

**ADVICE from The Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee
12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT**

3 July 2023

Gloucester Lodge, 12 Gloucester Gate and 12 & 13 Gloucester Gate Mews, NW1 4HG 2023/1742/P

Strong objection.

1. The complex architectural history of Gloucester Lodge is generally well set out and evidenced in the applicant's 'Heritage Statement', especially at sections 3.2-3.6 pp. 8-14. This account, at pp. 8-10, draws out and illustrates the work of J. B. Papworth in the 1830s. It is this work which the applicant references at section 6.5 p. 20: '... The proposed design is considered to be of an exceptional high-standard of design, which presents an unusually elegant form that reflect the historic curved forms of the apsidal end to the south wing and the garden building present during the late 19th and early 20th centuries (ref. Figure 5). ...'.

2. But the applicant also argues, at section 5.6 at p. 18, that 'The rear elevation was never designed with the same architectural interest as the principal west elevation ...'. This assessment is reinforced by the history of the pre-1952 construction, section 3.4 p. 12, which included the single-storey building linking the main house to the mews buildings. This was the configuration as Listed, at Grade I, in 1974.

3. The RPCAAC therefore advises that the current proposal is harmful to the Grade I Listed Buildings in that it is out of scale for a building in the rear of the group, where the hierarchy of the surviving historic fabric reflects a subordinate scale.

4. Similarly, the forms to the rear are plain and subordinate. The design proposed is alien in its forms and dominant where they should be modest. It is not persuasive to argue that the proposed forms reflect those of the Papworth buildings ('Heritage Statement' pp. 8-10 with figures 5, 6, 7). Papworth's apsidal feature to the 1836 south wing impinges modestly on the garden space: it is also stated to be at ground level. Further, the round conservatory building, also of 1836, sits at a small scale in the garden: it is a feature of the garden, not a substantial element of building defining the south boundary of the space as in the current application proposals.

5. We are also concerned that, while the proposed main glazed elevation faces north, the upper parts of the proposed roof would be subject to significant solar gain which would imply the need for high levels of energy use to control internal temperatures. This would contravene Camden's Local Plan policies addressing the – increasingly acute – problems of the climate emergency (Local Plan CC2).

6. The proposed two-storey link would harm the hierarchy of building which is a key element of the significance of the Grade I Listed Buildings. There is no public benefit which would outweigh this harm. The proposals would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.



Chair RPCAAC