

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/3706/P	Richard Simpson for Regent's Park CAAC	12A Manley Street NW1 8LT NW1 8LT	18/08/2016 18:28:59	OBJ	<p>Advice from Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street London NW1 8LT</p> <p>15 August 2016</p> <p>10 Gloucester Gate London NW1 4HG Application number: 2016/4064/L + 2016/3706/P Various alterations to dwelling house and mews including replacement of the rear extension, mews roof rebuilt and alterations to fenestration, internal refurbishment consisting of demolition and reposition of some partition walls.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very strong objection. 2. We note that, despite advice in the NPPF, the RPCAAC was not consulted on these proposals pre-application. 3. These proposals are substantially harmful to the special significance of the Listed Buildings at 10 Gloucester Gate, the attached mews house (10 Gloucester Gate Mews), the adjoining houses in Gloucester Gate, and the setting of the Listed Buildings as a group. 4. The relationship between the main house, the rear open space, and the mews house is of special significance in terms of the historic character and appearance of the Listed Buildings. This relationship is part of, and contributes to, the 'very clear hierarchy of building types in this conservation area', as formally recorded and acknowledged in Camden's approved Regent's Park Conservation Area appraisal and management strategy (4.9 p. 24), where it is also recognized that this hierarchy 'conforms to Nash's grand masterplan', and that each building type 'has a contribution to make' (4.9 p. 24). 5. Gloucester Gate Mews are singled out in Camden's Appraisal as 'the most intact of the Nash mews, and retain a real sense of their past function' (p. 28). It is recorded that 'There has been little apparent alteration to the elevations'. In particular their significance in relation to the main houses in Gloucester Gate is recognized: 'The elevations of the mews houses facing the rear of the main houses have survivals of blind arcading, which suggest another element in the integrated design of the Park, where the rear of the mews houses were designed to be seen from the main houses' (p. 28). This exceptional significance lies in the decorative treatment of the rear elevation of the mews, which conceals the function of the houses – which was subservient service provision to the main house – with a wall which both gave separation from that function, but also contributed, through the decorative blind arches – to the view from the main house. This is an exceptional survival witnessing to the built hierarchy: it is equally of exceptional significance in the Park as a whole. 6. The rear open space is visibly a subservient space in the larger hierarchy, expressed in terms of scale, and of the form and scale of detailing. We note that the service area, with service buildings, is shown in the 1834 Mayhew Survey extract included in this advice. 7. There is also a hierarchical relationship between the front of the main house and the rear elevation,

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

expressed through a diminution of scale of window openings, and of simpler detailing.

8. The series of hierarchical relationships – between the rear of the mews house and the rear of the main house, and the rear of the man house and its front – are clear examples of the ‘historic grain, patterns, forms, and details which are an essential part of the special character of the Regent’s Park conservation area’ (Management strategy p. 55)

9. We note that the Management strategy specifically states that the Council, in undertaking its development control function ‘will ensure that the historic grain, patterns, forms, and details which are an essential part of the special character of the Regent’s Park conservation area are preserved, repaired and reinstated where appropriate’ (p. 55).

10. These essential elements would be very substantially harmed, in effect largely destroyed, by the present application.

11. The scale and detailing of the proposed replacement building linking the main house and the mews (shown in sections AA and BB) are excessive and inappropriate. The columnar treatment of the vertical brick panels is on an excessive scale in this location: they and the glazed openings are equally inappropriate to a location where scale and detail should be subservient and modest. The scale of the rooms provided in this rear extension would also compete with the scale of the reception rooms in the main house, at the first floor of the extension dwarfing the major rooms in height, seriously harming the hierarchy of spaces within the Listed Buildings. This loss of hierarchy has been recognized as critical by Planning Inspectors in dismissing a series of appeals in the area.

12. The opening of the blind arches to the rear elevation of the mews is very seriously harmful to the exceptional significance of these arches in this wall. The major architectural point that the arches conceal the function of the mews house would be destroyed, that is this exceptional significance would be destroyed in direct conflict with the provisions of the NPPF.

13. The internal changes to the mews are also harmful to the character of the Listed Building, destroying its scale.

14. The insertion of a narrow transverse passage between the front and rear rooms on the entrance level is harmful to the original, and surviving, floorplan. It is not justified historically; it would harm the proportions of the main front reception room, which is exceptionally deep. While we acknowledge that the partitions could be removable, the alterations would be harmful to the significance of the building while they were in place: changes to a Grade I Listed Building should not be undertaken on this basis, but as respectful of the forms of the historic asset.

15. The stairs at the upper level should be retained: again, they represent the hierarchy of spaces in the building, the upper floors being for less important uses, and the details reflecting that character.

16. We strongly advise that, as set out, the proposals are seriously harmful to the significance of the

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Listed Buildings. We note that the NPPF at 132-33 states that:

[132] Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably ... grade I and II* listed buildings ...should be wholly exceptional. [133] Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, ...

There is no public benefit proposed here, and certainly none that could justify the substantial harm proposed.

Richard Simpson FSA, Chair RPCAAC
