

Donald Insall Associates


Chartered Architects and Historic Building Consultants

Seven Dials Warehouse, 42-46 Earlham Street, WC2

Historic Building Report
for CBRE Global Investors

July 2016

DRAFT



Seven Dials Warehouse, 42-46 Earlham Street,
WC2

Historic Building Report

for CBRE Global Investors



Ordnance Survey map with the site marked in red.
[Reproduced under Licence 100020449]

This report and all intellectual property rights in it and arising from it are the property of or are under licence to Donald Insall Associates. Neither the whole nor any part of this report, nor any drawing, plan, other document or any information contained within it may be reproduced in any form without the prior written consent of Donald Insall Associates. All material in which the intellectual property rights have been licensed to DIA and such rights belong to third parties may not be published or reproduced at all in any form, and any request for consent to the use of such material for publication or reproduction should be made directly to the owner of the intellectual property rights therein. Checked by HP, VP.



Contents

- 1.0 Summary of Historic Building Report
 - 1.1 Introduction 6
 - 1.2 The Building and its Legal Status 6
 - 1.3 Assessment of Significance 8
 - 1.4 Summary of Proposals and Justification 9
- 2.0 Historical Background
 - 2.1 Combe & Co and the Development of the Brewing Site 10
 - 2.2 The Building: The Seven Dials Warehouse 13
 - 2.3 Relevant Planning History²⁹ 31
 - 2.4 Sources and Bibliography 32
- 3.0 Site Survey Descriptions
 - 3.1 The Setting of the Building and the Conservation Area Context 34
 - 3.2 The Building Externally 36
 - 3.3 The Building Internally 38
- 4.0 Commentary on the Proposals
 - 4.1 Description of the Proposals and their Impact on the Heritage Assets 40
 - 4.2 Justification of the Proposals 40
 - 4.3 Conclusion 40

Appendices

- Appendix I – Planning Policy
- Appendix II – Statutory List Description
- Appendix III – List of Plates and Endnotes

Contact Information

Hannah Parham (Director)
E: hannah.parham@insall-architects.co.uk
T: 020 7245 9888

Sarah Bridger (Historic Buildings Advisor)
E: sarah.bridger@insall-architects.co.uk
T: 020 7245 9888

London Office
12 Devonshire Street
London, W1G 7AB
www.insall-architects.co.uk

1.0 Summary of Historic Building Report

1.1 Introduction

Donald Insall Associates was commissioned by CBRE Global Investors in June 2016 to assist them in the preparation of proposals for the parts of the Seven Dials Warehouse that are in office use, 42-56 Earlham Street, Covent Garden, WC2.

The investigation has comprised historical research, using both archival and secondary material, and a site inspection. An illustrated history of the site and building, with sources of reference and bibliography, is in Section 2; the site survey findings are in Section 3. The investigation has established the significance of the building, which is set out below. This understanding will inform the development of proposals for change to the building, by gpad architects. In due course, Section 4 will provide a justification of the scheme according to the relevant planning policy and guidance.

1.2 The Building and its Legal Status

The Seven Dials Warehouse is a Grade II-listed building located in the Seven Dials Conservation Area in the London Borough of Camden. The building has strong group value together with the neighbouring buildings positioned around Old Brewers Yard in the Covent Garden Conservation Area in the City of Westminster. Several of these buildings, including nos. 24-26 and 34 Shelton Street, are listed at Grade-II. It also has group value with nos. 29-40 (even) Earlham Street and the Cambridge Theatre, both listed at Grade-II.

The statutory list description of the Seven Dials Warehouse is included in Appendix I and a summary of the Seven Dials Conservation Area Statement provided by the local planning authority is in Appendix II, along with extracts from the relevant national and local planning policy documents.

The proposed alterations require listed building consent and planning permission. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is the legislative basis for decision-making on applications that relate to the historic environment. Sections 66 and 72 of the Act impose a statutory duty upon local planning authorities to have '*special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas*'.

In considering applications for listed building consent and planning permission, local authorities are also required to consider the policies on the historic environment set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. At the heart of the Framework is '*a presumption in favour of sustainable development*' and there are also specific policies relating to the historic environment. The Framework requires local authorities to '*recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance*'. The Glossary to the National

Planning Policy Framework defines a heritage asset as:

A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).

The Framework, in paragraph 128, states that:

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.

Section 1.3 of this report – the assessment of significance - meets this requirement and is based on the research and site surveys presented in sections 2 and 3, which are of a sufficient level of detail to understand the potential impact on the proposals.

The Framework also, in paragraph 132, requires that local planning authorities, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, should give '*great weight ... to the asset's conservation*' and that '*the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be*'. The Framework goes on to state that:

... 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.

Section 4 of this report will, when the proposals are finalised, provide this clear and convincing justification.

The Framework requires that local planning authorities categorise harm as either '*substantial*' or '*less than substantial*'. Where a proposed development will lead to '*substantial harm to or total loss of significance*' of a designated heritage asset, the Framework states, in paragraph 133, that:

... 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, or all of the following apply: the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Where a development proposal will lead to '*less than substantial harm*' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Framework states, in paragraph 134, that:

... this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

1.3 Assessment of Significance

The wedge-shaped building at 42-56 Earlham Street was constructed in the mid-19th century as an extension to the Combe & Co brewery but the architect of the building is not known. It is situated in the Seven Dials Conservation Area which contains an eclectic mix of buildings including a number of 18th and 19th century terraces juxtaposed against larger mid-to-late-19th century warehouses. The Seven Dials Warehouse has strong group value with these neighbouring buildings, which display similar architectural characteristics including a shared scale and materiality.

In September 1999 a fire destroyed the third, fourth and fifth floor and the entire roof structure of the Seven Dials Warehouse. In addition, most of the windows were also blown out. In 2001 a scheme was approved to restore and alter the interior of the building. It was rebuilt internally from the third floor upwards with modern floors, columns, double glazed windows and a flat roof. Sections of the façade were also rebuilt, particularly along Shelton Street.

The **primary significance** of the building, therefore, lies in the external elevations to Neal Street, Earlham Street and Shelton Street. Although these elevations have undergone considerable alteration the solid brick frontages, which are articulated with large windows, winches and high-level door openings, are reflective of the buildings age and former industrial use. The windows are of neutral significance as 2001 replacements but the consistent glazing bar pattern positively contributes to the buildings overall appearance. The exterior of the building also makes an overall **positive contribution** to the Seven Dials Conservation Area and it is particularly prominent in views from Five Dials Square where there is an impressive panorama of the front elevation with foreshortened views of the Shelton Street and Earlham Street elevations. The painted brickwork to the ground floor, however, detracts from the original character of the building.

The interior of the building is of **secondary significance**. Sections of the original structure survive on the ground to first floor including brick barrel vaults, steel beams, concrete columns and wooden floor joists; these elements are of high significance. The remaining fragments of the original stairwell located to the east of the building have some modest significance. The upper levels of the stairwell were, however, demolished following the fire and replaced in the late-20th century with a staircore that did not align vertically with the original. This has resulted in a confused circulation layout which also detracts from the significance of the interior. The modern internal structure and fittings including the plasterboard linings and stud partition walls, modern staircase, lift shaft and double

height columns, are of no architectural or historic significance.

Following the fire, the pitched roof was re-built in 2001 as a continuous flat roof. This facilitated a fifth floor glazed extension at the west end of the building which is concealed behind the brick parapet and is not visible from street level. The modern roof structure is of neutral significance but the rooftop plant enclosure detracts from the significance of the building, particularly in views from Langley Street.

1.4 Summary of Proposals and Justification

To be completed when proposals are finalised.

2.0 Historical Background



1. 1682 'London Actually Survey'd' by William Morgan (LMA)

2.1 Combe & Co and the Development of the Brewing Site

2.1.1 The 18th Century

The area to the north of Covent Garden was once a narrow strip of market gardens owned by the monks of Westminster Abbey. In 1552 the land was granted to the 1st Earl of Bedford and by 1631 the gardens had been developed with shops, workers buildings and houses.¹ William Morgan's map of London, published in 1682, illustrates the streets and buildings that first occupied the area (Plate 1). Castle Street (later renamed Shelton Street) and King Street (later Neal Street) are marked on the map, but Earlham Street had not yet been constructed. In its place were groups of buildings set around small courtyards and Tower Street, a north-south road connecting Monmoth Street with Castle Street.²

By 1747 the area had been substantially redeveloped with a new plan designed by Thomas Neale in c.1690-1700 (Plate 2). This consisted of seven roads connecting to the main thoroughfares of King Street (later Neal Street), Castle Street (later Shelton Street), West Street and Monmoth Street. The roads converged at a central crossroads in the centre of the block, which was known as the Seven Dials. Tower Street, which originally ran north-south through the study site, was replaced with a street pattern which still survives to this day: a triangular block bounded by Great Earl Street, Castle Street and White Lion Street. Running through the centre of the block was a small lane known as Earl's Court.



