
From: CAAC Comments Form [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 July 2023 10:04
To: Planning Planning; [REDACTED]
Subject: CAAC Consultation Comments Received

Camden Council

Hi,

Someone submitted an entry for the CAAC Comments form form in the Camden Council site. View all the form's entries by clicking [here](#).

[Click here to access the form](#)

Here's what **Someone** entered into the form:

Enter Pin

[REDACTED]

Application ref.

2023/2372/P

Site Address

2 Chester Place London NW1 4NB

Development Description

Alterations to the rear courtyard and installation of rooflight to the rear closet wing.

Planning officer

Obote Hope

Advisory committee

Regent's Park;Regents Park

Advisory committee

Please send your comments by:

2023-07-30T00:00:00.000

Please choose one

Objection

Do you have any comments or consider that the proposal is harmful to or does not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area?

ADVICE from The Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT
ADVICE from Regent's Park CAAC 12A Manley Street NW1 8LT 3 July 2023 2 Chester Place, NW1 4NB 2023/2372/P Strong objection. 1. The RPCAAC is very concerned that unapproved work to Listed Buildings should not be seen to be a means of gaining consent for inappropriate changes: a dangerous precedent would be established. We note with serious concern that the applicant states that the work – apparently including the unapproved work – was 'approved by the Crown Estate and monitored closely by Purcell Miller Tritton' (Firstplan Ltd, 'Planning Heritage Design and Access Statement' para 6.20 p. 18) despite being unapproved work to the Listed Building. 2. The Committee objects to the changes to the rear courtyard as detailed in the 'Planning Heritage Design and Access Statement' paras 6.3-6.6 p. 16. The rear courtyards link the houses which front Chester Place to the service access on Albany Street. This arrangement makes a clear statement of the hierarchy of the spaces of the original building and the relationship of the formal and distinguished 'fronts' of the group to the service 'backs' on Albany Street. The arrangement is a rarely surviving example of the physical relationship of the houses which formed the formal layout of the Park to the service areas behind: most of these rear service areas have been destroyed. 'The Regent's Park Conservation Area Appraisal', current SPD, at p. 20, records that 'the rear elevations of the Chester Place houses offer important evidence of the original form of the rear elevations of middle grade formal terraces. 3. We strongly object to the mirror panelling and the fire surround which detract from the surviving character – as the applicant accepts – stating that they are 'not in keeping with the character of the property' and 'not in keeping with the traditional style' (6.6). We argue that they are harmful to the original and surviving character of the rear courtyard which is an important element in the significance of the Listed house. 4. We object to the reconfiguration of the rear access door to the kitchen, the rear (Albany Street) room on the ground floor. This insertion changes the surviving plan form of this original room. This is harmful to the surviving plan form of the ground floor, one of the principal floors in the house. The plan

form of principal floors is recognized as of key significance to Listed Buildings. 5. We are concerned by the configuration of the front area (to Chester Place). 5.1. The existing and proposed drawings for application ref. 2007/4277/L show no steps to the front area. No steps in the front area are mentioned in the 2007 Officer's Report. No steps are shown in the current application 'as approved' drawing. Steps in the front area are, however now shown in the current application although they are not referenced in the applicant's 'Planning Heritage Design and Access Statement'. It is clear on site that these steps are in place. On the basis of the applicant's drawings, these steps appear, therefore, to be further unapproved changes to the Listed Building. We would object strongly to their being approved under this application. 5.2. A review on site of the houses 1-11 Chester Place, the group of which no. 2 is a part, shows that none of these front areas have steps: no. 2 is therefore exceptional in having front area steps. We note that some other houses in the group do have original gates in the railings, but these are not associated with steps. This established pattern reinforces the key significance of the original and surviving plan of these houses, as stated above, which is that the Park side of the house does not have service areas with access from the Park side: the accessed service areas are on the Albany Street side. This distinction is a key element in the significance of these houses: this significance would be harmed by the application for front area steps. The RPCAAC strongly objects to this change. No public benefit outweighs this harm. 6. The proposals identified here would harm the significance of the Listed Building: the external changes identified here would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. Richard Simpson FSA Chair

Do you want to attach any files?

Yes

Attach files

2 Chester Place NW1 4NB 2023 2372 P Advice from RPCAAC July 2023.pdf

To receive a confirmation email, enter your address below:

[REDACTED]

[Click here to access the form](#)