

Heritage Impact Assessment

21 Park Square East

London

NW1 4LH

To support Listed Building and Planning Applications for refurbishment and extension and other alterations on the lower ground floor.



January 2013

GRANT AUDLEY-MILLER MA Oxf, DipTP, MRTPI, IHBC

21 Park Square East, London, NW1 4LH

1. Introduction

This statement has been prepared by Grant Audley-Miller, MA Oxf, DipTP, MRTPI, IHBC, for Mrs Dzhansari Umarova. The purpose of the statement is to assess the impact of the proposal for the refurbishment and extension of 21 Park Square East, London in accordance with the requirements of para. 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

My advice is made solely on the basis of the heritage issues. These are the impact of the proposals on No 21 Park Square East which is included in the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest and the Regent's Park Conservation Area and the adjacent listed buildings.

My competence for undertaking the work required is based on over thirty five years professional experience as a Chartered Town Planner and a member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation. My duties have involved advising on urban design, listed building matters and policies and proposals for a wide range of conservation areas.

2. The site and surroundings

21 Park Square East is a Grade I listed building located to the south east of Regent's Park adjacent to the Marylebone Road. The property forms part of one of the Nash Terraces fronting onto Park Square and backing onto Peto Place.

3. The heritage assets

The designated heritage assets relevant to this proposal are:

Nos 13-24 Park Square East (which includes No 21 Park Square East). These buildings are Listed Grade I and the list description is attached at Appendix 1.

GRANT AUDLEY-MILLER MA Oxf, DipTP, MRTPI, IHBC

The Regent's Park Conservation Area. The site is situated close to the southern boundary of the Conservation Area which was designated on 1st July 1969. The Regent's Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (RPCAAMS) was adopted on the 11 July 2011.

4. The proposal

The proposal consists of:

- A refurbishment of the interior
- A rear extension and
- A small front enclosure and other alterations on the lower ground floor

A detailed description of the proposal and the rationale of the design approach are considered in detail in the Planning, Design and Access Statement prepared by Bell Cornwell, Chartered Town Planners.

5. National Policy Guidance on the Historic Environment

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and supersedes Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5) as Government Policy on the management of change to the Historic Environment in England.

The NPPF policies relevant to this proposal are:

Para 128. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any

contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

Para 129. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Para 131. In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Para 132. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the

highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Para 137. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.

Para 138. Not all elements of a Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance.

PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment: Practice Guide

In the Revision Note to the Practice Guide English Heritage stresses that it remains a valid and Government endorsed document pending the results of a review of guidance supporting national planning policy. The references to PPS5 policies in the Practice Guide are now redundant, but the policies in the NPPF are very similar and the intent is the same, so the Practice Guide remains almost entirely relevant and useful in the application of the NPPF.

Building in Context: new development in historic areas (2001)

This joint EH/CABE publication states that

“Successful architecture can be produced either by following historic precedents closely, by adapting them or by contrasting with them”.

GRANT AUDLEY-MILLER MA Oxf, DipTP, MRTPI, IHBC

It goes on to advise the importance of context, the scale of neighbouring buildings and the use of good quality materials.

The setting of heritage assets: English Heritage Guidance 2011

This English Heritage document was published in October 2011. It sets out guidance on managing change within the setting of heritage assets. It provides the basis for advice by English Heritage when they respond to consultations and assess the implications of development proposals on the historic estates they manage. It is also intended to assist others involved with managing development that may affect the setting of heritage assets.

Since the publication of the NPPF in March 2012 some of the references in this document are out of date but English Heritage believes, however, that the policy approach is unlikely to change and that this document still contains useful advice and case studies.

6. Relevant Planning Policy

The relevant development plan policies are those of the adopted Camden Local Development Framework adopted in 2010 .

The relevant Local Development Framework policies are:

Policy CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Policy DP25 Conserving Camden's Heritage sets out policies to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas and preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings.

The Regent's Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy adopted in 2011 is used in the assessment of planning applications for proposed developments in the Regent's Park conservation area.

The RPCAAMS at pages 6 and 6 describes the conservation area in considerable detail and the contribution that Park Square West makes to the character and appearance of the conservation area. I have no hesitation in concurring with that description of the significance of Park Square East.