2. John Rocque's Survey of London, 1747 (LMA)

To the south of the study site, on the opposite side of Castle Street, a small brewery had been established by John Shackley in the 'Wood Yard' in 1722, on land leased from the Mercers Company.³ By 1739 Shackley's brewery business had been acquired by William Gyfford who enlarged the premises and traded as Gyfford and Co. By 1787 the brewery was the fifth largest of the capital's great porter breweries and it was taken over by Harvey Christian Combe (1752-1818), a malt factor and later Lord Mayor of London. As well as Combe, there were four other partners, George Shum, Joseph Delafield, Edmund Hamomnd and William Packer,



3. Horwood, Survey of London 1792 (LMA)

of whom Combe and Shun were the largest stakeholders. It was not until 1839 that the firm began to trade as Combe & Co.⁴

Horwood's map of 1792 shows that the warehouse was not yet part of the brewery, which is shown to the south, as the plot of land was developed with two blocks of terraced houses (Plate 3).⁵

2.1.2 The 19th Century

The Victoria County History states that under the management of Harvey Christian Combe the brewery prospered, with Combe spending a considerable amount on the repair, rebuilding and extension of the brewery premises. On Combe's death in 1818, the brewery passed to his son, Harvey Combe (1782-1858) and his brother-in-law, Joseph Delafield, who further enlarged the premises.⁶



4. Horwood, Survey of London, 1813 (LMA)

By the publication of Horwood's map of 1813 the site had expanded on the north side of Castle Street (Plate 4). Gyfford and Co appears to have acquired the freehold of the site though the rest of the brewery was leased from the Mercers Company Archive. Horwood's map shows the site during its development, with only a small block on the west side of the plot having been constructed.⁷

The brewery underwent a major single phase of rebuilding in c.1830. A contemporary illustration of the Brewery was produced in the same year, illustrating the site from the corner of Castle Street and Neal Street (Plate 5).⁸ Later rebuilding work included a small corner redevelopment in c. 1850 and further partial rebuilding in 1872. The site also expanded in 1839 when the brewery bought the neighbouring 'Richard Meux Brewery' on the west side of Langley Street, and it was after this purchase the company began trading as 'Combe & Co.'⁹

The 1830 redevelopment appears to have resulted in the rebuilding of all of the buildings surrounding the yard and the expansion of the site to the south, behind the terraced row fronting Long Acre. The 1872 re-building works were undertaken by the architect E J Wilson and involved the substantial rebuilding of the buildings on Langley Street and also partial rebuilding works to those fronting Shelton Street. A photograph dating to c.1875 shows the site looking north from Langley Street, with the former



5. The original warehouse shown in a print of Five Dials Square Neal Street, 1830 (CLA)



6. Langley Street looking north showing the re-built Seven Dials Warehouse in the distance, c.1875 (Collage)



7. Goad's Fire Insurance Map, 1888 (LMA)

Richard Meux Brewery connected to Combe & Co by an overhead hop bridge and the Seven Dials Warehouse is visible in the distance on Castle Street (Plate 6).¹⁰ Detailed information about how the brewery buildings were used is depicted on Goad's 1888 Insurance map (Plate 7).¹¹

The Victoria County History records that 450 people were employed on the site and there was an annual output exceeded 500,000 barrels. In June 1898 the business was acquired the brewing company Watney & Co and the firm was renamed Watney, Combe, Reid & Co.¹²

In 1905 the brewery site closed and the buildings were sub-let or sold, but the Combe family continued to take a major role in the management of Watney, Combe, Reid and Co Ltd.¹³

2.2 The Building: The Seven Dials Warehouse

There have been two warehouses on the site, the first warehouse was constructed in the early-19th century and the second, the present building on the site, is likely to have been constructed in c.1861.

2.2.1 The First Warehouse in the Early-19th Century

A warehouse was originally constructed on the site in the early-19th century as an extension to the Combe & Co brewery. No plans of the original warehouse have been found in the archives, or a reference to the architect and/or builder, but the company's financial records suggest Thomas Cubitt were their builders of choice and it is likely they were responsible for constructing the building.¹⁴ Horwood's map of 1813 is the first known depiction of the warehouse and it appears to illustrate it during its construction as the west end was drawn fully developed, but the east end was dotted as though it was still under construction (Plate 4).¹⁵



4. Horwood, Survey of London, 1813 (LMA)

The completed building was depicted in a contemporary illustration of Neal Street, which was published in 1830 (Plate 5).¹⁶ The building is clearly shown with two separate ranges divided by an internal yard. The front of the building was constructed of stock brick and was of three bays and three storeys. To the right of the building there was a small domestic-looking frontage with a single sash window, framed with external shutters, and a narrow entrance door with a Georgian-style fanlight above. To the left there was a wide opening that provided access for horse and carts into the internal courtyard. The upper floors of the building were articulated with sash windows and large signs. The range to the rear is not easily distinguishable in the illustration, but it appears to be a solid brick warehouse accessible from the internal courtyard.




5. The original warehouse shown in a print of Five Dials Square Neal Street, 1830 (CLA)

2.2.2. The Construction of the Second Warehouse in the Mid-19th century


The statutory list description notes that the building is likely to have been constructed in 1861 as discussions regarding the construction of overhead hop bridges, which were fixed to the north and south elevations of the building, commenced in this year. This suggests that the building must have been redeveloped by this date, but the exact date of the demolition of the first warehouse is not recorded, nor is the architect who designed the current warehouse.

The first known depiction of the warehouse is in an engraving dating to 1888 (Plate 8).¹⁷ The engraving shows the corner elevation of the building,



8. Engraving of the Seven Dials Warehouse in 1888, taken from Alfred Barnard, *The Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland, Volume 1* (1889)

6. Langley Street looking north showing the re-built Seven Dials Warehouse in the distance, c.1875 (Collage)




which fronted onto Neal Street, and the south elevation, which fronted onto Castle Street (later Shelton Street). The building was constructed in stock brick and had louvered windows set into arched openings. On the corner elevation there was a large, double height central doorway that was clearly the main entrance to the warehouse as barrels are shown being loaded onto a horse and cart in Five Dials Square. Above the doorway there was a gas lamp, which is still fixed to the building. At roof level there was a tall brick parapet and a fenced enclosure with a high level railing above, whilst at the sides of the building there were two high level iron 'hop bridges' that provided access to the brewery buildings located to the north and south of the warehouse. A brick chimneystack rose from the rear of the building, which is also depicted in the distance of a contemporary photograph taken from the southern end of Langley Street (Plate 6).¹⁸

The decision to rebuild the warehouse was probably driven by the need for a larger building to contain new machinery used in the brewing process, which was often of a considerable size. A contemporary account of the building was written in the late-19th century by Alfred Barnard in his book *Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland*, which states that the building was filled with machinery used for the cooling and fermenting process of beer making:

...it contains a large size pontifex, a Reece Amonia ice machine, with

its unusual set of three plunger feed pumps, built in a very substantial manner, for the returning of liquid to the ammonia boiler or generator. There is also a powerful set of three throw pumps for elevating and circulating the cold brine through the cooling pipes in the top of the fermenting squares.¹⁹

The use of the building for the cooling and fermenting of beer is also confirmed on Goad's insurance map of 1888 (Plate 7). This map shows that the building extended further west than it does now, incorporating no. 28 Castle Street and a small rear yard.²⁰



7. Goad's Fire Insurance Map, 1888 (LMA)

2.2.3 The Conversion of the Building in the Early-20th Century

Little else is recorded on the history of the building until Watney, Combe, Reid and Co closed the brewery in 1905 and began to sell and sublet the buildings. A site plan held in Westminster City Archives records how the company disposed of the site and the Seven Dials Warehouse was one of the first buildings to be sold (Plate 9). The building was divided into two units; the western unit was sold to Lepard and Smith on the 10th April 1907, while the eastern unit was first leased to Mr Charles Bateman in 1906 for a yearly sum of £325, after which it was sold to the International Correspondence Section in 1919. It was at this time that the building at 28 Castle Street was detached from the rest of the building.²¹


9. Block plan showing disposal of the Combe & Co Brewery (WCA)



Various alterations took place within the interior of the building to allow it to be used for other occupants, including the removal of all the brewing machinery. The earliest conversion plans date to 1907 and show the alterations undertaken to the western unit, which was occupied by the paper manufacturing company Lepard and Smith (Plates 10a-f).²² The basement to fifth floor plans show that the company extended several existing staircases to the basement while WCs were fitted on the first to fifth floors. Several sections of the elevations to Earlham Street and Castle Street were also re-built and new windows were inserted. It is likely these rebuilt sections correspond to the removal of the overhead hop bridges and the replacement of large taking in doors and recessed loading bays. The roof plan shows that the building had three pitched ranges with several long rooflights, which is likely to have been the original mid-19th century roof structure.



