red brick surrounds. Again, the house has been extended upwards in yellow brick with gauged red brick flat arches. A deep stuccoed cornice finishes the elevation with a mansard above. Surviving early features include the red brick bands above the French windows, the red brickwork to the first floor and the decorated wrought iron overthrow on the boundary. The Survey of London (volume 42) says the rear elevation is well preserved and contains several early window frames and a closet wing.

3.46 No. 31 was built in 1699 then partly rebuilt in 1836-37 by builder, Isaac T. Couchman of Kensington who most probably updated the windows and added the channelled stucco to the ground floor. The gabled and tiled upper storeys probably date from 1882 when the house was bought by Charles Darwin’s son-in-law, Richard Buckley Litchfield. The apex originally displayed an iron sunflower finial. Litchfield bought the house which was larger than where he was living to make the Darwins’ visits more
comfortable, although Charles died before being able to take advantage. The rendering to the first floor is unusual but the simple Georgian window baskets for plants are of interest. The entrance is unusual on this side of the square in not having an arched fanlight, but instead a plain narrow one. There is a plain iron overthrow with lantern on the boundary.

3.47 No. 32 was built by 1708 when it was insured and then first occupied in 1709. It was altered c.1830 with the addition of stuccoed blockwork to the ground floor and a delicate Regency Gothic balcony balustrade under lengthened first floor French windows. Apart from the stucco, the front elevation is built in yellow brick with red brick dressings. All the windows (except ground floor and basement) have moulded stucco architraves and the floors are divided by stucco bands. The top floor was probably added c.1900 with a panelled/crenellated effect to parapet created by red brick quoins - a similar effect can be seen at no. 23 on the south side of the square. The mansard is a modern addition. There is a plain iron overthrow with lantern on the boundary as well as an early wrought iron surround to the gate.

3.48 The next group of houses, (i.e. no. 33-35 (consec)) were built in the 1730s and along with no. 36 (built 1721-23) were the last houses to be constructed in Young’s square.

3.49 No. 33 is only three storeys (plus mansard and half-basement) and was erected early in the 1730s, the freehold owner insuring the newly-built but still unoccupied house in July 1732. Again, the front has been altered: the stuccoed ground storey, the lengthening of the first-floor windows and the particularly delicate wrought iron balcony being doubtlessly early nineteenth century alterations. The mansard here is covered in clay tiles and has multi-paned casement windows instead of sashes and the plain parapet has been rebuilt in yellow stocks.

3.50 No. 34 rises to four storeys (plus half-basement) but without a mansard and was built under a long lease dated April 1737 to bricklayer, John Skynner of Kensington but was refronted probably in 1820. The simple doorcase consists of a moulded architrave flanked by carved acanthus leaf consoles under the first floor balcony which is of a delicate design and is supported on decorative cast iron brackets. All windows are six-over-six paneled except the French windows which have margin lights and a delicate wrought iron balcony.

3.51 No. 35 was also erected under a long lease dated 30 June 1737 and is a rare gem to which has been little altered externally. It is three
windows wide with six-over-six pained sash windows that have visible sash boxes, no horns and contain historic glass. The front door has six panels (the top two of which are glazed – this house is almost unique in the whole square in not having a fanlight of any sort) and a simple architrave topped with brackets and a cornice which is probably original. The small wrought iron plant baskets to the first floor windows probably date from the second half of the nineteenth century.

3.52 It is a shame that the bricks have been much obscured by what looks like cement before finishing with tuck pointing. The flank wall is rendered and painted cream and crowned by a complete set of fifteen red terracotta chimney stacks.

3.53 This small three storey house without a mansard roof at the end of the terrace not only mirrors the small scale of no. 24 at the southern end, but forms a charming corner to the square and suitably marks the narrow and discreet passage into Derry Street.

NORTH SIDE

3.54 The north side displays the variety in elevation and roofline treatment that is so characteristic of the square and contains the square’s only two storey house (plus mansard) at its east end as well as its tallest building at eight storeys (including the roof and basement) which was built as flats between 1900-05. At either end the houses are stucco fronted with the houses in between being in fair-faced brick of either yellow-brown, red or a mixture of both.
As with the south side, these houses are set behind good front gardens.

3.55 The site of no. 36 was left undeveloped when the square was laid out and the present house was built between 1721-23 by Richard Slater, a carpenter. The Survey of London (volume 42) describes it as ‘a nicely proportioned example of early Georgian town house building’. It is four windows wide with early Georgian nine-over-nine paned windows to the first floor and a continuous cast iron bombé balcony that was undoubtedly added in the early nineteenth century. The frontage is fully stuccoed with channelling at ground floor level and there are full height pilasters to both sides of the elevation and a band course under the second floor windows. The entrance is located in a Classically inspired surround with simple pilasters and situated under the second window rather than being centralised. The hipped and tiled roofs may have copied the form of the original following bomb damage and is a positive feature in the conservation area. The flank wall is of red and yellow bricks and was rebuilt after World War II and left unpainted, but sash windows have been added in neat pairs leaving an expanse of unadorned brickwork to be enjoyed at the entrance to the square.

3.56 No. 37 was originally built c.1694 by joiner, Henry Lobb and most probably refronted between 1801-03, probably by Jonathan Hamston a local builder. It is only two windows wide and three storeys over half-basement with later mansard and is entirely fronted in stucco lined to imitate ashlar stone which has been restored and left unpainted. In keeping with this late Georgian date are the shallowly recessed arches which contain the first floor French windows with glazing bars and margin lights, with cast iron window baskets and stucco pilasters. The other windows are the usual six-over-six pattern and the entrance has a door with six raised and fielded panels set in a timber doorframe and fanlight that is surrounded by a simple moulded stucco arch. There is an iron overthrow with a lantern on the boundary.

3.57 No. 38 was originally built by Henry Lobb’s brother, also a joiner, William Lobb, c.1689-90 but was almost completely rebuilt in 1850 in the Victorian Italianate style of the time. It is three windows wide and four storeys over half-basement without any roof extensions disrupting the flat parapet roofline. The windows all have stucco architraves and those to the first and second floor have bracketed cornices above. The six-over-six paned sashes have been reused to the second and third floors whilst
French windows have been added to the first floor and two-over-two paned sashes to the ground floor. The deeply moulded cornice to the parapet conceals the roof form behind and creates a strong horizontal element echoing the continuous balcony railings (which matches the one to no. 36). The sun blind boxes to the first and second floor windows are typical of this date.

3.58 No. 39 is a block of flats and was designed by architect, G.D. Martin and met with disapproval at the outset. Construction was commenced in 1900 by one builder but suspended the following year and completed in 1904-5 by a different builder. At five main storeys plus two roof storeys and a half-basement, it is the tallest building in the square and shares a similar Queen Anne Revival style with those by Goldie and Child albeit in yellow stock brick with red brick dressings. The principal features are the wide canted bay up to the second floor, the deeply dentilled cornice at roof level topped with a gable and double mansard as well as the distinctive arched stucco door hood on thickset corbels housing a pair of double entrance doors (the varnished wood is appropriate to the architecture in this instance). The windows are four-over-four panelled, an uncommon format, and surrounded by red brick quasi-quoins emulating some of the early houses in the square. The boundary matches the style of the building with a curved wall and sturdy gate posts topped with deep stuccoed cap stones.

3.59 No. 40 was built by joiner, Simon Oldfield c.1686. It is three windows wide, built of brown/yellow brick with red brick dressings including band courses and quasi-quoins around the Georgian paned windows. These features resemble its original appearance although the elevation has been either rebuilt or altered to include a rendered ground floor with pilasters (seen also at no. 20), a continuous bombé railing (matching those at nos. 36 and 38), lengthened French windows, segmental window heads and a brick cornice with panel-like decoration. These probably took place c.1832-3 or the following decade whilst the parapet was probably altered c.1870. The front door is of four panelled design with flush beading around the panels and a rectangular overlight above it. Railings and a hedge enclose the front garden.