The Regent's Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy identifies 'Views up Portland Place past the Circus and along Park Square East' as a Key View.

7. Relevant Planning History

Planning permission was granted in 1970 (M11/3/16/9654) for the limited use of front room on first floor as office and reception room. A subsequent application (M11/3/16/21829) to continue that use was refused in 1975.

Listed building consent and planning permission (application no 8970495 and 9003113) was granted in 1989 and 1990 for the refurbishment and extension of nos 20-24.

Significance of the heritage assets

21 Park Square East's significance comes from its architectural quality and its contribution to the overall design the Nash terrace of Park Square and his wider scheme for Regent's Park as a whole.

Nash had originally intended to build a circus of grand terraced houses at the north end of Portland Place but the only part of the circus to be built was Park Crescent. Instead of the circus Park Square East and West were built fronting on to Park

Square between 1823 – 5 to a design by Nash.

The terraces of Park Square East are an important visual link from Portland Place and Park Crescent through to Regent's Park and this is recognized in the Regent's Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy where the 'Views up Portland Place past the Circus and along Park Square East' are identified as a Key View.

This has led me to conclude that in terms of the heritage assets affected by the proposal :

No 21 Park Square East is a prominent and significant Grade 1 Listed Building forming an integral part of the setting and group value of the Grade 1 Nash Terrace.

The Regents Park Conservation Areas as a whole is of significance as a designated heritage asset with Park Square East identified as a 'key view'

8. Significance of the Building

To properly assess the significance of No 21 Park Square East I carried out 2 visits to the building to assess its interior. On my second visit I had the opportunity to inspect the roof structure and other parts of the structure where modern fittings for bathrooms and kitchens had been removed.

Exterior

A comprehensive description of the exterior of the building and terrace is contained in the list description at Appendix1

Interior

Lower Ground Floor

GRANT AUDLEY-MILLER MA Oxf, DipTP, MRTPI, IHBC

Cantilevered stone staircase with metal balustrade and handrail with modern timber laid on stone treads and risers. Timber flooring except in storage room. Plain skirting throughout and no cornices

Vaults under pavement have been rendered and concrete floors inserted.

Ground Floor

Entrance hall - moulded skirting and decorative cornices and small roundel. Modern ceramic tile flooring. Fanlight over door frame (No doors)

Entrance lobby - moulded skirting and decorative cornices and small roundel. Modern ceramic tile flooring.

Dining Room - has two architraved sash windows with wooden shutters. Deep moulded skirtings, cornices, roundel and marble fireplace. Timber flooring. Architraved doorway and door.

Kitchen - sash window, moulded skirtings, cornices and ceiling roundel. Architraved doorway and door. Ceramic tile flooring.

Cantilevered stone staircase with simple rounded nosings and tread ends, ornamental iron balusters and mahogany handrail. Paneled timber and glazed infill with door to basement. Damage to landing stonework and repairs in cement mortar on landings

The first half landing has a square 6 pane double hung sash window with panelled shutters. The second half landing has a large round headed sash window in simple deep reveal.

First Floor

Drawing room - three architraved sash windows with wooden panelled shutters. Deep moulded skirtings, ceiling roundel and decorative cornices. Marble fireplace.

GRANT AUDLEY-MILLER MA Oxf, DipTP, MRTPI, IHBC

Architraved doorway and door to landing. Architraved doorway with double doors to living room. Floor is timber raised on timber fillets.

Living room - Architraved 6 pane double hung sash window with wooden panelled shutters. Deep moulded skirtings, ceiling roundel and cornices. Marble fireplace. Architraved doorway and door. The level of the timber floor has been raised.

Landing – Stone floor

Second Floor

Architraved doorways and doors. Moulded skirtings and cornices. Softwood floors throughout. Bedroom 1 has two sash windows with paneled shutters, decorative cornices and skirting. The wardrobe has modern built-in cupboards. The bathroom has new skirtings and ceramic tile flooring. The study has one sash window and a simple but undistinguished modern fire surround. Modern winding staircase to third floor.