The earliest development records that have been located for the eastern unit date to 1961 when an application was approved for the encasement of some of the original cast iron columns with concrete, but unfortunately no plans were included with the application.²³

Photographs of the building were taken in 1975 and these illustrate that it had retained much of its original character and appearance to that in the 1888 engraving (Plate 11a-b). The main changes included the painting of the ground floor brickwork, the extension of the first floor windows with lower glazed panels and the removal of the corner roof enclosure and high-level railing. The windows on the side elevation, seen in Plate 11b, had also been extended and numerous ground floor entrances had been constructed. Plate 12, which was taken a year later in 1976, shows a small section of the side elevation taken from an identical viewpoint to that in Plate 6. Comparison between the two photos shows that a number of windows had been inserted in the elevation and the two uppermost storeys appear to have been rebuilt and raised in height. The chimney had also been significantly reduced in size.²⁴



10a. Ground floor plan showing the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)


10b. First floor plan showing the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)



10c. Third floor plan showing the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)


10d. Fourth floor plan showing the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)





10e. Fifth floor plan showing the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)

10f. Roof plan of the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)



11a. Photograph of the corner elevation of the Seven Dials Warehouse, 1975 (Collage)

11b. Photograph of the Earham Street elevation of the Seven Dials Warehouse, 1975 (Collage)




12. Photograph of Langley Street with the Seven Dials Warehouse seen in the distance, 1976 (Collage)




In 1972 the entire building was bought the Greater London Council who initially sought to demolish it. Fortunately, this plan was never realised and in 1979 permission was granted for the mixed use of the premises including shops, a restaurant, a showroom, a gallery, light industry and office and community space. A set of the approved floor plans are held in Camden Archive which show that the layout of the building was altered with new partitions and new ground floor openings (Plate 13a-e).²⁵ The ground floor plan illustrates that a new entrance had been constructed off Earlham Street, which led to a central reception area and staircase to the upper floors. The corner entrance remained in use but this only provided access to a small stairwell. The rest of the building remained largely open plan, subdivided with the existing structural walls and staircases, though two lifts had been inserted in the centre and west end of the building. On the upper floors a central corridor was constructed on each floor level and new partitions were inserted to form segregated offices.

In 1997 two windows were inserted either side of the central entrance on the corner elevation, in order to provide greater space for shop displays.




13a. Ground floor plan of the Seven Dials Warehouse showing alterations undertaken in 1979 (CLA)



13b. First floor plan of the Seven Dials Warehouse showing alterations undertaken in 1979 (CLA)



13c. Third floor plan of the Seven Dials Warehouse showing alterations undertaken in 1979 (CLA)



13d. Fourth floor plan of the Seven Dials Warehouse showing alterations undertaken in 1979 (CLA)



13e. Fifth floor plan of the Seven Dials Warehouse showing alterations undertaken in 1979 (CLA)

14. Photograph showing the damage to the Seven Dials Warehouse, c.2000 (AKT II)



2.2.4 The Fire of 1999 and Subsequent Rebuilding


In September 1999 a serious fire broke out in the building which destroyed everything from the third floor upwards, including the roof structure and most of the windows. A temporary roof was put over at third floor level to ensure the building was watertight and the side elevations had to be pinned together to stop them from collapsing (Plate 14).²⁶

In 2001, an application was approved to carry out major structural and refurbishment works by Fletcher Priest architects and AKT II engineers. This excluded the retail and community units at the eastern end of the building, which comprised the entire of the basement and second floor and a small part of the ground and first floors, as these areas were not damaged by the fire (Plate 15a-g). The Planning Officer's report, which is held in Camden Archive, notes that the structural works were required to ensure the building did not collapse.²⁷


The plans show that at ground and first floor level the original structure that had survived the fire was retained, but the ground floor was subdivided with new partitions and new staircases were introduced through the floor plates. A section of the first floor was also demolished to create an impressive double height space to the south side of the building. The rest of the building was rebuilt internally from the third to fifth floor and a flat roof was constructed over the entire building with a rooftop plant enclosure, as opposed to the original pitched roofs at the western end. The eastern end of the building had originally been of four storeys and the fifth floor extension was constructed in glass and set back from the parapet so it was not visible from the street. The façade along Shelton Street was also substantially rebuilt at the western end and this is the cause of the patchy brickwork along this façade. In addition, nearly all of the windows were replaced with double glazed units, the approved design shown in Plate 16.

Despite the damage caused by the fire and the substantial rebuilding, the building was nonetheless considered of national importance as a rare survival of an industrial warehouse in central London and it was Grade-II listed on 25th July 2002.²⁸

The building has remained in a mix of retail, office and community use and no significant internal alterations have been carried out since it was restored in 2001.





15a. Ground floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)




15c. Second floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)


15b. First floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)

15d. Third floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)







15e. Fourth floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)



15g. Roof plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)

15f. Fifth floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)



15h. Aerial view of the rebuilt roof of the Seven Dials Warehouse, 2001 (CLA)

2.3 Relevant Planning History²⁹

Application Ref: 2008/5102/L and 2008/5026/P

Description of Works: Installation of two condenser units at roof level on the south-east (Shelton Street) elevation of office

Decision: Granted, 17 November 2008

Application Ref: 2008/2517/L

Description of Works: Refurbishment of the interior ground and mezzanine floors.

Decision: Granted, 22 August 2008

Application Ref: 2003/0658/L

Description of Works: Internal and external works of alteration including the removal of internal cladding, demolition of part of the mezzanine floor area, relocation of internal staircase, the replacement of secondary entrance with fully glazed shop window on Earlham Street frontage and the removal of paint to door surrounds, stone plinths and banding.

Decision: Granted, 9 July 2003

Application Ref: 2003/0657/P

Description of Works: Alterations to shopfront including the replacement of the existing secondary entry door with fully glazed shop windows.

Decision: Granted, 9 July 2003

Application Ref: PSX0104366

Description of Works: Installation of new entrance to Earlham Street and internal modifications. As shown on drawing numbers 001TP, 002TP, 003TP, 004TP, 005TP, 006TP, 007TP, 008TP, 009TP, 012TP2, 013TP, 014TP, 015TP2, 016TP, 018TP3, 019TP2 AND 051TP3

Decision: Granted, 3 July 2001

Application Ref: PSX0004538

Description of Works: Refurbishment, alteration and extensions following fire damage to provide a mix of offices, retail and community uses including the erection of a roof extension at fifth floor level and roof top plant and associated alterations at ground floor level and facades.

Decision: Granted subject to Section 106, 2 May 2001

Application Ref: CSX0004582

Description of Works: Part demolition of the fire damaged structure including roof, internal fabric and part elevation fronting Shelton Street.

Decision: Granted, 2 May 2001


Application Ref: PS9704382R1

Description of Works: Alterations to the elevations on Earlham Street, Neal Street and Shelton Street to form new shopfront doors, windows and louvered ventilation openings, in connection with the retail use of the premises on ground, mezzanine and first floor levels as one large unit.

Decision: 20 October 1997

Application Ref: 9401157

Description of Works: Alterations to the Shelton Street and Earlham



16. Approved design of the replacement double glazed windows in the Seven Dials Warehouse, 2001 (Camden Online Planning Records).

Street elevations to form entrances and windows to restaurant use.
Alterations to brickwork above Earlham Street entrance and the installation of security shutters to Earlham Street entrance and alterations to doors at first floor level on Shelton Street

Decision: 29 July 1994

2.4 Sources and Bibliography

City of Westminster Local Studies and Archives (WCA)

Watney, Combe, Reid and Company Limited Archival Records:

Ref: 789/713-728: Leases and plans of warehouses in Castle Street.

Ref: 685-699: documents relating to the construction of a subway under Langley Street and Castle Street.

Camden Local Archive (CLA)

Ref: 89.3: An ephemera file on 42 – 48 Earlham Street and 27 – 29 Shelton Street

Ref: 89.3 Print of Seven Dials, looking east towards Earlham Street and Castle Street, 1830.