3.60 Nos. 41 and 42 were both completely rebuilt as a pair on a mirrored plan by Thomas Walters in 1804-5 although they were never the same width. Amongst the important features of their Regency style are the elegant arched windows to the ground floor with the glazing bars arranged under the arch in segments and
the windows linked by a stucco band which is repeated between the balconies above. Both retain their graceful iron window baskets, iron overthrow to the boundary, reeded doorcases with deeply moulded four panel doors and fanlights.

3.61 Both share the same appearance at ground and first floor levels with the stucco bands continuing across the frontage, but no. 41 has been raised by two storeys (probably in 1876 and again in 1931) and fronted in red and yellow bricks with red mortar which was no doubt added at a much later date. The windows to the second and third floors have been given segmental brick arches. The mansard roof emphasises the difference in height and appearance between the two contemporaneous houses.

3.62 No. 42 has retained its original appearance in red and yellow brick and flat headed upper window openings with a brick parapet over a stucco cornice hiding the roofline.

3.63 Nos. 43 and 44 form another non-matching pair. No. 43 was built by 1687 and no. 44 by 1685 under long leases granted to bricklayer, Henry Webb of Kensington. Their wrought iron gates and entrances are paired and the wooden door cases with triple keystone, architraves and bracketed cornices may well be original. The fanlights are later as are the doors although these probably retain the original patterns. Both have been significantly altered so that the pair no longer matches. The front of no. 43 appears to have been rebuilt in the
eighteenth century with red gauged brick flat arches to the Victorian windows and a simple parapet that was lowered slightly after 1931. **No. 44** was stuccoed and architraves added to the Georgian paned windows some time before the 1860s. They are set behind particularly well planted front gardens and simple railings on a low wall (although a solid barrier to **no. 44** spoils this effect). They both have later mansards which also fail to match – the one to **no. 43** is less prominent (and therefore more sympathetic) than that to **no. 44**.

**3.64 No. 45** was erected in 1685-6 under a long lease to William Barwell of St Dunstan-in-the-West, plasterer. The house retains its original two storey height with mansard, and is the only house in the square to do so, but the exterior was stuccoed probably in the late eighteenth century. Extensive alterations were carried out here in 1895 to the designs of J. Dixon Butler (architect to the Metropolitan Police) who moved the front door to the Young Street elevation and put a bow window created by a leaded dome supported on columns in its old location on the Kensington Square elevation. This was converted back to a door in 1949-50 when Barkers had ownership of the house and converted it to three flats whilst demolishing the garden for their delivery yard. Today, the side elevation is rendered with the side wall of the mansard, timber framed windows, original chimney breast and flat bands being visible, but the security bars, vents and various alarm boxes harm the appearance.
The Former Convent of the Assumption

3.65 This is an important group of buildings to the south-west of Kensington Square, some of which is occupied by Heythrop College at the time of writing. The significant buildings are discussed under nos. 23 and 24 Kensington Square (including the building attached to them), in the South Side section and in the South End section as they front onto these streets, whilst the open space is discussed in Green Space.

3.66 This group of buildings forms an important complex which makes a strong contribution to the historic and architectural character of the conservation area. The Convent of the Assumption was established here in 1859 having been founded in Paris twenty years earlier. The first nuns moved into no. 23, which was then a pair of houses and subsequently had the chapel and various buildings constructed (including the Gothic buildings attached to no. 23 and in South End) as well as occupying several houses including no. 24.

3.67 The site consists of a large open green space with lawns and trees that are enclosed by the former convent buildings, the gardens of neighbouring houses and the railway to the west. This gives the historic buildings a very pleasant green setting, but it is regrettable that the flats and hotels to the west loom large over the site. One of the current features of the site is that the buildings are of different heights and massing reflecting their original purposes. The main convent building attached to no. 23 encloses the site from the north and displays a fine Gothic frontage to the south and wing to the west. Next to this, the former pair of houses at no. 23 display their unharmed parapet roofline, sash windows and closet wings and beyond that the chapel with its apse, windows and roof are clearly visible. To the other sides of the site there are more modern buildings that do not contribute
greatly to the character of the conservation area except the Victorian Gothic building(s) to the south (centring on **St Andrew's Hall**), leading onto South End which are contemporaneous with the convent and well designed in their own right.

**3.68** The whole site would benefit from an in-depth informed conservation plan which is beyond the scope of this document.
Kensington High Street

3.69 The conservation area only contains two buildings on Kensington High Street – the former Barkers department store (nos. 63-97 (odd)) and the former Derry and Toms department store (nos. 99-121 (odd)). Neighbouring buildings are in different conservation areas. See also History section.

3.70 These are iconic, large Art Deco buildings, built as department stores in the 1930s for John Barker to the designs of Bernard George, his architect, with floor layouts designed by the American architect C.A. Wheeler. These major stores had few parallels in this country and they have international significance in terms of their architectural design, internal design and marketing style.

3.71 This magnificent pair still have an enormous presence on the high street and although their designs do not match, they share many characteristics. They are both steel framed structures clad in Portland stone with shops to the ground floors and flagpoles to the roof; the bays between the supporting members are filled with glazing; stair towers to the fronts are arranged symmetrically; and both buildings have bronze windows.

3.72 Derry and Toms (western building) was built first, between 1929-31 in an Empire/Art Deco style with a flat frontage which is divided traditionally into base, column and frieze. The base has polished Hopton Wood stone surrounds to the windows on a brief plinth of black marble. Through the middle floors, the column “order” is overly expressed by means of broad fluted pilasters, in a stripped and fluted Ionic with Egyptian overtones alternating with bands of windows. The grand fifth floor represents the frieze stage; here the voids are filled with elegant openwork metal grilles with figures representing signs of the zodiac by Walter Gilbert, while the spaces above the piers are devoted to ‘metopes’ with reliefs depicting productive labour; these combine with the grilles to make delightful if distant decoration. The former main entrances were marked by canopies which are an integral part of the design.
and served to add importance and grandeur to these doorways.

3.73 Derry and Toms’ famous roof gardens were designed in 1936 by Ralph Hancock and opened on 9 May 1938 and today still retain their separate garden areas, some of the structures, pond and trees. Such conceits, usually in conjunction with tea rooms or restaurants, had been popular in English stores since the Edwardian years (in fact Barkers had had a makeshift example since 1921) but the Derry and Toms gardens were planned to outdo all such others and the building had been constructed to allow for its future creation including water brought from artesian wells beneath the building.

3.74 The garden was originally divided into three areas: a woodland garden with a lake, an old Spanish garden with a Spanish bell tower and a Moorish arcade; and a Tudor Court garden with arches from an unidentified stately home. The restaurant is located in a Moderne ‘sun pavilion’. Although much has changed, the gardens are a wonderful piece of designed green space in an unusual location. They can only be glimpsed from viewpoints at pavement level.
3.75 Barkers (1937-8) reflects the rapidly changing style at this time and was inspired by European Expressionism. This frontage was designed around the gentle curve in the street so that its vertical pillars give a tambour effect. The defining features of this design are the soaring glazed stair towers evoking the ocean liners of the day, particularly due to the glazed lanterns that crown them, beneath which the name of the store is carved in low relief. Indeed, low relief carvings on the frontage depicts modern forms of transport including cruise ships and aeroplanes. As at Derry and Toms, George used relief and incised carving to add interest to the stonework, but here these panels are happily more visible from the street. A canopy shelters shoppers the whole length of the building as well as part way along the side streets which is not present at Derry and Toms. The roofline is stepped back in three grandiose tiers.

3.76 Both buildings retain their original bronze shop surrounds and low polished black marble stallrisers. There are terrazzo slabs enclosed in brass strips on the pavement immediately around the stores although these are less sophisticated around the former Derry and Toms.