Third Floor

Architraved doorways and doors. Softwood floors throughout. Bedrooms have plain skirtings, carpet flooring, new architraves and doors. There are no cornices to the ceilings. The bathrooms have modern ceramic tiles to floors (over softwood flooring) and walls. Late 19th century cast iron fire surrounds to bedrooms 2 and 3

9. Assessment of the interior

During the later part of the 20th century this property along with neighbouring properties underwent a comprehensive scheme of refurbishment. This is recognized in the list description which states that “.... Nos 20-24 converted to flats c1986, many original interior features destroyed.

From my inspection it is clear that while the original fabric survives largely intact on the front and rear elevations, a considerable amount of the interior fabric is modern work, most likely replaced during the refurbishment works during the late 1980's.

Certainly from my visits throughout the building the floors have been replaced, walls and ceilings particularly in the upper stories replaced in plasterboard and new partitions and doors inserted.

The lower ground floor plan appears largely unaltered but all flooring and most doors have been replaced and, as one would expect for a basement level, it is simply detailed.

The original floor layout has largely survived on the ground and first floors but a considerable amount of the fabric has been replaced. This includes the timber flooring in the dining room and living room and ceramic tile flooring in the kitchen and hall. The relining of part of the walls in plasterboard in the kitchen and hall, renewal and replacement of joinery including doors and their architraves, skirtings, some windows and window shutters.

On the second and third floors the room layouts were comprehensively reorganized with original partitions being removed and new doors and partitions erected to create bathrooms with tiled floors and walls, cupboards and wardrobes/dressing rooms and a new staircase inserted from the second to the third floor. Again there is evidence of the relining of walls, and the erection of new plasterboard ceilings, cornices architraves and skirtings.

One of the major original features of the building is the staircase from the lower ground floor up to the second floor although on the lower ground floor the treads and risers have been overlaid with modern timber.

The loss of historic fabric in the interior of the building has in my opinion reduced the special interest, and consequently the significance of the interior. I also consider

that the building, particularly on the second and third floors where the floor plan has been reorganized there is the greatest potential for further change.

THE PROPOSALS

10. Appraisal of the interior refurbishment

The proposed refurbishment works are designed to update the building to modern living standard.

My assessment of the works on the significance of the building are as follows:

Lower Ground Floor

The works except for the realignment of a partition are almost exclusively confined to flooring works.

The modern ceramic tiled floors and narrow width timber floors are to be replaced with Jura limestone to match the colour of the staircase and oak boards. These would be appropriate and more sympathetic replacement materials.

Of particular interest is the proposal to remove the treads and risers from the stone staircase which will better reveal the significance this feature of the building.

Ground Floor

The main proposal is to remove part of the wall between the family room and kitchen and install architrave and double doors. Removing only part of the wall would minimize the loss of historic fabric and have minimal impact on the historic floor plan. The doors could be removed and the wall reinstated if it was ever decided to

reinstate the original plan.

This approach has been considered acceptable in other properties in the Park Square East terrace. (20 Park Square East App No 2009/5687/L)

It is also proposed to remove the door at the head of the staircase to the Lower Ground Floor. Considering that this is not a historic door I am of the view that this alteration will not affect the significance of the building. It is also proposed to reinstate double doors into the existing frame in the hall.

The modern ceramic tiled floors and narrow width timber floor boards are to be replaced with Jura limestone to match the colour of the staircase and oak boards. These would be appropriate and more sympathetic replacement materials.

First Floor

The works on this floor are minimal including reflooring as on the ground floor with varied width oak boards and the replacing the modern double doors between the drawing room and the library with new double doors to open out into the drawing room. It is also proposed to repair/reinstate the damaged and previously repaired stone slabs on the landings of the main staircase.

Second Floor

The partition between bedroom 1 and the study would be removed creating a large master bedroom. The existing door opening to bedroom 2 would be blocked. The opening up of the master bedroom will allow the three sash windows to be read together and therefore better reveal their significance.

The staircase to the third floor, which is not original, would be replaced on a new alignment and the modern partition in the wardrobe removed.

The false ceiling in the dressing room is to be removed and the ceiling and cornices reinstated at the original ceiling height and will be a positive improvement.

GRANT AUDLEY-MILLER MA Oxf, DipTP, MRTPI, IHBC

Oak floor boards are proposed and in the existing bathroom marble flooring and tiling installed.