Drainage plans: 27-33 Shelton Street and 42-54 Earlham Street

Ordnance Survey Maps, 1:2500, 1875, 1896 1916, 1952, 1965

Camden Council Online Planning Records

All applications relating to the Seven Dials Warehouse, 27-33 Shelton Street and 42-54 Earlham Street

The Seven Dials Estate Conservation Area Statement, 1998

London Metropolitan Archive (LMA)

William Morgan, 'London Actually Survey'd', 1682

John Rocque's Survey of London, 1747

Horwood, Survey of London, 1792, 1813

Goad's Fire Insurance Map, 1888

Collage, City of London

Photograph of Combe & Co Brewery from Langley Street, 1875

Two photographs of the Seven Dials Warehouse, 1975

Photograph of the Seven Dials Warehouse from Neal Street, 1976

Published Sources

Books and Articles

Lynn Pearson, *British Breweries* (1999)

Henry Hurford, *The Red Barrel. A History of Watney Mann* (1963)

Alfred Barnard, *The Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland*, Volume 1 (1889)

Brewery History Society for English Heritage, *Strategy for the Historic Industrial Environment: The Brewing Industry* (2010)

Pevsner, N., *London 6: Westminster* (2005)

Victoria County History, *A History of the County of Middlesex* (1911)

Weinreb B., Hibbert C., Keay J, Keay J., *The London Encyclopaedia* (2008)

3.0 Site Survey Descriptions

3.1 The Setting of the Building and the Conservation Area Context

3.1.1 The Conservation Area Context

The Seven Dials Warehouse is located in the Seven Dials Conservation Area. The conservation area is broadly divided into three character areas, one centred on Seven Dials, one incorporating the Freemasons Hall/ Great Queen Street and one set around Macklin Street.³⁰

The building is located in the Seven Dials character area, which is defined by the radiating street layout devised by Thomas Neale in the late-17th century that created distinctive wedge shaped building plots. The area contains an eclectic mix of buildings including a number of 18th and 19th century terraces with distinct narrow frontages. These buildings are juxtaposed against larger mid-to-late-19th century industrial warehouses, though the street frontages are unified by a consistent use of brick and prevailing building height of five storeys. Seven Dials has become a major shopping destination in connection with Covent Garden and most of the buildings have modern glazed shop fronts at ground floor level that generate a modern, urban retail feel at street level.

The Seven Dials Warehouse makes a positive contribution to the area. The brick elevations, articulated with large windows and high-level door openings, are reflective of the buildings age and former industrial use. The building is particularly prominent in views from Five Dials Square where there is an impressive panorama of the front elevation with foreshortened views of the Shelton Street and Earlham Street elevations. The warehouse also has strong group value with the neighbouring buildings, which display similar architectural characteristics including a shared scale, proportion and materiality.

3.1.2 The Setting of the Building

The Seven Dials Warehouse is located to the west of Seven Dials and to the north west of Covent Garden. It is bounded by Earlham Street, Neal Street, Shelton Street and Mercer Street. The boundary to the adjoining London Borough, the City of Westminster, runs down the middle of Shelton Street.

To the north of the study site, on the opposite side of Earlham Street, is the former Crafts Centre, a Grade-II listed building that once formed a warehouse and stables to the Combe & Co Brewery. The building has more recently been converted into a retail hub known as the Thomas Neal Centre. It is of five storeys and has an impressive brick façade that stretches nearly the entire length of Earlham Street, with horizontal rows of windows and doors on the upper floors, reflecting a similar composition to the Seven Dials Warehouse on the opposite side of the street. Further north is Neal's Yard, a small internal yard famed for its vibrant coloured buildings.

The east elevation of the Seven Dials Warehouses faces onto a small

square in front of Neal Street, which is known as the Five Dials Square due to the convergence of five surrounding roadways. On the northwest side of the square is a late-19th or early-20th century warehouse that was also once part of the Combe & Co Brewery. It has a prominent corner frontage turning the junction of Earlham Street and Neal Street. To the east is the Crown and Anchor, an early-20th century public house constructed of red brick with stone dressings and with an attractive corner turret articulated with sash windows. Framing the square to the southeast is a modern retail and office development with two-storey timber glazed shop fronts fronting the square and substantially taller brick elevations to the rear. To the southwest is a Grade-II listed early-19th century warehouse that was part of the original Combe & Co brewery. The building is constructed of stock brick with a double-height former carriage entrance to Old Brewers Yard. The listed building description notes that it is a rare survival of warehousing of this date and quality in central London.

To the south of the Seven Dials Warehouse is the neighbouring borough of the City of Westminster and the northern boundary of the Covent Garden Conservation Area. The site is composed of 19th and 20th century brick warehouses that once formed part of the Combe & Co Brewery. The buildings have strong group value with the Seven Dials Warehouse and the site makes a significant contribution to the industrial character of the area. Nos. 24 and 26 Shelton Street are listed at Grade-II and this building, together with 34 Shelton Street, are the only complete early-19th century warehouses to remain on the site. Further south is Langley Street, a narrow road connecting Shelton Street with Long Acre. Framed views of the Seven Dials Warehouse can be seen from the south end of the street as well as the detracting rooftop plant enclosure.

To the west, adjoining the rear of the Seven Dials Warehouse is the Grade-II listed terrace numbering 36-40 Earlham Street, the Grade-II listed Cambridge Theatre and an unlisted warehouse numbering 25 Shelton Street. 36-40 Earlham Street comprise a group of three early-19th century terraced houses with brown brick frontages. The buildings are of four storeys with a consistent brick parapet and the rear elevation of the Seven Dials Warehouse rises above these buildings and is visible in east facing views from Earlham Street. The Cambridge Theatre is a landmark in views from seven dials and was constructed in 1929-30 by Wimperis, Simpson and Guthrie. It is of Portland stone to the front and brick to the rear where it faces onto Shelton Street. The unlisted early-20th century warehouse adjoins this building to the east and is of six bays, five storeys and constructed of stock brick. The building is characterised its ordered composition with rows of metal-framed louvered windows with rendered lintels. The brick elevations of these two buildings complete the row of high level solid brick frontages that define this end of Shelton Street. Further west is the landmark of Seven Dials, an important late-17th century radiating road layout.

3.2 The Building Externally

3.2.1 Front Elevation

The front elevation of the building faces onto Neal Street and is of four storeys, three bays and constructed of stock brick (Plate 17). At ground floor level there is a wide double-height central entrance door with a pedimented stone surround and an original gas lamp fitting. The doors are modern glazed replacements of no significance. Flanking the entrance are two late-20th century windows with arched headers and fixed glazed panels. At first floor level there are three original window openings, the outer two have been extended with additional glazing and the windows are modern replacements. At second and third floor level there are three original window openings on each floor, the windows are also modern replacements. Between the second and third floor there is a brick cornice and at roof level there is a brick parapet.

3.2.2 Side Elevations

Earlham Street

The Earlham Street elevation is of five storeys, sixteen bays and constructed of stock brick. At ground floor level there is a mixture of modern fully glazed shop windows, modern louvered windows with metal



17. Front elevation of the Seven Dials Warehouse facing onto Five Dials Square 2016 (DIA)

glazing bars, wide presumably original loading entrances and small recessed entrance doors. The ground floor is also painted from the fourth bay onwards, in a mixture of black, white and red paint. The main entrance to the site is located in the second bay from the west, there are modern doors set in a mid-19th/early-20th century splayed surround emblazoned with the Leopard and Smith logo, a lion holding a shield.

The upper floors of the building are articulated with an asymmetrical composition of louvered windows. Most of these windows were replaced in 2001 following the fire in September 1999. On the ground, first and second floor there are several windows that survived the fire damage, the windows in the study site are late-20th century four-pane replacements but to the east, above Belgo's restaurant and Urban Outfitters, there are some original windows with timber-boarded panels. In the centre of the building there is a winch fixed to the exterior with two hoist doors below, these fittings are modern replacements that replicate the style of the originals.

At roof level there is a brick parapet which steps up to the fifth storey at the west end of the building. At the east end the fifth storey is set back from the façade and consists of an early-21st century glazed extension.



18. Side elevation of the Seven Dials Warehouse facing onto Shelton Street, 2016 (DIA)

Shelton Street

The Shelton Street elevation is of five storeys, sixteen bays and predominately constructed of stock brick. The western end of the building was largely rebuilt in 2001 after the fire in September 1999 and this is the result of the patchy brickwork across this façade (Plate 18).

At ground floor level there is a mixture of modern fully glazed shop windows, narrow doors with roller or louvered shutters, wide presumably original loading entrances, narrow mid-to-late 20thth century entrances and small recessed entrance doors. The ground floor is also painted from the fifth bay onwards, in a mixture of black, white and red paint.

The upper elevations are similar to those on Earham Street though there is a more ordered arrangement of windows. All of the windows at the west end, in which the study site is located, are 2001 replacements but some original windows are in the separate units to the east above Belgos restaurant and Urban Outfitters. In the second, sixth, ninth and thirteenth bay from the west there are vertical rows of taking in doors with winches fixed to the side.

At roof level there is a brick parapet which steps up to the fifth storey at the west end of the building. At the east end the fifth storey is set back from the façade and consists of an early-21st century glazed extension.

3.2.3 Roof

The original roof was completely destroyed in the fire of September 1999. The current roof was constructed in 2001 and is a flat roof of no significance. It is fully glazed at the east end and in the centre there is a raised lantern. At the west end there is a rooftop plant area concealed with retracting metal louvers.