3.77 Both stores were designed as detached buildings and the flanks (except the one abutting High Street Kensington Station) are treated with a design similar to the frontages. The two side streets, Young Street and Derry Street (which runs between the stores) are both narrow streets that offer pleasant views into the square when looking south; and when looking north, the late Victorian buildings on Kensington High Street close the view. Derry Street offers particularly good views of trees, flank walls, garden walls and rear elevations as one approaches the square.

3.78 To the rear, the stores have more utilitarian elevations yet ones that are still clearly 1930s in design and character. They are both built in red brick with regularly spaced metal framed windows. The former Derry and Toms has slightly more detail with rubbed brick flat arches over the windows, stone surrounds to the ground floor openings and a rendered attic storey whereas Barkers has longer windows, some of which have stone architraves; and a deep stone cornice below the attic storey.

3.79 The relationship between commercial and residential uses can be difficult and in Kensington Square they have been fraught for decades. The goods yard and the congestion it brings results in a challenging juxtaposition between the hard urban environment and the soft character of the garden square. Due to aggressive purchasing of property in the square by Barker, many houses have lost their gardens to the department stores over the years.
Ansdell Terrace

3.80 Ansdell Terrace, formerly St Albans Road North, was laid out in 1878 by the Kensington builder Thomas Hussey, in the gardens of nos. 11-13 (consec) Kensington Square with a terrace of houses on the east side. Hussey seems to have intended these houses for multiple occupation by artisan families from the beginning which explains by the curious floor plans which repeated the accommodation of three rooms and a water closet on each of the four floors. The Italianate front elevations may have been designed to add respectability, but their design is old-fashioned for their date. They are four storey stock brick houses without basements and sit directly on the pavement having no gardens or front areas. The windows are all two-over-two paned sashes with stucco architraves and those to the first floor have bracketed cornices. The ground floor is fronted in channelled stucco with no window surrounds and arched recessed entrances with timber four panelled doors and there are moulded stucco bands between each floor level echoing the horizontality of the parapet roofline.

3.81 No. 22 was hit by a bomb in 1940, damaging the coal gas main, causing the ground and first floors to collapse and rendering the other floors unsafe. A scheme for the reinstatement of nos. 21-23 (consec) was approved in 1948 but it was not until 1953 that the present three-storey replacements were approved and begun. The original terrace has not been copied accurately: the pediments are undersized and not used on the original houses, nor are the Georgian paned windows which should be two-over-two paned sashes as seen elsewhere in the terrace. The worst error in the modern group are the garages which were not part of Victorian architecture and ruin the appearance and uniformity of the ground floors.

3.82 Original houses at the southern end have been much extended over the years, no. 18 in particular having being taken to the limit of what is acceptable.

3.83 Opposite, nos. 16 and 17 were built in 1967-68 to the designs of architects, Richardson and McLaughlin, on part of the large rear garden
of no. 14 Kensington Square. These are of two storeys in a long format and inoffensive in their design.

3.84 At the north end of the square is a garage built in stock brick with a gabled frontage. This would be a suitable, simple termination to the street, but has been severely marred by an ugly metal concertina door and two pedestrian doors of poor design inserted to the right of it. Beyond the garage, and across the garden wall to the left, rear elevations, the roof of the chapel and garden plants create an intimate setting.
South End

3.85 The South End area grew as a rural settlement around a crossing of roads. The north side of South End was first occupied by stables belonging to the houses on the south side of Kensington Square when it was developed in the late seventeenth century. Although much historic fabric has been lost, as have the stables, South End still conserves the air of a small and quiet back lane. The pavements, where they exist, are only very narrow and the road is surfaced with granite setts which reinforce the character of this area. The lane narrows towards the west where the buildings converge and lead the eye towards the trees in the grounds of the former convent. The two storey houses set the scene in the street, but St Andrew’s Hall, the Gothic building on the south side, give it a focus at the junction between the public street and the private convent land for which it was built towards the end of the nineteenth century.

3.86 St Andrew’s Hall (next to no. 14/The Cottage) was built between 1873-74 as an elementary school for the former Convent of the Assumption, doubtlessly, due to its date and style, to their architect George Goldie’s designs. It is built in stock brick with a centrally located gable to the front with dominant Gothic arches over the windows and a central oculus. An almost contemporaneous extension with two dormers sits to the west with The Cottage attached beyond that. The main gabled section has red brick banding, segmental and pointed arches and pivoting timber windows. The roof is hipped and covered in slate with lead hips and forms the start of the southward wing (now painted white) behind. This building makes a very important contribution to the character of South End, the former convent close and the wider conservation area. The wiring and pipework to the front detract from its commanding appearance.

3.87 On the north side, nos. 15-20 (consec) South End were originally built as stables...
belonging to the houses on the south side of Kensington Square, although it seems very unlikely that they retain anything of their late seventeenth century fabric.

3.88 No. 15 was built shortly before 1912 as a motor garage and has an interesting design of two double height arches to the upper floors over a recessed undercroft to the ground floor. It is built in stock brick with red brick dressings and has timber framed multi-paned sash windows which have been removed from the right hand bay, much to the detriment of this interesting building and to the character of this part of the conservation area.

3.89 No. 16 is a recent house of three storeys with slated mansard roof and two-over-two paned sash windows. The garage to the ground floor harms the domestic design, which in turn fails to complement the erstwhile character of this alley of stables.

3.90 No. 17 was built for no. 17 Kensington Square in 1881, perhaps by Richard Norman Shaw and extended towards South End in 1908. The Survey of London (volume 42) says the garden front has a handsome eighteenth century design, but today, the South End frontage is marred by two large, anonymous grey metal garage doors which are harmful to the character of the conservation area.

3.91 No. 18 was built for no. 16 Kensington Square but has since entirely broken with its
humble origins (and the character of South End) to present a modern domestic, stone clad frontage with three tightly packed dormers, a garage and, in deference to the conservation area, two-over-two paned sash windows.

3.92 No. 19 was used for storage or warehousing in the 1930s and was converted to office use in 1964, then refronted by architects, Newman, Levinson and Partners in 1972 in yellow stock brick with three-over-three paned timber framed sash windows. It is of three storeys with a simple parapet finish concealing the roof behind. In 2016 this house was the subject of a planning controversy and neighbour dispute during which it was painted in red and white stripes. At the time of writing the building is boarded to the front, but some stripes can still be seen and remains a live planning enforcement case.

3.93 No. 20 is a very attractive symmetrically fronted house of five windows wide and two storey plus mansard, built in stock brick in 1909 to the designs of architect, E.W. Marshall. It has stock brick flat arches, Georgian paned sash windows and an arched timber door hood that is neither too ostentatious nor too diminutive which was designed by Richardson and McLaughlin architects. To the front, simple railings enclose a narrow front garden on a stock brick wall with stone coping. The gate posts are made of cast iron, an interesting feature. To the side, the house presents a completely blank elevation to Ansdell Terrace which is entirely appropriate in
this simple, village-like area. To the rear there is a two storey addition which is similarly neatly designed with Georgian paned sash windows.
**Thackeray Street**

3.94 The only building in this street is Abbots Court mansion flats, part of which fronts Kensington Square, but the bulk of which fronts Thackeray Street. The block was built between 1901-02 for John Barker by builders, Martin Wells and Company, but the architect is unknown. Only the Kensington Square elevation and the first section in Thackeray Street are listed (grade II), however the rest of the building makes a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area and is thus also protected.

3.95 The block is built in red brick with sandstone courses and dressings. At the extremities and the corner of the block are turrets projecting from the facade which are finished with leaded domes and cupolas. The roofline has four gables that are flanked by scrolls and topped with pediments and decorated with brick pilasters and cornices that extend down to the third floor. Tall chimney stacks and small dormer windows are other significant features of the playful roofline. Lower down, both elevations have oriel canted bays containing three or four plain sash windows and these are linked by railings on the Kensington Square elevation with a deep cast iron bombé design railings with Art Nouveau flowers to the centre and corners.