Third Floor

More radical readjustments to the partitions take place on the third floor would result in a change in the floor plan. I consider that in this part of the house where the fabric of the building underwent significant alteration in the late 1980's it will not have an adverse impact on the significance of the building.

In general it is proposed that where required cornices, skirting, architraves, mouldings, plasterwork and windows will be restored and repaired.

Bearing in mind the extent of the previous refurbishment works to the interior and the limited nature of the alterations and refurbishment works now proposed I am of the opinion that the proper implementation of the works can be controlled by appropriate conditions requiring the submission of details for matters such as joinery, flooring and making good.

In conclusion I am of the opinion that the works to the interior will not harm the significance of the building and as I have identified above some of these works will enhance and better reveal the significance of the building.

11. Appraisal of the Rear Extension

In my assessment of the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets I have taken particular account of the guidance and advice in the National Planning Policy Framework, 'PPS5: 'Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide' 2010 and English Heritage's the 'Setting of Heritage Assets'.

Advice in the Historic Environmental Planning Practice Guide 2010 states that ‘The main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, including new development in conservation areas, are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, use, relationship with adjacent assets, alignment and treatment of setting’.

Advice in the Historic Environmental Planning Practice Guide 2010 states that ‘The main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, including new development in conservation areas, are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, use, relationship with adjacent assets, alignment and treatment of setting’.

The guidance in the ‘Setting of Heritage Assets’ recommends that in assessing whether a proposal be acceptable or unacceptable in terms of the degree of harm to the significance of the setting of an asset three questions should be sequentially addressed :

Is a development of a particular type, scale, massing or prominence?

Is the precise location of the development likely to be a critical factor in determining whether the degree of harm to significance is acceptable or unacceptable?

Are more detailed aspects of the development’s design likely to be a critical factor in determining whether the degree of harm to significance is acceptable or unacceptable?

I have therefore been mindful of this national guidance in my consideration of this proposal together with Policy CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage and Policy DP25 Conserving Camden’s Heritage of the Local Development Framework and the guidance in the RPCAAMS.

GRANT AUDLEY-MILLER MA Oxf, DipTP, MRTPI, IHBC

The Planning, Design and Access Statement describes how the rear extension has been designed in such a way as to respect the character and appearance of the listed building and the Conservation Area as well as ensuring an acceptable relationship with neighbouring properties.

The designer has closely followed the design principles used on the neighbouring extensions and as a result the proposal will mirror in terms of height, scale, design and materials the extensions that have been added to those neighbouring properties.

In particular I note that the height, width and fenestration of the extension has been carefully designed so as to respect and take account of and minimise its impact on the fenestration and rainwater goods runs on the existing building. The only significant alteration to the main building will be to replace the modern sash window in the hall with a new door opening but in my opinion this will not adversely affect the significance of the listed building.

This approach will in my opinion result in a siting, bulk, scale, mass, proportions and design that will sit comfortably with and not upset the scale or proportions of the building or harm the setting of the adjacent rear elevations of the terrace facing Peto Place and preserve and enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

12. Appraisal of the front connecting lobby

The proposal involves the creation of a connecting lobby at lower ground floor level to provide access from the house to the vaults under the pavement.

This would involve the erection of a new glazed screen and French door. The principle of such screens is well established in this and other terraces within Regent's Park. Permission was recently granted for such a screen at No 20

The current proposal has been designed in a traditional manner in painted softwood with single glazing, in keeping with the appearance of the listed building. I am of the opinion that the implementation of this proposal can be controlled by an appropriate condition regarding joinery details.

Because of its position it would not affect the special interest of the building or the character or appearance of the conservation area. In particular it would not impact on the Key View identified in the RPCAAMS. It should also be noted that the screen and door would be reversible.

13. Appraisal of the vaults

With their low ceiling heights and lack of interconnection the vaults are not practicable for modern domestic use. Furthermore the fabric of the vaults has been rendered over at some time in the past. The proposal is to lower the modern concrete floors and create interconnecting doors between the vaults. The loss of the floors will not involve the removal of historic fabric. I understand that structural engineers will be advising on how the alterations can be achieved without affecting either the stability of the vaults, the main building or adjacent buildings in accordance with the guidance on basements in the RPCAAMS. I am of the opinion that the detail of such structural works could be controlled by an appropriate condition.