3.3 The Building Internally

The application site comprises the office unit numbering 42-56 Earham Street; this includes the western third of the ground and first floors and the entire of the third to fifth floors.

The separate units within the building, which include the Belgo restaurant, Urban Outfitters and the Covent Garden Community Association, have not been inspected as they do not form part of the application site.

Ground Floor

The main entrance to the ground floor is from the canted entrance off Earham Street. The reception has a raised modern floor and modern built-out walls that are of no significance. The original columns have been demolished on both the ground and first floor and a double height space created with a modern stairwell and a paired lift shaft. Sections of the original structural wall remain to the east, though large portions have been demolished and bridged with late-20th century steel beams. To the east there is a modern staircase providing access onto a raised plinth in the office space. To the north the first floor has been cut back to create

a double height lobby and there is a modern staircase providing access to the first floor and modern columns supporting the second floor above.

To the south of the ground floor there are a number of cast iron columns which have been encased in concrete in the late-20th century; these are of high significance. At the very southern end of the building, where it fronts onto Shelton Street, there are original barrel-vaults which are also of high significance. To the west there are modern partitions enclosing W.Cs and secondary escape stairs, and there is also a modern service void concealing three columns.

There is otherwise a modern internal fit out that is of no significance.

First Floor

A section of the first floor has been cut away at the north end of the building to create a double height lobby and through space between the two ground floor entrances on Earham Street. Modern double-height columns have been inserted to support the second floor and there is a modern ground-to-first floor staircase at the northwest end of the building that is of no significance.

The first floor retains its original structure with cast iron beams supporting cast iron columns. The columns have been encased in concrete in the late-20th century but they are nevertheless of high significance. The floorboards appear to be plain modern replacements but the roof structure, which has curved timber ceiling joists, is original and is of high significance.

There is otherwise a modern internal fit out, including glazed partitions and a kitchenette, which is of no significance.

Third to Fifth Floors

These floors were rebuilt in 2001 following a fire that destroyed all nearly all of the original fabric. The only original elements to survive include a curved brick stairwell extending from the ground to third floor, though the staircase itself appears to be a late-20th century replacement that is of no special interest. There is also a single cable pulley to the third floor, but this has been reattached onto a modern plasterboard wall and does not appear to be in its original location. The internal fit out is otherwise entirely modern with built-out plasterboard walls, modern partitions, staircases and columns.

4.0 Commentary on the Proposals

4.1 Description of the Proposals and their Impact on the Heritage Assets

To be completed when proposals are finalised.

4.2 Justification of the Proposals

To be completed when proposals are finalised.

4.3 Conclusion

To be completed when proposals are finalised.

Appendix I

Planning Policy and Guidance

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

The Act is legislative basis for decision making on applications that relate to the historic environment.

Sections 66 and 72 of the Act impose a statutory duty upon local planning authorities to consider the impact of proposals upon listed buildings and conservation areas.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that:

in considering whether to grant permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or as the case may be the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Similarly, section 72(1) of the above Act states that:

... with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

National Planning Policy Framework

Any proposals for consent relating to heritage assets are subject to the policies of the NPPF (2012). This sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. With regard to 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment', the framework requires proposals relating to heritage assets to be justified and an explanation of their effect on the heritage asset's significance provided.

The NPPF has the following relevant policies for proposals such as this:

*14. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a **presumption in favour of sustainable development**, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.*

The NPPF sets out twelve **core planning principles** that should underpin decision making (paragraph 17). Amongst those are that planning should:

- *not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives;*
- *proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities;*
- *always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;*

- *support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change, and encourage the reuse of existing resources, including conversion of existing buildings, and encourage the use of renewable resources (for example, by the development of renewable energy);*
- *conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations;*

With regard to the **significance** of a heritage asset, the framework contains the following policies:

129. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal 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.

In determining applications local planning authorities are required to take account of significance, viability, sustainability and local character and distinctiveness. Paragraph 131 of the NPPF identifies the following criteria in relation to this:

- *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.*

With regard to potential '**harm**' to the significance designated heritage asset, in paragraph 132 the framework states the following:

...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.

Where a proposed development will lead to '**substantial harm**' to or **total loss of significance** of a designated heritage asset paragraph 133 of the NPPF states that:

...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, or all of the following apply:

- *the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- *no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- *conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- *the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

With regard to '**less than substantial harm**' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, of the NPPF states the following;

134. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal,

including securing its optimum viable use.

In terms of **non-designated heritage assets**, the NPPF states:

135. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balance judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

In relation to the consideration of applications for development affecting the **setting of a designated heritage asset**, paragraph 137 of the document states the following:

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.

With regards to the loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to a **Conservation Area**, paragraph 138 states this should be treated:

...As substantial harm under paragraph 133 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 134, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area...as a whole.

National Planning Practice Guidance

The planning practice guidance was published on the 6th March 2014 to support the National Planning Policy Framework and the planning system. It includes particular guidance on matters relating to protecting the historic environment in the section: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. The relevant guidance is as follows:

Paragraph 3: What is meant by the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment?

The conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance is a core planning principle. Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and effective conservation delivers wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits.

Conservation is an active process of maintenance and managing change. It requires a flexible and thoughtful approach to get the best out of assets as diverse as listed buildings in everyday use to as yet undiscovered, undesignated buried remains of archaeological interest.

In the case of buildings, generally the risks of neglect and decay of heritage assets are best addressed through ensuring that they remain in active use that is consistent with their conservation. Ensuring such heritage assets remain used and valued is likely to require sympathetic changes to be made from time to time. In the case of archaeological sites, many have no active use, and so for those kinds of sites, periodic changes may not be necessary.

Where changes are proposed, the National Planning Policy Framework sets out a clear framework for both plan-making and decision-taking to ensure that heritage assets are conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner that is consistent with their significance and thereby achieving sustainable development.

Part of the public value of heritage assets is the contribution that they can make to understanding

and interpreting our past. So where the complete or partial loss of a heritage asset is justified, the aim then is to capture and record the evidence of the asset's significance which is to be lost, interpret its contribution to the understanding of our past, and make that publicly available.

Paragraph 7 states:

There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

- an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;*
- a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and*
- an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.*

Paragraph 8: What is “significance”?

“Significance” in terms of heritage policy is defined in the Glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework.

In legislation and designation criteria, the terms ‘special architectural or historic interest’ of a listed building and the ‘national importance’ of a scheduled monument are used to describe all or part of the identified heritage asset’s significance. Some of the more recent designation records are more helpful as they contain a fuller, although not exhaustive, explanation of the significance of the asset.

Paragraph 9: Why is ‘significance’ important in decision-taking?

Heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals

Paragraph 13: What is the setting of a heritage asset and how should it be taken into account?

The “setting of a heritage asset” is defined in the Glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework.

A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

Setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced, and may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not.

The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although

views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each.

The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstance.

When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset's significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its ongoing conservation.

Paragraph 15: What is a viable use for a heritage asset and how is it taken into account in planning decisions?

The vast majority of heritage assets are in private hands. Thus, sustaining heritage assets in the long term often requires an incentive for their active conservation. Putting heritage assets to a viable use is likely to lead to the investment in their maintenance necessary for their long-term conservation.

By their nature, some heritage assets have limited or even no economic end use. A scheduled monument in a rural area may preclude any use of the land other than as a pasture, whereas a listed building may potentially have a variety of alternative uses such as residential, commercial and leisure.

In a small number of cases a heritage asset may be capable of active use in theory but be so important and sensitive to change that alterations to accommodate a viable use would lead to an unacceptable loss of significance.

It is important that any use is viable, not just for the owner, but also the future conservation of the asset. It is obviously desirable to avoid successive harmful changes carried out in the interests of repeated speculative and failed uses.

If there is only one viable use, that use is the optimum viable use. If there is a range of alternative viable uses, the optimum use is the one likely to cause the least harm to the significance of the asset, not just through necessary initial changes, but also as a result of subsequent wear and tear and likely future changes.

The optimum viable use may not necessarily be the most profitable one. It might be the original use, but that may no longer be economically viable or even the most compatible with the long-term conservation of the asset. However, if from a conservation point of view there is no real difference between viable uses, then the choice of use is a decision for the owner.

Harmful development may sometimes be justified in the interests of realising the optimum viable use of an asset, notwithstanding the loss of significance caused provided the harm is minimised. The policy in addressing substantial and less than substantial harm is set out in paragraphs 132 – 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Paragraph 20: What is meant by the term public benefits?

Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic,

social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 7). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.

Public benefits may include heritage benefits, such as:

- sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting
- reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset
- securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset

Historic England: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning (March 2015)

The purpose of the Good Practice Advice note is to provide information on good practice to assist in implementing historic environment policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the related guidance given in the National Planning Practice Guide (NPPG).