3.96 The entrance is well designed with polished oak double doors that are half glazed and have side panels and overlights to let light into the communal hall. Most of the shops have either their original (or close to original) formats made out of polished timber and consisting of a frontage with transom lights, low carved stallrisers, recessed entrances with panelled timber sides and ceiling and mosaic floors. Each shop is divided by flat polished red granite pilasters with carved capitals and bases and above each shopfront is a shared timber fascia which is painted to imitate mahogany on Thackeray Street but, probably wrongly, painted white on the Kensington Square frontage. The shopfronts make a very positive contribution to the historic and architectural character of the conservation area as a group of original frontages. One or two have been replaced with modern shop windows (no. 20 and no. 9 and of the historic ones two have been painted white which also harms the character of the block and the appearance of the conservation area.

3.97 See also Kensington Square, South Side.
Young Street

3.98 This street takes its name from the developer of the square, Thomas Young, and was laid out in 1685 although all the houses from this time have been swept away with the exception of no. 16 which has been altered from its original appearance. The street mirrors Derry Street in that it encloses the department stores and offers views to the turn of the century buildings on Kensington High Street as well as views to houses on the square to the south. It is a narrow street that makes the transition between the highly urban environment and the calmness and domesticity of the garden square. The two bare brick house walls flanking the entrance to the loading bay form a simple entranceway and the fact that they have not received unsuitable additions or alterations is a positive feature.

3.99 No. 16 was built in the 1690s and was extended and refronted with two curved bays in 1804-05. This charming house is well known for having been occupied by William Makepeace Thackeray between 1846-53, the novelist who gave his name to the street to the south of the square. Originally one ‘bay’ wide with a two-room plan, the house has been extended on the left but only by one room per floor. This gives a central entrance with a distinctive overlight consisting of elongated ovals and pilasters flanking the studded, two panel front door with brass door furniture. The elegant, curved late Georgian bays rise to full height and contain two six-over-six paneled sashes per floor with those to the first floor being underlined by a continuous stucco band. There is a narrow front area and a mansard has been added above the stucco parapet roofline. The house is now used by Richmond University.

3.100 No. 9 on the opposite side of the road was built in 1905 to the designs of architect, Frank Chesterton by builders, T.H. Adamson and Sons of Putney using thin red ‘Lawrence’ bricks and Portland stone for the frontage. The upper floors display a pair of shallow stone gables with metal casement windows divided into small square panes. There is a projecting cornice above these, following their curves, and a straight cornice below them dividing the shop from the upper floors. The Baroque style door hood echoes this detail. Above the windows the building is finished with a red brick gable with stone parapets that conceals an original clay tiled mansard behind.
Recent Architecture

3.101 Young Street contains the most recent architecture which has changed the street’s character from residential to offices. There are no buildings of great architectural value here except those previously described and the main feature of this small street is its narrow scale as a side street.

3.102 At the time of writing a new residential development was being built at nos. 19-27 (odd) Young Street (next to The Greyhound) on the site of a former car park which will have a more sympathetic appearance. Next to this there is a backland office development accessed through the arch to the stables that were previously behind no. 3 and today is mostly concealed from the square.

3.103 The large college/former convent site to the south of the square has also seen a great deal of post World War II development, which is of indifferent quality but succeeds in remaining separate from the square and therefore not having an impact on it.

3.104 The delivery yards to the rear of the department stores contain recent and temporary structures that do not enhance the character of the conservation area and these areas are highly sensitive due to their very close proximity to the residential houses and gardens of the square.
Shared Features of Houses

Windows and Doors

3.105 Historic windows and doors are essential features of the houses in Kensington Square Conservation Area and make an important contribution to its historic and architectural character and appearance.

3.106 Most windows are sash windows except for a few French windows at first floor giving access onto narrow balconies. Sash windows were an important British invention that allowed a room to be aired without the window projecting outwards and breaking the carefully designed Classical building line. Georgian and Victorian houses were built with a hierarchy of windows whereby the largest (and usually those with most decoration around them) were located at the principal floor (or ‘piano nobile’) – usually the first floor – and above this the window openings got smaller.

3.107 The predominant style of window in the square is the six-over-six ‘Georgian paned’ sash window without horns in which the panes are divided by slender glazing bars, putted on the outside and moulded on the inside. All the houses have been altered or rebuilt since the square was laid out in the 1680s so the sashes date from the eighteenth century when most of the alterations took place. Some earlier windows survive with smaller panes such as the eight-over-eight paned sashes to the top floors of no. 20. Another type of Georgian window is the four-over-four paned sash which came later in the period and can be seen at several houses including nos. 11 and 12.

3.108 The Victorian frontages have two-over-two paned sashes and where there are French windows, these usually have a single horizontal
Important features of Victorian sashes are the horns on the meeting rail which were added to strengthen the frame as the panes of glass got larger and heavier. These can be seen at one or two houses in the square, as well as in Ansdell Terrace where they make an essential contribution to the uniformity of the terrace.

3.109 Many panes of old Crown or cylinder glass survive in the area giving an attractive reflection and adding to the authenticity of the architecture thus making a very important contribution to the character of the conservation area.

3.110 Later windows such as those in the late Victorian Queen Anne Revival houses often have six-over-six paned sashes, perhaps in deference to the overriding character of the square. However, the sashes are plain at Abbots Court on the corner with Thackeray Street and the fact that the windows are the same across the whole building is an essential and positive feature of its appearance.

3.111 Front doors are also a key feature of the houses in the conservation area and those in Kensington Square are particularly special as they have fine Georgian door cases and fanlights.

3.112 Historic doors were always made of wood and painted unless they were made of exotic wood such as oak or mahogany, but pine was never stripped and this is harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Many of the doors have six panels that are raised and fielded and sometimes have a central bead in imitation of a pair of doors, but as there is little uniformity in the area, there are variations on this design, some having glazed top panels,
some having ogee mouldings around recessed panels and others having flush beading around panels instead.

3.113 Many doors display historic brass door furniture such as knockers and letter boxes which contribute to the richness of the conservation area. As steel is a modern metal, this harms the character and appearance of the conservation area.

3.114 The door cases enhance the character of the houses greatly and the Georgian ones are usually made of timber and painted to look like stone, whereas the Victorian examples are usually made of stucco with the same objective.

3.115 Fanlights are delicate designs set in lead that are moulded on the outside and are usually fan shaped and set in an arch over the door frame, but can also be set in rectangular overlights, either with a fan shape or a different design.

3.116 As with other features, the fanlights, front doors and door cases are all different but complementary and this attractive range contributes to the varied character of the conservation area.
Original fanlights
3.117 Historic rooflines make a very important contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Roofs in Kensington Square have been extended individually over the years so that a variety of roof profiles and heights has resulted, however this harmonious array is now part of the undoubted charm and character of the area.

3.118 Some undeveloped roofs remain and these are of the highest conservation value. Only a small number of houses have roofs that are hidden from view behind parapets so that the smallest top windows remain, as originally intended, on the front elevation rather than in a mansard. Roofs covering these houses tend to be pairs of hipped roofs with a central gulley, often running left to right rather than front to back.

3.119 Another important roof type is the Queen Anne Revival type which consists of hipped roofs that were concealed so that only decorative features such as turrets, decorative gables or small original dormer windows were visible to the front. Good examples of these survive around the square and make an important and lively contribution to the character of the conservation area.

3.120 Other features of roofs that contribute to the character of the conservation area are the tall chimney stacks with their terracotta pots and, where they survive, the valley roofs, lead rolls to hips and small, early, timber dormer windows.

3.121 There are a small number of roofs that have been extended in an unsympathetic way. No. 13 is a pair of houses, but the roof extensions do not match and this harms the pair and in turn, the conservation area. Some dormer windows are slightly oversized and appear top heavy rather than following the proportions of the host house.

