



STEPHEN LEVRANT
HERITAGE ARCHITECTURE LTD
Architects & Historic Building Consultants

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

Supporting Statement to discharge conditions 4C) and 4D) of LBC 2013/1888/L

June 2015

Introduction

1. This heritage statement is to accompany the discharge of conditions 4c) and 4d) of LBC 2013/1888/L granted 12 June 2013, which states:
*“Detailed drawings, or samples of materials as appropriate, in respect of the following, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the relevant part of the work is begun:
c) Details of service runs for all new bathrooms/kitchens, demonstrating the relationship of new pipework with the structure of the building;
d) Details of all new light fittings;”*
2. This assessment aims to appraise the impact of the 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 (17 June 2014)

3. The issue of the new light fittings and particularly the downlights has been discussed at the onsite meeting on 17 June 2014 with the Local Planning Authority (Antonia Powell, Senior Planner), The Crown Estate (Paul Prentice) and the Historic England (Alasdair Young).
4. MMM Architects showed to the team three options of proposed downlights, and the proposed location within the rooms. Despite acknowledging the improvement of technology and appearance of the new available models, Antonia Powell and Alasdair Young appeared unconvinced, especially on the two larger fittings. They both conveyed that the appearance of rooms will be affected and that such a proposal should be avoided in principal rooms at ground and first floors. Alasdair Young noted that the efforts in reinstating the Nash’s detailing would be ruined by the introduction of downlights. However, it was agreed that mock-up samples should be prepared and tested when dark, to assess the visual impact from the public realm.

5. Furthermore, in a subsequent email exchange, following a design revision and a meeting with MMM architects, Paul Prentice (The Crown Estate) confirms that *“The diversity of the lighting...on the upper floors is reassuring and the lighting is acceptable in principle. You confirmed that the recessed fittings are directional and that the colour temperature of the LED lamps will be selected to harmonise with the lighting on the floors below. We did agree that a mock up would be useful to see if a black housing is preferable to a white one, at a time when the interiors are taking shape.”*

Proposed Works and Impact Assessment – 4c) Service Runs

6. The proposed service runs for all new bathrooms and kitchens, as shown on Drainage layout and Hot & Cold water & Gas services layout drawings by Optima BES Ltd, are considered to not compromise the historic building fabric and are acceptable in conservation terms, will not be visible and are intended to be of high quality and workmanship.
7. The proposed services are necessary functional interventions that that will provide for the future of the heritage asset through achieving present day acceptable standards in one of the most affluent areas of London.
8. It is, therefore, considered that the overall impact of the proposed works for the service runs on the identified heritage asset is considered to be **minor/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 and 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.

Proposed Works and Impact Assessment – 4d) Light fittings

9. The proposed light fittings, as shown on the Proposed Lighting Scheme and the Light Fitting Schedule by MMM Architects Ltd are considered to not compromise the historic building fabric and are intended to be practically reversible and of high quality.
10. In line with the pre-application advice the proposal for downlights is now limited to the basement, ground and 1st floor only bathrooms and smaller halls that are not visible from the street and upper floors (2nd and 3rd) bedrooms, bathrooms, dressing and storage rooms. There are no downlights in principal rooms on the ground and 1st floor, nor on any of the landings on the upper floors.
11. The proposed lighting scheme is also in line with the Crown Estate’s comments. The minor impact on the historic building fabric and the appearance of the heritage asset is limited only to upper floors and will not be visible from the public realm.
12. Following the initial pre-app discussions and further revisions of the original proposals, we consider that the current proposed lighting scheme 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 and 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.
13. The significance of the heritage asset and the surrounding Conservation Area is not challenged. The proposal results in degrees of **impact** across the site and within its

setting which are considered to be **minor and beneficial** and would assist in the long-term use of the heritage asset.

Conclusion

14. 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.
15. Although the proposal is considered to have a **minor impact** on the historic building fabric and the appearance of the heritage asset, the benefits that thus accrue include, sustaining its significance as a heritage asset; optimum viable use of the heritage asset in support of its long term conservation; the enhanced status makes a positive contribution to the economic vitality and sustains the unique attributes of the Crown Estate community.
16. 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.
17. It is considered that the proposed works cause "**no harm**". If, however the officer may find that the proposals do cause a degree of harm, we believe that this cannot be greater than 'less than substantial harm'. In which case the proposal will be clearly balanced by the following public benefits: the optimal viable use of the property developed through a sensitive and sympathetic design that maximises the intrinsic qualities of the existing building, further revealing its heritage value and enhancing the quality of its setting.
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**