**Note 2 'Managing Significance in Decision-Taking'
The Assessment of Significance as part of the Application Process**

Paragraph 7 emphasises the need to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting early in the process, in order to form a successful development, and in order for the local planning authority to make decisions in line with legal objectives and the objectives of the development plan and the policy requirements of the NPPF.³¹

8. Understanding the nature of the significance is important to understanding the need for and best means of conservation. For example, a modern building of high architectural interest will have quite different sensitivities from an archaeological site where the interest arises from the possibility of gaining new understanding of the past.

9. Understanding the extent of that significance is also important because this can, among other things, lead to a better understanding of how adaptable the asset may be and therefore improve viability and the prospects for long term conservation.

10. Understanding the level of significance is important as it provides the essential guide to how the policies should be applied. This is intrinsic to decision-taking where there is unavoidable conflict with other planning objectives.

11. To accord with the NPPF, an applicant will need to undertake an assessment of significance to inform the application process to an extent necessary to understand the potential impact (positive or negative) of the proposal and to a level of thoroughness proportionate to the relative importance of the asset whose fabric or setting is affected.

Conservation Principles and Assessment

Conservation Principles (2008) explores, on a more philosophical level, the reason why society places a value on heritage assets beyond their mere utility. It identifies four types of heritage value that an asset may hold: aesthetic, communal, historic and evidential value. This is simply another way of analysing its significance. These values can help shape the most efficient and effective way of managing the heritage asset so as to sustain its overall value to society.³²

Cumulative Impact

28 *The cumulative impact of incremental small-scale changes may have as great an effect on the significance of a heritage asset as a larger scale change. Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development to the asset itself or its setting, consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset in order to accord with NPPF policies. Negative change could include severing the last link to part of the history of an asset or between the asset and its original setting. Conversely, positive change could include the restoration of a building's plan form or an original designed landscape.*

Listed Building Consent Regime

29. *Change to heritage assets is inevitable but it is only harmful when significance is damaged. The nature and importance of the significance that is affected will dictate the proportionate response to assessing that change, its justification, mitigation and any recording which may be needed if it is to go ahead. In the case of listed buildings, the need for owners to receive listed building consent in advance of works which affect special interest is a simple mechanism but it is not always clear which kinds of works would require consent. In certain circumstances there are alternative means of granting listed building consent under the Enterprise & Regulatory Reform Act 2013.*

Opportunities to Enhance Assets, their Settings and Local Distinctiveness

52. *Sustainable development can involve seeking positive improvements in the quality of the historic environment. There will not always be opportunities to enhance the significance or improve a heritage asset but the larger the asset the more likely there will be. Most conservation areas, for example, will have sites within them that could add to the character and value of the area through development, while listed buildings may often have extensions or other alterations that have a negative impact on the significance. Similarly, the setting of all heritage assets will frequently have elements that detract from the significance of the asset or hamper its appreciation.*

Design and Local Distinctiveness

53. *Both the NPPF (section 7) and PPG (section ID26) contain detail on why good design is important and how it can be achieved. In terms of the historic environment, some or all of the following factors may influence what will make the scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and proposed use of new development successful in its context:*

- *The history of the place*
- *The relationship of the proposal to its specific site*
- *The significance of nearby assets and the contribution of their setting, recognising that this is a dynamic concept*
- *The general character and distinctiveness of the area in its widest sense, including the general character of local buildings, spaces, public realm and the landscape, the grain of the surroundings, which includes, for example the street pattern and plot size*
- *The size and density of the proposal related to that of the existing and neighbouring uses*
- *Landmarks and other built or landscape features which are key to a sense of place*
- *The diversity or uniformity in style, construction, materials, colour, detailing, decoration and period of existing buildings and spaces*
- *The topography*
- *Views into, through and from the site and its surroundings*
- *Landscape design*
- *The current and historic uses in the area and the urban grain*
- *The quality of the materials*

Note 3 'The Setting of Heritage Assets'

This note provides guidance on the setting of heritage assets, which is separate to issues of curtilage, character or context.

The Extent of Setting

4. *The setting of a heritage asset is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset.*

The setting of a heritage asset may reflect the character of the wider townscape or landscape in which it is situated, or be quite distinct from it. Extensive heritage assets can include many heritage assets and their nested and overlapping settings, as well as having a setting of their own. I.e. A conservation area will include the settings of listed buildings and have its own setting.

Views and Setting

5. *The contribution to the setting of a heritage asset can be expressed through a wide variety of views.*

6. *Views which contribute more to understanding the significance of the heritage asset include:*

- *those where relationships between the asset and other historic assets or places or natural features are particularly relevant;*
- *those with historical associations, including viewing points and the topography of battlefields;*
- *those where the composition within the view was a fundamental aspect of the design or function of the heritage asset; and*
- *those between heritage assets and natural or topographic features, or phenomena such as solar and lunar events.*

Even if recent unsympathetic development has affected the setting or views of a heritage asset, consideration will still be given to whether developments would further detract or enhance the significance of the asset.

Setting and the Significance of Heritage Assets

9. *Setting is not a heritage asset, nor a heritage designation, though land within a setting may itself be designated. Its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset, which may vary from asset to asset.... Therefore, implications of development affecting the setting of heritage assets should be considered on a case-by-case basis.*

Setting and urban design

The numbers and proximity of heritage assets in urban areas mean that the protection and enhancement of setting is intimately linked to townscape and urban design considerations, and often relate to townscape attributes such as lighting, trees, and verges, or the treatments of boundaries or street surfaces.

Setting and economic and social viability

Sustainable development under the NPPF can have important positive impacts on heritage and their settings, for example by bringing an abandoned building back into use or giving a heritage asset further life. However, the economic and social viability of a heritage asset can be diminished if accessibility

from or to its setting is reduced by badly designed or insensitively located development.

A staged approach to proportionate decision-taking

10. Protection of the setting of heritage assets need not prevent change; indeed change may be positive, for instance where the setting has been compromised by poor development.

Camden Council Local Policy

The London Borough of Camden adopted the Development Policies Document in November 2010. Policy DP24 sets out the council's policies on design:

DP24 – Securing high quality design

The Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

- a) character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;
- b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed;
- c) the quality of materials to be used;
- d) the provision of visually interesting frontages at street level;
- e) the appropriate location for building services equipment;
- f) existing natural features, such as topography and trees;
- g) the provision of appropriate hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatments;
- h) the provision of appropriate amenity space; and
- i) accessibility.

Policy DP25 relates to listed buildings and conservation areas:

Conservation Areas

In order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will:

- a) take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans when assessing applications within conservation areas;
- b) only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area;
- c) prevent the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area where this harms the character or appearance of the conservation area, unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;
- d) not permit development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character and appearance of that conservation area; and
- e) preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character of a conservation area and which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage.

Listed Buildings

To preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings, the Council will:

- e) prevent the total or substantial demolition of a listed building unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;
- f) only grant consent for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building; and
- g) not permit development that it considers would cause harm to the setting of a listed building.

The Core Strategy was also adopted in 2010 to help plan for the future of the Borough of Camden. The policies within the document that are relevant to the proposals include:

CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

The Council will ensure that Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe and easy to use by:

- a) requiring development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character;
- b) preserving and enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens;
- c) promoting high quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces;
- d) seeking the highest standards of access in all buildings and places and requiring schemes to be designed to be inclusive and accessible.

Policy CS1 identifies the council's approach to growth and development:

Policy CS1

Overall approach to growth and development:

The Council will focus Camden's growth in the most suitable locations, and manage it to make sure that we deliver its opportunities and benefits and achieve sustainable development, while continuing to preserve and enhance the features that make Camden such an attractive place to live, work and visit. We will promote:

- a) a concentration of development in the growth areas of King's Cross, Euston, **Tottenham Court Road**, Holborn and West Hampstead Interchange;
- b) appropriate development at other highly accessible locations, in particular Central London and the town centres of Camden Town, Finchley Road / Swiss Cottage, Kentish Town, Kilburn High Road and West Hampstead; and
- c) more limited change elsewhere.

Making the best use of Camden's limited land

The Council will promote the most efficient use of land and buildings in Camden by:

- d) seeking development that makes full use of its site, taking into account quality of design, its surroundings, sustainability, amenity, heritage, transport accessibility and any other considerations relevant to the site;
- e) resisting development that makes inefficient use of Camden's limited land;
- f) expecting development that will significantly increase the demand of travel to be located in growth areas and other highly accessible parts of the borough;
- g) expecting high density development in Central London, town centres and other locations well served by public transport; and
- h) expecting the provision of a mix of uses in suitable schemes, in particular in the most accessible parts of the borough, including an element of housing where possible.