3.122 A number of properties in Ansdell Terrace have had their original roofs altered to create roof terraces but these are out of keeping with character of the conservation area and should not set a precedent for others.
No. 35 to the right shows original roof form

Centre house has parapet to conceal the roof form behind

Queen Anne hipped roof with dormers

View of varied rooflines
3.123 Rear elevations make an important contribution to the historic and architectural character and appearance of the conservation area. The backs of houses are brought into the character of the conservation area by being visible across garden walls, from rear windows, gardens and from the services yards of the departments stores. Features that contribute to the character of the conservation area include their original design (e.g. closet wings, chimneys), traditional materials (e.g. fair-faced brick and timber) and features (e.g. sash windows, brick window arches).

3.124 Where groups of houses were built by the same builders, their rear elevations are likely to have been built to similar designs, but as with other aspects of the houses, there is a great deal of harmonious variety. However all the houses have been altered and storeys have been added so that any original fabric from the 1680s will be of great conservation value. An unusual feature of the houses on Kensington Square is that many have two closet wings – one at either side of the rear elevation. Today, many of these have been given infill extensions at the lower levels. The closet wings vary in height and some remain low, but almost none rise above the penultimate storey and most have flat roofs with brick parapets.

3.125 Some houses have individual rear elevation designs and this can be seen to the rear of no. 13 which have matching canted bays up to first floor level and no. 6 which has a four storey canted bay the full width of the rear as part of the original design.

3.126 Windows to rear elevations are also multi-paned timber sash windows with brick flat arches above with their number and layout depending on the interior planform of the house. Rear window patterns to the larger houses are more uniform and symmetrical whilst others may be staggered to light the stair landings in between the main floor levels. Several houses have canted bay windows to the rear. These
features are important to the significance of the houses as well as the character and appearance of the conservation area.

**3.127** Rear elevations can be harmed in similar ways to front elevations, that is to say, that additions which spoil the historic architectural pattern and rhythm of the closet wings or the replacement of windows (as well as changing their size or location) and disproportionate extensions can all harm the historic characteristics that are important features of the design of these elevations and therefore to the character of the conservation area.
3.128 Houses on the north and south sides were built with the largest front gardens. These incorporated small ‘areas’ or lightwells in front of the basement windows as well as a section of planting space behind the railings. Houses on the east side were built with very small front areas which just allowed space for access to the servants’ entrance, coal cellars and for light to reach the windows; and houses on the west side had only slightly more space. Nos. 34 and 35 look like their front areas have been reduced due to the laying out of the access road into Derry Street, but this arrangement shows on the map of 1869 and is probably original.

3.129 Most of the houses around the square are enclosed by iron railings and gates as they would have been originally. The Georgian railings have a simple design consisting of multiple square section posts individually caulked into a low wall and held together by a rail close to the top. The tips have a hammered finish in which the tips are all slightly different as the work was done individually by a blacksmith and this is an important and charming feature. There are also some later railings with decorative finials which have a very regular appearance as they were cast in identical moulds.

3.130 Boundary treatments, lightwells and front gardens make a vital contribution to the character of the conservation area and are enhanced by planting and hedging which can be enjoyed greatly on the north side of the square. The south side of the square has the greatest number of barren front gardens and modern railings that reduce the attractiveness of this high quality conservation area. The paved forecourts in front of nos. 13 and 23 are particularly desolate with railings being of non-historic design to the latter and non-existent to the former.

3.131 Nos. 43-44 share a particularly good pair of Georgian gates with wrought iron decoration above; and six houses (five on the west side and two on the north side) have historic overthrows supporting lanterns at the junction of their boundary with the pavement. These features make a strong contribution to the character of the conservation area as well as the significance of the listed buildings.

3.132 No. 10 has some particularly good historic lightwell railings with sunflower designs. Ironwork to the late Victorian/Queen Anne Revival houses is more decorative and incorporates curllicues and geometric panels in between the plain iron posts. As ever, the character of the conservation area lies in its subtle variety and the fact that there is a range...
of railing designs from different periods is one of its positive features.

3.133 The contribution made by gardens, both to the front and rear of houses, is fundamental to the area’s special character. This green space provides a balance between soft and hard architecture, it creates a pleasant setting for each building and was part of the development that was planned by Thomas Young to attract high class residents. Where front gardens are paved and devoid of planting this is harmful to the leafy character of the conservation area. Many front gardens around the square contain small trees and conversely, the small houses on the west side of Ansdell Terrace contain some large Plane trees which obviously predate the houses.

3.134 Some of the back gardens, such as those on the south side are large whilst others are small or have been regrettably curtailed. Private gardens provide opportunities for quiet relaxation which is essential to the character and amenity of a residential area.

3.135 With public access to the square possible from three of its four corners, many trees in rear gardens are as visible as those in the front gardens. On the north side of the square there are two trees of note growing in rear gardens: a Beech (Fagus sylvatica) and a Tree of Heaven (Ailanthus altissima). On the south side of the square there is an excellent Japanese Maple (Acer palmatum) growing in a front garden and good quality Planes (Platanus x hispanica), Horse Chestnuts (Aesculus hippocastanum) and Lime trees (Tilia species) growing in the rear gardens here.
Georgian railings with hammered tips
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Queen Anne Revival wrought ironwork, no. 5 Kensington Square
4 Public Realm

Street Trees

4.1 Kensington Square was developed before the planting of trees in streets became widespread in the Victorian period and as the square itself was designed to contain trees, no others were deemed necessary around it. Kensington High Street was not given trees in this location; South End was a back street; and there was no space in Ansdell Terrace, hence there are no street trees in this conservation area. However, there are many other important trees which are described in the Green Space sections.

Street Surfaces

4.2 Surfacing of streets forms an important part of the character of the conservation area with different materials being used in areas of different character.

4.3 Where original York stone paving remains it is of the highest conservation value both for its intrinsic historic value and its attractive riven and worn appearance that contributes strongly to the character of the conservation area. This survives around the perimeter of the garden square, in front of no. 20 South End and on both sides of Ansdell Terrace where it is complemented by three rows of granite to the gutters.

4.4 Most other pavements are paved in modern sawn York stone with granite kerbstones which are in keeping with the character of the conservation area. Surprisingly the north side of Kensington Square is paved in concrete slabs. Of the side streets, Thackeray Street and Derry Street have concrete slabs whilst Young Street is paved in modern York stone, but these have been patched in tarmac and broken in places by vehicles driving over them.

4.5 The entrance to the square’s north west corner is paved in square blocks laid in an attractive curving form and closed off with bollards, two of which are foldable to allow access in an emergency.

4.6 The department stores have aprons of terrazzo around them which match their 1930s character and the shops of Thackeray Street have pavement lights to illuminate their basements.

4.7 Cast iron coal hole covers are rare in the conservation area, but where they survive, they are a reminder of the way coal was historically delivered through the pavement to coal cellars for storage before being used in the fireplaces to heat the rooms.
Modern blocks between Derry Street and Kensington Square

Granite gutter

Granite setts, South End

Terrazzo to shop forecourts, Kensington High Street

Coal hole cover
Street Furniture

4.8 There are many bollards in the conservation area which protect pavements from traffic damage. All are modern and painted black but modelled on historic examples which were in fact old canon with a canon ball on the top.

4.9 A tall cast iron pipe to vent the sewers was erected in 1908 at the cross roads of South End and Ansdell Terrace. It has a moulded base but a plain shaft and contributes positively to the character and setting of the Kensington Square Conservation Area.

4.10 There is a double pillar box on the west side of Young Street (ER II) which is an item of historic street furniture painted in the traditional red colour.

4.11 Kensington Square is enhanced by having nineteenth century lamp posts called the ‘Kensington Vestry’ type that have been adapted from gas to electricity. They are shorter than modern posts, have octagonal glazed lanterns and posts and are painted green. These make a very positive contribution to the character of the conservation area.

