



STEPHEN LEVRANT
HERITAGE ARCHITECTURE LTD
Architects & Historic Building Consultants

41-42 Chester Terrace, London, NW1 4ND:

Supporting Statement to discharge condition 4. of 2014/4977/P

July 2015

Introduction

1. This heritage statement is to accompany the discharge of condition 4. Amendments to main application - Planning Permission 2014/4977/P granted 10 December 2014, which states:

“Detailed samples of facing materials in respect of the repairs to external cracks and sections of facade, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the relevant part of the work is begun: The relevant part of the works shall be carried out in accordance with the details thus approved and all approved samples shall be retained on site during the course of the works.”

2. This assessment aims to appraise the impact of the below proposal on the special interest of the heritage asset within the site: No. 41-42 Chester Terrace. Furthermore, the assessment considers the impact of the proposed works on the Grade I listed house and the Regents Park Conservation Area; and on the setting of the designated and non-designated heritage assets within and surrounding the site.

Pre-Application Advice (Feb-June 2015)

3. The issue of the façade repairs has been discussed via emails/letters exchange with the Local Planning Authority (Antonia Powell, Senior Planner) and the Historic England (Alasdair Young), and on site with The Crown Estate (Paul Prentice).
4. They were all in principal supportive of the proposed method of the paint removal trials on the decorative details on the south elevation and the proposed repair of the stucco façade.
5. The LPA officer confirmed *“I am happy with the proposed repairs to the existing fabric. I do not in this instance consider that Listed Building Consent would be required for this repair work.”* The officer furthermore acknowledged that *“The principal of cleaning the details is acceptable in principal”* and *“In principal I have no objection to these proposals and I can confirm that I would be likely to support the application”*, but also had two concerns *“one is the appearance of the cleaned details should not be “as new”. So it is important that the details are not over*

cleaned. Secondly these types of paint removal paste can leave chemical deposits which leach out in the future. It is, as I am sure you are aware, very important that the product is washed off effectively but without damaging the stucco or harming the historic fabric with excessive amounts of water”.

6. Stephen Levrant (SLHA) and Paul Prentice (The Crown Estate) inspected and discussed the paint removal trials on site and agreed that *“The paint removal trials on the modillions to the second floor cornice to the south elevation revealed many layers of paint”* and that *“the principle of paint removal from the decorative detail is considered to be acceptable here as it obscures the underlying detail and the paint sequence will be analysed and recorded. However it may be prudent to leave a full sequence of paint on one of the modillions in a discrete location.”*
7. It was furthermore agreed that it would be very difficult to remove just some of the layers of the paint as a bird preventative gel (“pigeon gel”) was also present on the upper surfaces of the Acanthus leaves of the capitals, which had been subsequently covered with a paint system making it ineffective and hard to remove.
8. Also, one of the trial modillions seems to be a modern replacement so the paint removal exercise could also be used as an investigation to determine and record all the other modern replacement decorative details on the elevations.

Proposed Works and Impact Assessment

9. PAYE were instructed to carry out a hammer test and condition survey. The first report was produced in July 2014 ('Stucco condition report, Rev A' - Appendix 3) and a second in August 2014 ('priced schedules' - Appendix 4). The facades were inspected using a combination of binocular surveys and a hammer test to the four elevations accessed by abseil rope technicians.
10. Heritage Architecture Ltd was appointed in September 2014 to prepare schedules of condition and repair works (Appendix 1 and 2) and specification using the information provided to date by PAYE with the necessary amendments and input, in order to comply with the Crown Estate Guidelines and Standard Specification. Identified areas will need to be reviewed following inspection from scaffolding.
11. The proposed method of repairs to the stucco façade is detailed in the attached schedules by SLHA and the "Stucco Condition Report" by PAYE. Mortar samples have also been taken to ascertain the most appropriate repair mix for replacement areas of stucco. Trial patches will be undertaken to satisfy the Conservation Officer's requirements.
12. Furthermore, in response to the Conservation Officer's/Crown Estate concerns we can advise the following:
 - Cleaning chemical residue is to be removed using "DOFF" Superheated water, (steam), therefore minimal amount of water on the fabric of the building and all of chemical will be removed. The proposed chemical is alkali based and will be effectively inert once water has been applied to wash off.
 - Paint removal from the detailing is to enhance the features of the enrichment only, these are to be subsequently repainted (4-5 new layers).

- Work method statement and risk assessment to be supplied prior to commencement and can be agreed with conservation officer prior to commencement.
 - Paint analysis and report with recommendations to be provided if required. Initial visual analysis indicates a modern paint system over a modern cement render.
13. It is considered the proposed repairs to the façade do not compromise the historic building fabric, are acceptable in conservation terms and are intended to be of high quality and workmanship.
14. It is also considered that the proposed repairs will preserve and enhance the appearance of the heritage asset and the conservation area. They will also provide for the future of the heritage asset through achieving present day acceptable standards in one of the most affluent areas of London.
15. It is, therefore, considered that the overall impact of the proposed stucco façade repairs on the identified heritage asset is considered to be **negligible/beneficial** and will not have an adverse effect on the special interest and appearance of the main house and its setting, nor the character of the Regents Park Conservation Area. They are consistent with the spirit of local policies and national conservation principles, particularly NPPF policy principles guiding the determination of applications for consent relating to all heritage assets.

Conclusion

16. English Heritage (now Historic England) "Conservation Principles" and the NPPF define conservation as "managing change". Buildings, designated or undesignated heritage assets, are dynamic environments that have been subject to change and in order to remain a sustainable, welcoming and pleasing place they will continue to change.
17. Furthermore, the applicant has recognised the importance of undertaking investigations and analysis necessary for the assessment of the effects of the proposed works on the special interest of the heritage asset. This approach has been both beneficial with regard to the consideration of alternatives and important with regard to the process of acknowledging the best practice guidance as outlined in NPPF.
18. It is therefore concluded that the proposed works satisfy the relevant clauses of the NPPF. These are consistent with the spirit of local policies and national conservation principles and therefore there must be a presumption for its approval.

**Stephen Levrant: Heritage Architecture
Architects and Heritage Asset Consultants**