The council's more detailed aspirations for development are set out in **Policy CS2**. The policy states that all development within the area should contribute to the Council's wider vision and objectives for this part of the borough:

Policy CS2

- a balanced mix of uses, including housing and affordable housing, significant provision of offices and other employment opportunities, community facilities, and retail to support the Central London Frontages of Charing Cross Road, Tottenham Court Road and the western end of New Oxford Street;
- an excellent public realm, with an improved network of safe and attractive places and routes for pedestrians and cyclists, that successfully links to neighbouring areas (particularly the growth area at Holborn (see below), Covent Garden, Bloomsbury and Oxford Street) and reduces the dominance of

traffic in the area (see Appendix 1, item 55 on improvements for pedestrians in the St Giles area);

- maximising densities compatible with local context, sustainable design principles and public transport capacity;
- development of the highest quality and sustainable design as befits a historic area in the heart of London, which preserves local amenity and seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas;
- remedying the lack of open space in the area through on-site provision or contributions to assist in the provision of new spaces.

Policy **CS7** outlines the council's approach to centres and shops:

CS7

The Council will promote successful and vibrant centres throughout the borough to serve the needs of residents, workers and visitors by:

- e) seeking to protect and enhance the role and unique character of each of Camden's centres, ensuring that new development is of an appropriate scale and character for the centre in which it is located;
- f) providing for, and maintaining, a range of shops, services, food, drink and entertainment and other suitable uses to provide variety, vibrancy and choice;
- g) protecting and promoting small and independent shops, and resisting the loss of shops where this would cause harm to the character and function of a centre;
- h) making sure that food, drink and entertainment uses do not have a harmful impact on residents and the local area, and focusing such uses in Camden's Central London Frontages, Town Centres and the King's Cross Opportunity Area;
- i) supporting and protecting Camden's local shops, markets and areas of specialist shopping; and
- j) pursuing the individual planning objectives for each centre, as set out below, including through the delivery of environmental, design, transport and public safety measures.

Within the Core Strategy the council also states that they will:

- promote and preserve the specialist retail character of Tottenham Court Road and Charing Cross Road by managing the level of shop and food, drink and entertainment uses in these areas, in line with the approach set out in our Planning Guidance for Central London supplementary planning document;
- support the expansion of the Central London Frontage and new retail uses along New Oxford Street, where this would not cause harm to residential amenity. Additional retail growth along the Central London Frontage will be achieved through redevelopment and refurbishment of existing premises;

The Seven Dials Estate Conservation Area Statement was adopted in 1998.³³ This document is used in the assessment of planning applications for proposed developments in the conservation area. The statement describes the character of Earlham Street, Shelton Street and the Seven Dials Warehouse in 1998; this does not reflect the current appearance of the building post its reconstruction and restoration after the fire of 2000:

Shelton Street is dominated by the former Woodyard Brewery buildings which line both sides of this narrow street. Evidence of the high level linking iron bridges remain on some of the buildings. The historic remains of ironwork form part of the distinctive industrial character of this part of the Conservation Area. At the junction with Neal Street and Earlham Street is the **Seven Dials Warehouse**, which has iron hoists and hoist doors remaining. The building was converted to a mix of uses following a GLC permission in 1974, however a recent fire has destroyed much of the interior and proposals for it are expected (April 2000).

Earlham Street is predominately four storey with the scale and plot sizes of the original Seven Dials

although it was almost entirely rebuilt in the 1880s as part of the Woodyard Brewery. There is still evidence of the high level cast iron bridges, which connected the brewery buildings across the street. A few 18th and early 19th century terraced buildings remain, in particular the section on the south side Nos.14-26. The Cambridge Theatre, a 1930s building designed by Wimperis, Simpson and Guthrie with interiors by Serge Chermayeff, forms a corner building at Seven Dials. The simple classical design provides an interesting contrast to the 18th and 19th century corner buildings whilst having some affinity with warehouse buildings. The Art Deco design was later echoed in Ibis House, designed by Terry Farrell, another corner building at the junction of Monmouth Street and Mercer Street. Between Shaftesbury Avenue and Seven Dials there are a number of new shopfronts on the north side on buildings previously in office use that have been converted successfully to retail and residential use. An exception to the distinctive quality of Seven Dials is Earlham House, a 1970s development designed by Richard Seifert. It has a particularly damaging impact at street level on Mercer Street at the entrance to the basement car park. Between Seven Dials and Neal Street the streetscape is notable for the reinstatement of original paving materials plus Victorian gas lantern style streetlights and Seven Dials bollards as the first stage of the Renaissance project. Between Seven Dials and Shaftesbury Avenue a market, which has traded since at least the 19th century, occupies one side of the street.

Views of the junction of Shelton Street, Earlham Street and Neal Street are also described as a significant feature of the conservation area:

In an area of narrow streets open spaces provide unexpected and important contrasts and an opportunity to view the townscape. The most significant are; views towards and from Seven Dials; this included the view west along Earlham Street that frames the distinctive, red brick turreted corner of the Palace Theatre at Cambridge Circus and the view north along Mercer Street to the Post Office Tower. **The views towards the open space at the northern end of Neal Street, the open space at the corner of Neal Street, Earlham Street and Shelton Street**, views along Shaftesbury Avenue towards Cambridge Circus and Princes Circus, views into Neal's Yard.

In regards to matters of design, as well as proposals for roof extensions and roof gardens, the conservation area audit states that:

DESIGN SD2

The Conservation Area has a long history of development which is demonstrated in the variety of styles which are juxtaposed within it. The last twenty years has seen the development of a successful combination of refurbishment and modern design, reflecting the dynamic changing character of the area, located in a unique historic context. Appropriate design for the Conservation Area can reflect both the historic and the modern context and both traditional and contemporary materials may be appropriate.

ROOF EXTENSIONS SD25

Planning permission is required for alterations to the roof, at the front, rear and side, within the Conservation Area. There are limited opportunities for roof extensions as alterations to the roofscape could adversely affect the character of the Conservation Area. The following principles will apply: a. The retention or reinstatement of any architecturally interesting features and characteristic decorative elements such as parapets, cornices and chimney stacks and pots will be encouraged. b. Roof extensions should be drained to the rear of the building; no rainwater pipes will normally be allowed on the street elevation. c. All external works should be carried out in materials that match as closely as possible in colour, texture and type those of the original building or are common in the area. d. Where the property forms part of a proper terrace which remains largely, but not necessarily, completely unimpaired, an extension is likely to be unacceptable.

ROOF GARDENS SD26

The formation of roof gardens can be an opportunity for external space. Due to the dense character of the area, the provision of roof gardens with extensive planting can provide visual amenity to neighbouring properties. However care should be given to locating gardens so that they do not have a detrimental impact on the street scene or on the architectural quality of the building. They can be successfully concealed, for example behind parapet walls. Consideration should be given to overlooking and the impact on long views in particular. Roof Seven Dials - (Covent Garden) 29 gardens should not be located on mansard roofs. Window boxes above shop fronts were a 19th century feature in the area and are an additional way of providing a greener environment in an appropriate way.

Camden Council is currently developing a **Local Plan**. Although this document has not been adopted yet it has reached the submission stage and policies can therefore be given limited consideration when determining planning applications. The relevant policies include:

Policy D1 Design

The Council will seek to secure high quality design in development. The Council will require that development:

- a. respects local context and character;
- b. preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2 - Heritage;
- c. is sustainable in design and construction, incorporating best practice in resource management and climate change mitigation and adaptation;
- d. is of sustainable and durable construction and adaptable to different activities and land uses;
- e. comprises details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character;
- f. integrates well with the surrounding streets and open spaces, improving movement through the site and wider area with direct, accessible and easily recognisable routes and contributes positively to the street frontage;
- g. is inclusive and accessible for all;
- h. promotes health;
- i. is secure and designed to minimise crime and antisocial behaviour;
- j. responds to natural features and preserves gardens and other open space;
- k. incorporates high quality landscape design (including public art, where appropriate) and maximises opportunities for greening for example through planting of trees and other soft landscaping,
- l. incorporates outdoor amenity space;
- m. preserves significant and protected views;
- n. for housing, provides a high standard of accommodation; and
- o. carefully integrates building services equipment.

The Council will resist development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Tall buildings

All of Camden is considered sensitive to the development of tall buildings. Tall buildings in Camden will be assessed against the design criteria set out above and we will also give particular attention to:

- p. how the building relates to its surroundings, both in terms of how the base of the building fits in with the streetscape and how the top of a tall building affects the skyline;
- q. the historic context of the building's surroundings;
- r. the relationship between the building and hills and views;
- s. the degree to which the building overshadows public spaces, especially open spaces and watercourses; and
- t. the contribution a building makes to pedestrian permeability and improved public accessibility. In addition to these design considerations tall buildings will be assessed against a range of other relevant

policies concerning amenity, mixed use and sustainability.

Public art

The Council will only permit development for artworks, statues or memorials where they protect and enhance the local character and historic environment and contribute to a harmonious and balanced landscape design.