The creation of the new doorways will lead to the loss of some historic fabric but the historic plan form will be retained. The alterations will give the vaults a viable future use and ensure their longer term maintenance and preservation. If necessary the floor plan of the vaults could be reinstated in the future.

14. Conclusions

The refurbishment works, although they will involve the loss of some historic fabric, such as the removal of the wall between the kitchen and dining room, could ultimately be reinstated. Set against this the renewal of the current floors in more appropriate materials, the restoration of the basement staircase, the creation of the new master bedroom on the second floor and the reinstatement of the ceiling in the second floor dressing room can all be seen as positive improvements that will better reveal the significance of the building.

The Planning, Design and Access Statement prepared by Bell Cornwell, Chartered Town Planners describes how the rear extension has been designed to respect the character and appearance of the listed building and the Conservation Area as well as ensuring an acceptable relationship with neighbouring properties.

The proposed new rear extension and front lobby take into account the context provided by not just the significance and architectural quality of the Park Square East terrace but also the modern extensions that have been permitted on the neighbouring rear elevations and the lobby enclosures permitted in the front lightwells. Taking account of these factors I do not consider that the extensions in terms of the size, height and scale and design proposed are inappropriate in this location and will not harm the significance of the heritage assets.

I consider the proposed extensions will sit comfortably with this nationally important terrace. The proposals are an appropriate design for their context and it will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Regent's Park Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings of the terrace.

The proposals are consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide. It is also consistent with the advice in 'Building in Context: new development in historic areas (2001). Furthermore it does not conflict with the relevant conservation policies set out in the Camden LDF and the guidance set out in the Management of Change-Application of Policy Guidance section of the Regent's Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011

For all the reasons set out above, it is my considered professional opinion that the refurbishment works and extension and other works on the lower ground floor at 21 Park Square East can be justified in conservation terms as they will not harm the significance of the designated heritage assets.

Grant Audley-Miller

January 2013

Appendix 1

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: NUMBERS 13-24 AND ATTACHED RAILINGS THE DIORAMA, BEDFORD COLLEGE ANNEXE

List entry Number: 1322054

Location

NUMBERS 13-24 AND ATTACHED RAILINGS, 13-24, PARK SQUARE EAST THE DIORAMA, BEDFORD COLLEGE ANNEXE, PETO PLACE

Grade: I

Date first listed: 14-May-1974

Includes: The Diorama, Bedford College Annexe PETO PLACE. Terrace of 12 houses, the northern most bay forming part of No.1 St Andrew's Place (qv). c1823-5. By John Nash. Nos 13-16 and Nos 20-24 converted to flats c1986, many original interior features destroyed. Stucco and slated mansard roofs with dormers. EXTERIOR: symmetrical terrace, 3 bays at either end and centre 7 window bays projecting. Projecting bays 4 storeys, and basements; otherwise, 3 storeys, attics and basements. 3 windows each. Ground floor with attached Ionic order supporting an entablature surmounted by a continuous cast-iron balcony (the northern most projection without railings). Square-headed doorways with architraves, cornices, pilaster-jambs carrying cornice-heads and patterned fanlights (except Nos 16, 19, 21, and 23) and panelled doors. Architraved sash windows with cornices and some glazing bars. 1st floor windows arcaded with keystones, archivolts and moulded imposts. 2nd floor sill band. Dentil cornice at 3rd floor with attic storeys over centre and end bays and balustraded parapets between. INTERIORS: with stone stairs, cast-iron, foliated balusters and wreathed wood handrails. Some panelled rooms; most with enriched ceiling cornices and central roundels. Rear ground floor room of No.24 with good vaulted and moulded ceiling, roundels of Classical figures, pilasters and pedimented mirror over original fireplace. SUBSIDIARY FEATURES: attached cast-iron railings with urn finials to areas. No.18 incorporates at the rear, in Peto

Place, a 3 storey, altered, polygonal building in brick with stone capped buttresses between round-arched 2nd floor windows. This was the Diorama, a picture show designed by Augustus Charles Pugin. By 1854 it had been converted into a Baptist Chapel which closed 1922 when the Middlesex Hospital used it for a rheumatism treatment pool. An arts co-operative at time of inspection in 1989.