4.12 In the small streets the lamps are the modern, but sympathetic Chelsea Coronet style, a tall slender post with a round, historically inspired lantern; whilst in Kensington High Street, taller modern road and pavement lighting is used.
Views

4.13 Views make an important contribution to the way the conservation area is experienced from within and without. Views of buildings outside provide the setting to the conservation area whilst views within create a sense of enclosure and enhance the sense of place and character of the area. All around the square there are views of historic houses at every junction as well as through the trees and low planting in the garden square itself. The former department stores have a very strong presence on the High Street and are seen in views from east and west as well as from access points from the north.

4.14 Kensington Square has a strong sense of place with the varied roofline providing good enclosure on all four sides. Mostly there is nothing visible above the roofscapes which is a very important characteristic of the conservation area. The tall modern roof of the former Barkers department store and the cliff-like appearance of the other store unfortunately project above the rooflines to the north and north-west which harms the low lying and verdant character of the square. To the south-west, flats and hotels can just be seen above the roofline of the square and it would be an enhancement if these were one day reduced so that they were no longer visible.

4.15 On a smaller scale, there are short views out of the conservation area from all its exit points. To the south of the square, there are views of the attractive townscape of mansion flats on Thackeray Street and on towards the former three storey Kensington Court Mews. The two roads north are closed by vistas of the fine red brick late Victorian buildings on Kensington High Street.

4.16 The views west and east along South End are both attractive with the former red brick convent building, open space and trees at one end; and the small houses creating a village character at the other. At the end of Ansdell Terrace there are glimpses of rear elevations and gardens although the modern concertina garage doors create an unattractive end to the vista at the north end that could so easily be rectified.
5 Negative Elements and Opportunities for Enhancement

5.1 This section itemises some of the alterations that cause harm to the historic and architectural character of the conservation area. The National Planning Policy Framework and the Council’s policies require opportunities to be taken to enhance the character of conservation areas and the significance of listed buildings when opportunities arise and this includes the removal of the negative elements given in this section.

5.2 Historic areas are sensitive to change, as once a historic feature is lost it can only be reinstated in replica and never in authenticity, so the loss of historic features is a loss to the historic integrity and character of the conservation area as a whole.

5.3 The conservation area is generally very well maintained but there are still areas where enhancement would be beneficial. The delivery yards of the former department stores are open noisy spaces that would be better shielded from the calm, domestic character of the houses on Kensington Square. **No. 19 South End** is the subject of enforcement action as it was painted in red and white stripes and at the time of writing is boarded to the front so that the effect is still one of harm to the character of the conservation area.

5.4 Around the square, particularly to houses in non-residential use on the south side, original railings there have been lost and this harm is compounded by the loss of planting, leaving gaps in the otherwise continuous, pleasant green front gardens that can be enjoyed elsewhere. Where houses are no longer in domestic use this can have a negative impact on the character of the area, in particular where, for example, offices are seen through windows in the daytime and the building is dark at night.

5.5 There is an unsightly vehicle opening through the ground floor of **no. 25** which has caused the removal of features that are highly characteristic of the conservation area including...
sash windows, planted gardens and railings. Some roof extensions are slightly oversized and although built many years ago, they have harmed the original roof forms and removed the pre-eminence of the historic parapet rooflines.

5.6 There are some small scale alterations that are nonetheless harmful to the character of the conservation area such as alterations to windows, cement weatherstruck pointing, visible pipework or cabling, stripped (i.e. unpainted) timberwork such as front doors, modern stainless steel door furniture, security cameras, window grilles and other modern out-of-character additions.

5.7 Some of the back gardens on all sides of the conservation area have been curtailed due to the arrival of later buildings. This feature is particularly bad on the north and west sides of the square where there has been encroachment from the former department stores and offices. This harms the verdant setting of the houses as well as the balance between hard architecture and soft landscaping that is so characteristic of the conservation area.

5.8 Modern buildings have intruded into Young Street and to a lesser extent, South End; and there are two modern shopfronts in Thackeray Street and Kensington Square that fail to follow the historic design of the others, thus harming the historic appearance of the parade. Young Street is also marred by the four modern telephone/wifi kiosks at its north end, which are often unkempt, dirty and attract dumped trolleys.

5.9 South End has a village character, but double yellow lines are thick and intrusive in their appearance where they could have been narrower.
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Appendix 1: History

EARLY HISTORY

6.1 The original village of Kensington was settled in early medieval times; the parish church of St Mary Abbots stood on the main highway to the west of England, exactly four miles from Temple Bar, the western gateway to the City of London. From Elizabethan times the area had a reputation as a healthy place to live, with spas and extensive market and nursery gardens. The introduction of stage coaches in the latter part of the seventeenth century gave the little village more importance as a staging post.

6.2 With its pleasant position and proximity to London, Kensington gradually became popular with those who wished to get away from the thickly-populated and occasionally plague-ridden city. Proclamations from 1580 onwards and throughout the next century prohibited all new buildings within specified distances of London but these proved hard to enforce. Pressure for accommodation was met by a modest expansion of the village northwards to Holland Street, the construction of a number of houses for the gentry along the south side of Kensington Road and the building of Kensington Square. The desirability of the area received a tremendous boost when Nottingham House, enlarged and improved by Wren for the Earl of Nottingham and later to become Kensington Palace, was purchased as a country seat by William III in 1689.

THE BUILDING OF THE SQUARE

6.3 Several acres of land to the south of the High Street were leased in 1682 to Thomas Young, a builder and ‘Sergeant Carpenter and Joiner’ to Charles II. Young first laid out a new street leading south off High Street, east of the stocks which stood before the Parish Church.
This new street, completed in 1685 and named after the builder, consisted of forty simple terraced houses copied from the style of house evolved by Nicholas Barbon for his various developments in the growing West End. Barbon had already laid out several squares in that area and Young probably conceived his idea of a new square in Kensington Village from Barbon’s schemes. The development of the square also began in 1685, and it was called King’s Square after James II who had been crowned in February of that year. Certainly Kensington Square was the first square to be built out of town and it is the sixth oldest square in the capital, after Bloomsbury, Leicester, Red Lion and Soho Squares and Lincoln’s Inn Fields.

6.4 The first mention of the square in other records is dated 27 March 1687, when Thomas Young bought “a plot of land neere Kyng’s Sq. in ye parish of Kensingtoun.” The title deeds of the “Greyhound Tavern,” no. 1 Kensington Square, date from Lady Day 1686, and there is evidence that the east side of the square was completed in 1690, and the whole square by c.1700. The earliest houses to have survived in anything like their original condition are nos. 11 and 12 at the south-east corner, though they have been subsequently altered both inside and out.

6.5 With the arrival of the Court of William and Mary at Kensington Palace in 1689 the square became one of the most fashionable places of residence in England, “there being upward of forty carriages kept there”, according to Faulkner. Young had also created a bowling green and ‘Spring Garden’ to the south-west of the square.

6.6 But after the accession of George I in 1714 was already not quite so prestigious as it had been around the turn of the century. After the death of Queen Caroline in 1737, however, Kensington Palace fell into disfavour with George II, whose visits became very infrequent. Aristocracy left the square so that after George III ascended the throne in 1760 and abandoned...
Kensington Palace the square became something of a backwater and by about 1803 it became practically unoccupied.

6.7 During these austere years for the square several houses became used as genteel schools and academies. The earliest of these being established in the 1750s (no. 30) so that by the early 1830s there were at least eight in total in the square.

6.8 The scene of a rural placidity continued. The gardens of nos. 11-23 (consec) on the south side of the square extended to stables and a small group of cottages known as South End. At the south-east corner there was a short, curved street (now Ansdell Street, originally called James Street after the King), connecting with a footpath which joined up with Hogmire Lane, now Gloucester Road. At the south-west corner a grassy lane led into the fields.

6.9 On the west side of the square the gardens of nos. 24 and 25 extended to Barrows Lane, a twisting track which ran from the High Street across the fields to the Manor House at Earl’s Court. On the north, the square was bordered by the gardens of High Street properties and to the east by Kensington House and its grounds.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

6.10 Around the time of the birth in 1819 and upbringing of Princess Victoria at Kensington Palace, the town and the square enjoyed a revival of their fortunes and activity and was given the sobriquet ‘The Old Court Suburb’. In the early nineteenth century, Kensington began again to grow so that most of the houses on the square had been rebuilt or refronted by 1850.

6.11 The square and its surrounding streets were first paved and lit early in the nineteenth century, when the parish authorities were empowered to pave, repair, light, watch and
otherwise improve Kensington Square, Young Street and James Street. The whole district was further affected by the Kensington Improvement Act 1861. In 1870 a new road (Ball Street) was built to connect Young Street and King Street, parallel to the High Street and the north side of the square, but this was lost in the subsequent development of High Street properties.

6.12 In 1868-71, the Metropolitan Board of Works carried out a project to clear the slums on Kensington High Street and widen this important thoroughfare. This, coupled with the arrival of the railway in 1866, enabled Kensington to become a large and successful shopping centre, second only to that of the west end of London.

6.13 Henceforth there began a radical change in the square, beginning with the building of the Maria Assumpta Chapel for the Convent of the Assumption (1870-71) and the subsequent buildings for the convent and their school from 1875 onwards. This coincided with the evolution of the red brick Queen Anne Revival style for town houses and the development of flats. Goldie and Child, architects of the chapel and ‘new’ convent buildings were also responsible for the design of the three Queen Anne Revival houses in the square (nos. 5, 6 and 16) which replaced earlier houses and displayed vastly different design and detailing to their predecessors. Similarly, at the turn of the twentieth century, the old houses at the bottom of the east side of the square were demolished for store owner, Barker, to make way for Abbots Court mansion flats in 1901-02 which were built by Martin Wells and Company, although the architect is unknown.

6.14 In 1873 some of the houses to the north-east of the square (including the seventeenth century mansion houses Kensington House and Colby House), together with other land nearby, were purchased by Baron Albert Grant, MP, who erected on the seven acre site a new mansion, also called Kensington House, designed in the Italianate manner to be the grandest in
The project floundered seven years later on Grant’s bankruptcy and the unfinished house was demolished and the site used for the construction of Kensington Court. The stables to the house survive as no. 3 Kensington Square.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

6.15 The major changes in the twentieth century were the construction and further development of the large department stores on the High Street.

6.16 John Barker was a brewer’s son from Kent, but was apprenticed to the drapery trade and worked for William Whiteley who ran a drapery shop that also expanded into a department store in Westbourne Grove. In 1870, Barker left Whiteley’s and opened his own small drapery in Kensington High Street and after this his story is one of great success and expansion culminating in his buying up two other department stores in on the High Street – Derry and Toms; and Pontings – and building two purpose designed buildings based on American designs that remain today, albeit in reduced retail use.

6.17 Derry and Toms had had poor service facilities compared even to Barkers. Without the benefit of Ball Street, they had been coping with the old fashioned stabling of Burden Mews and portions of the old candle works for delivery, packaging and finishing of articles. One idea in contemplation during 1922-23 was for an arcade behind the back of the buildings all the way from King Street to Wright’s Lane, but this was dropped. By 1924, H.L. Cabuche had prepared a general scheme for the reconstruction of the great store which featured in the complicated negotiations for general rebuilding in 1925-27.

6.18 The new Derry and Toms store was completed in 1929-31. Designed by Bernard George, the Barkers in house architect in succession to Cabuche, with floor layouts by
the American architect C.A. Wheeler, it was one of the first London stores to be planned on the American ‘horizontal’ systems, whereby each floor was made as open as possible. The plan of the building placed the staircases (conceived generally as for emergencies only) in self-contained shells. A battery of eight lifts sited against the back wall of the retailing space provided regular access to the upper floors; there were no escalators. The suave restraint of the interior, with its lighting, furniture, carpets, balustrades, lifts and other fittings, brought renown to Derry and Toms as a classic of the short lived phase of English Art Deco.

6.19 Six years after the store’s completion, the famous Derry and Toms roof gardens were created at the particular behest, it seems, of Trevor Bowen of Barkers. Such conceits, usually in conjunction with tea rooms or restaurants, had been popular in English stores since the Edwardian years; Barkers had had a makeshift example since 1921. The Derry and Toms garden was planned to outdo all such others and the building had been constructed to allow for its future creation. A thick bitumastic base was laid on the roof. Above this came a layer of loose brick and rubble with a fan shaped system of drains. On top is a thin layer of soil, watered regularly from artesian wells beneath the building. As the soil is thin the trees planted had to be supported until their roots spread.

6.20 The gardens as first conceived were divided into three: an ‘English Woodland Garden’ with floral beds and a ‘Tudor Court’ incorporating arches salvaged from an unidentified stately home; a ‘Spanish Garden’ with Moorish pergolas; and a Court of Fountains. The landscaping and planting were devised by Ralph Hancock but the authorship of the sundry follies is unknown. Bernard George exercised overall supervision and no doubt designed the modernistic ‘sun pavilion.’ The gardens were opened in 1938 by the Earl of Athlone.
6.21 The present main Barkers building was basically designed by George. After some alterations to the original designs to make them more acceptable to the fire authorities, further revisions took place as a result of the involvement in 1933-35 of C.A. Wheeler. From these evolved the present elevations, sleeker and sharper than those of Derry and Toms; the contrast between the two stores shows the rapid changes of taste which occurred in the early 1930s.

6.22 Like Derry and Toms, the newer Barkers Store is organised around the principle, familiar in London since Selfridges, of steel framed construction covered by stone piers alternating with broad panels of bronze faced windows. The gently curving front towards Kensington High Street was set back more than thirty feet from the previous building line of the Kensington Improvement Scheme. George’s treatment therefore recognised that the main elevation would be more naturally and usually seen from an angle. Three cornices, set back in stages, and a continuous canopy at first floor level emphasise the curve of the street.

6.23 Against these horizontal lines are set the two projecting tower staircases. In shapes and idiom, these go beyond the stripped Art Deco classicism which still controls the organisation and proportion of the rest of the elevation. Their profile, with slim setbacks of stone enclosing a tall lantern of glass within a bronze grid, show George alert to European Expressionism. By recessing the bands of windows and thinning down and splaying the piers, he further reinforced the verticality of the design and set up a play of forces at odds with the dignified, static conception of Derry and Toms.

6.24 The detailing was also carefully considered. The gilt metalwork to the window frames and along the top of the canopy, since removed, showed contemporary Scandinavian
influence in its recourse to conventionalised abstraction. As at Derry and Toms, George used relief and incised carving to add interest to the stonework, but at Barkers these panels are happily more visible from the street.

6.25 In recognition of their place in twentieth century architectural history both stores were listed in 1981.

6.26 However, the growth of the department stores conflicted with the quiet domestic nature of Kensington Square and its residents. After 1890, the growth of Barker’s business empire became a great threat to Kensington Square. Initially his horses and vehicles were stabled in the yards to nos. 2-6 (consec) Kensington Square (east side), and until the First World War, they also stood around the square’s garden whilst some of the houses were already occupied by the shop staff or even their business uses. In 1920, when Barker took over Derry and Toms department store, he also tried to buy nos. 43-45 (consec) Kensington Square and no. 16 Young Street so that he could build a loading bay there. A protest was made by the Kensington Square Garden Committee in 1923 and Barkers ended up only buying no. 16 and part of the gardens, whilst many residents signed covenants to restrict the use of their houses for residential purposes.

6.27 However, the feuds did not end there. By 1939, Barker owned some two-thirds of the houses in the square and the residents closed the garden against its staff. In 1946-49, he continued to press for the removal of the covenants and took up their plan again to build the loading bay in the same location as before.

6.28 The London County Council zoned the square as a special business area and residents sought the help of Kensington Borough Council. In 1946, the town planning sub-committee produced a report expressing the view that “there is no substantial claim for the preservation of the buildings on architectural or historic grounds” and recommended no alteration in the zoning. However, as a result of public pressure, the full Council reversed this view and a change to the London County Council policy was put in train.

6.29 In the end, Barker was allowed the loading bay behind the houses on the north side, swallowing several gardens but was not allowed access through no. 42 into the square as desired.

6.30 After World War II, the first Town and Country Planning Act was produced and along with it, the ability to ‘list’ and protect historic buildings. As a result, in 1949, a handful of houses around the square were listed as buildings of special architectural or historic interest and their future secured. The others were listed in 1969, 1970 and 1984.

6.31 A number of bombs fell around Kensington Square in the Second World War, but only Ansdell Terrace suffered serious damage causing the loss of three houses from its terrace were later replaced. A 1,000 lb bomb landed on the Derry and Toms roof garden in 1941 but failed to explode and a 250 lb bomb fell and damaged the bell tower in the Spanish Garden.

6.32 During Barkers’ own rebuilding works both before and after the war, Derry and Toms carried on as one of three basically independent stores in Kensington High Street owned and managed by the Barker. But the era of department stores was past its peak and after House of Fraser purchased John Barker and Company its value came under increasing scrutiny. Derry and Toms’ turn quickly followed. Following an arrangement made in November 1971, the store closed on 13 January 1973 and Barkers’ interest in the site passed to British Land and Dorothy Perkins for about £4 million.

6.33 There followed a brief revival of glory of the department store buildings. BIBA, the smart Kensington boutique-style business started some nine years before by Barbara Hulanicki, with a speciality in reviving inter-war fashions, ambitiously took over Derry and Toms, relying on the finances of its parent company, Dorothy Perkins. In a furious five month campaign the interior was transformed; escalators were installed, many whimsical features introduced and, most radically, the concept of window displays was abandoned in favour of raised areas of seating in front of the windows. Subdued lighting and velvet tones were pervasive. Altogether some £14 million was spent, but the investment proved rash. BIBA foundered after only a few years and more sober conversions ensued. Most of Pontings’ buildings were redeveloped in the 1970s and 80s.
THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY

6.34 In 2013, planning permission was granted for the redevelopment of the car park at nos. 19-27 (odd) Young Street as residential flats, a use more appropriate to the square which it borders, and this was under construction at the time of writing.

NOTABLE RESIDENTS

6.35 The character of the conservation area is enriched by the very high number of notable residents who have lived in the area, some of whom are celebrated by blue plaques.

6.36 Concerning the illustrious names painted on the door hood of no. 11, it is perhaps proper to point out that while Talleyrand certainly lived in the square, this could only have been October 1792 to February 1793 at the outside. It is also impossible to be precise as to which house he stayed in. Monsieur Defoeu, a French compatriot, occupied no. 11 during that period but was one of several French residents in the square at the time.

6.37 Turning to the Duchesse de Mazarin, a mistress of Charles II. There is no evidence of her residence in the square and instead there is complete consecutive evidence of her residence elsewhere (Arthur, Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede: Records of Kensington Square 1936, published by the Kensington Society in 1986). However, the Register of Deaths for 27 June 1792 does list the demise of a companion of the Duchesse in a lodging-house in the square.

6.38 Dates and addresses are given here for other residents where known:
- The Marquis of Powis (1617-1696), a companion of James II in exile, lived in the original house on the site of no. 7
- 1693: Sir Robert Hamilton, Bt.
- c.1697: Charles Talbot 12th Earl and Duke of Shrewsbury, Ambassador to France, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and Lord Treasurer
- 1697: Sir Richard Blackmore (d. 1729), physician and writer
- 1707: Sir Samuel Barnardiston, Deputy Governor of the East India Company.
- 1708: Sir Richard Steele (1672-1729), essayist
- 1711: Joseph Addison (1672-1719), essayist
- 1712: Sir Hele Hooke, Bt.
- 1720: Reverend Daniel Waterland (1683-1740), theologian and chaplain at Kensington Palace.
- 1721: The 2nd Marquis of Montgomery lived at no. 45
- 1721-32: Reverend John Hough (1651-1743), Bishop of Worcester
- 1742: John Smyth Bourke, 11th Earl of Marquess of Clannicarde
- Isabella Mattocks (1746-1826) actress
- 1770: Right Reverend Matthias Mawson (1683-1770), Bishop of Ely
- Peter Mark Roget (1779-1869), scientist and linguist
- 1782: John Williams (Anthony Pasquin) (1761-1818), satirist
- 1792: Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Perigord, Prince de Benevento, Bishop of Autun, French diplomat
- 1798: Major John Samuel Torrion, commanding officer of the Kensington Volunteers lived at no. 16
- 1799: Anthony Stokes (d. 1799), Chief Justice of Georgia
- c.1810: Reverend Robert Hamilton (d. 1832)
- 1810-1817: The Reverend William Below (1756-1817), bibliographer, lived in no. 44 until his death
- 1820-1827: William Nassau senior (1790-1864), political economist, lived at no. 32
- 1821-1834: Francis Douce (1757-1834), the antiquary, lived at no. 34 until his death
- 1837-1851: John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), the philosopher, lived at no. 18. Here he wrote his Logic and Political Economy
- 1838 to 1841: Richard Redgrave (1804-1888) lived at no. 29, as did his elder brother Samuel (1802-1876), the writer on art
- 1839: John Merriman (1774-1839), the surgeon, died at no. 45
- 1841-1847: Dr James Veitch, a medical pioneer, lived at no. 33
- 1857: Alexi Benoit Soyer (1809-1858), the famous nutritionist and cook, lived at no. 3 for one year
- 1861: Charles James Richardson (1806-1871), the architect, lived at no. 34
- 1863: Sir John Simon KCB (1816-1904), the sanitary reformer and pathologist, lived at no. 40
- 1864-1867: Sir Edward Burne-Jones (1833-1898), the painter, lived at no. 41
- 1864: Thomas Crampton, the railway engineer, received Garibaldi at no. 13
• John Richard Green (1837-1883), the historian, spent the last four years of his life at no. 14
• 1864: Thomas Crampton, the railway engineer, received Garibaldi at no. 13
• 1866: Field Marshall Earl Kitchener (1850-1916)
• 1868: George Goldie, architect of the Maria Assumpta Chapel, Convent of the Assumption and nos. 5, 6 and 16 Kensington Square
• 1876: General Sir Thomas Gore Browne (1807-1887), former colonial governor, lived at no. 7
• 1877-1879: Dame Emma Albani (1852-1930), the singer, lived at no. 31
• 1878-1903: Vernon Lushington QC (1832-1912) lived at no. 36
• 1879-83: John Richard Green (1837-1883), the historian, spent the last four years of his life at no. 14
• HRH Princess Alice, Countess of Athlone (1883-1981) visited no. 18 on many occasions
• 1886-1918: Sir Hubert Parry, Bt, (1848-1918), the composer, lived at no. 17 until his death
• 1890: Angela Thirkell (1890-1961), author, was born at no. 27 Young Street
• 1898: Lady Anne Ritchie (1837-1919), the novelist, lived at no. 16
• 1900-1918: Mrs Patrick Campbell, the actress, lived at no. 33
• Early 1900s: Leonard Stokes, architect, lived at no. 1a
• 1907-1924: The sculptor Frederick William Pomeroy (1856-1924) lived at no. 15 (until his death)
• 1935: Bernard George, architect to John Barker and Company, lived and had his office at no. 34
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 33: An Engaging Public Realm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy CR4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CR5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CR6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 34: Renewing the Legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy CL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CL3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CL4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CL6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CL7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CL8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CL9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CL10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CL11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CL12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>