Excellence in design

The Council expects excellence in architecture and design. We will seek to ensure that the significant growth planned for under Policy G1 will be provided through high quality contextual design.

Policy D2 Heritage

The Council will preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens and locally listed heritage assets.

Designated heritage assets

The Council will not permit the loss of or substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, including Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a. the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site;
- b. no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;
- c. conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d. the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use. The Council will not permit development that results in harm that is less than substantial to the significance of a designated heritage asset unless the public benefits of the proposal convincingly outweigh that harm.

Conservation areas

In order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management strategies when assessing applications within conservation areas. The Council will:

- e. require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area;
- f. resist the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area;
- g. resist development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character or appearance of that conservation area; and
- h. preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character and appearance of a conservation area or which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage.

Listed Buildings

To preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings, the Council will:

- i. resist the total or substantial demolition of a listed building;
- j. resist proposals for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where this would cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the building; and
- k. resist development that would cause harm to significance of a listed building through an effect on its setting.

Network and public realm.

Archaeology

The Council will protect remains of archaeological importance by ensuring acceptable measures are taken to preserve them and their setting, including physical preservation, where appropriate.

Other heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets

The Council will seek to protect other heritage assets including non-designated heritage assets (including those on and off the local list), Registered Parks and Gardens and London Squares. The effect of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, balancing the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Planning decisions

- B The significance of heritage assets should be assessed when development is proposed and schemes designed so that the heritage significance is recognised both in their own right and as catalysts for regeneration. Wherever possible heritage assets (including buildings at risk) should be repaired, restored and put to a suitable and viable use that is consistent with their conservation and the establishment and maintenance of sustainable communities and economic vitality.*

The London Plan Policies (Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) 2015)

On 10 March 2015, the Mayor published (i.e. adopted) the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP). From this date, the FALP are operative as formal alterations to the London Plan (the Mayor's spatial development strategy) and form part of the development plan for Greater London.

The London Plan has been updated to incorporate the Further Alterations. It also incorporates the Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan (REMA), which were published in October 2013.

Policy 7.8

Heritage assets and archaeology

Strategic

- A London's heritage assets and historic environment, including listed buildings, registered historic parks and gardens and other natural and historic landscapes, conservation areas, World Heritage Sites, registered battlefields, scheduled monuments, archaeological remains and memorials should be identified, so that the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and of utilising their positive role in place shaping can be taken into account.*
- B Development should incorporate measures that identify, record, interpret, protect and, where appropriate, present the site's archaeology.*

Planning decisions

- C Development should identify, value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, where appropriate.*
- D Development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.*

Policy 7.9

Heritage-led regeneration

Strategic

- A Regeneration schemes should identify and make use of heritage assets and reinforce the qualities that make them significant so they can help stimulate environmental, economic and community regeneration. This includes buildings, landscape features, views, Blue Ribbon*

Seven Dials Warehouse

27-33 Shelton Street

42-54 Earlham Street

Grade: II

Date First Listed: 25 July 2002

List Entry Number: 1061403

List Entry:

Former Brewery Building. 27-33 Shelton Street and 42-54 Earlham Street. Mid-19th century, designer unknown. Yellow stock brick with granite dressings; roof not visible.

Occupying a narrow wedge-shaped site, narrowing to the east, this former brewery building comprises a five-storey structure with a granite plinth, a granite impost band, a brick cornice and parapet.

EXTERIOR:

The narrow three-window wide east front has a large central opening with a pedimented door surround, retaining a gas lamp bracket to the centre. The longer side elevations have a mixture of window openings, generally with sash windows, some of which have been enlarged in recent times, but which retain their brick arches. The south elevation retains a loading bay with a crane hoist. Large granite-lined door surrounds are found on each side elevation too, as well as smaller openings.

INTERIOR:

Inspected in part; the basement, currently the Belgo Restaurant, retains its cast iron columns, jack-arched roof and barrel-vaulted cellars to the east, with a stone-paved floor. Other cast iron columns remain in situ within the retail space at upper levels.

HISTORY:

This block formed part of the former Combe's Brewery, the origins of which go back to the early 18th century. It expanded in the mid-19th century, becoming the 4th largest London brewery by the 1880s; it amalgamated with Watney's in 1898, and was vacated by them in 1905. According to the 1888 Goad Insurance Plan, this building was the cooling and fermenting section of the brewery, and was linked at its upper levels with bridges connecting this block with its neighbours to the north and south. Discussions for constructing such bridges were commenced in 1861, which is a probable terminus ante quem for the building's construction. The building had various post-1905 uses: the largest of which was as a stationers' warehouse. Despite considerable lesser alterations, the building retains its pronounced industrial character, and as such is an unusual survival in inner central London. It also possesses strong group value with already listed brewery buildings to the south, over the boundary in the City of Westminster.

SOURCES:

Watney Combe Reid archives, Westminster City Archive;
Goad Insurance Plan;
Alfred Barnard, 'The Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland' (1889) vol. I, 274 ff.; Hurford Janes, 'The Red Barrell. A History of Watney Mann' (1963).

Appendix III

List of Plates and Endnotes

List of Plates

1. 1682 'London Actually Survey'd' by William Morgan (LMA)
2. John Rocque's Survey of London, 1747 (LMA)
3. Horwood, Survey of London 1792 (LMA)
4. Horwood, Survey of London, 1813 (LMA)
5. The original warehouse shown in a print of Five Dials Square Neal Street, 1830 (CLA)
6. Langley Street looking north showing the re-built Seven Dials Warehouse in the distance, c.1875 (Collage)
7. Goad's Fire Insurance Map, 1888 (LMA)
8. Engraving of the Seven Dials Warehouse in 1888, taken from Alfred Barnard, *The Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland*, Volume 1 (1889)
9. Block plan showing disposal of the Combe & Co Brewery (WCA)
- 10a. Ground floor plan showing the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)
- 10b. First floor plan showing the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)
- 10c. Third floor plan showing the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)
- 10d. Fourth floor plan showing the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)
- 10e. Fifth floor plan showing the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)
- 10f. Roof plan of the 1907 conversion of the Seven Dials Warehouse (CLA)
- 11a. Photograph of the corner elevation of the Seven Dials Warehouse, 1975 (Collage)
- 11b. Photograph of the Earlham Street elevation of the Seven Dials Warehouse, 1975 (Collage)
12. Photograph of Langley Street with the Seven Dials Warehouse seen in the distance, 1976 (Collage)
- 13a. Ground floor plan of the Seven Dials Warehouse showing alterations undertaken in 1979 (CLA)
- 13b. First floor plan of the Seven Dials Warehouse showing alterations undertaken in 1979 (CLA)
- 13c. Third floor plan of the Seven Dials Warehouse showing alterations undertaken in 1979 (CLA)
- 13d. Fourth floor plan of the Seven Dials Warehouse showing alterations undertaken in 1979 (CLA)
- 13e. Fifth floor plan of the Seven Dials Warehouse showing alterations undertaken in 1979 (CLA)
14. Photograph showing the damage to the Seven Dials Warehouse, c.2000 (AKT II)
- 15a. Ground floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)
- 15b. First floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)
- 15c. Second floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)
- 15d. Third floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the

- fire of September 1999 (CLA)
- 15e. Fourth floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)
- 15f. Fifth floor plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)
- 15g. Roof plan showing the 2001 rebuilding works following the fire of September 1999 (CLA)
- 15h. Aerial view of the rebuilt roof of the Seven Dials Warehouse, 2001 (CLA)
16. Approved design of the replacement double glazed windows in the Seven Dials Warehouse, 2001 (Camden Online Planning Records).
17. Front elevation of the Seven Dials Warehouse facing onto Five Dials Square 2016 (DIA)
18. Side elevation of the Seven Dials Warehouse facing onto Shelton Street, 2016 (DIA)

Endnotes

- 1 London Encyclopaedia and Pevsner
- 2 William Morgan, 'London Actually Survey'd', 1682 (LMA)
- 3 Watney Combe Reid and Company Limited Record, London Metropolitan Archives Entry & Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: Harvey Christian Combe
- 4 Watney Combe Reid and Company Limited Record, London Metropolitan Archives Entry & Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: Harvey Christian Combe
- 5 Horwood, Survey of London, 1792 (LMA)
- 6 Victoria County History, 'A History of the County of Middlesex', 1911
- 7 Horwood, Survey of London, 1813 (LMA)
- 8 Ref: 89.3 Print of Seven Dials, looking east towards Earlham Street and Castle Street, 1830 (CLA)
- 9 Alfred Barnard, *The Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland*, Volume 1 (1889)
- 10 Photograph of Langley Street, 1875 (Collage)
- 11 Goad's Fire Insurance Map, 1888 (LMA)
- 12 Victoria County History, 'A History of the County of Middlesex', 1911

- 13 Ibid
- 14 Ref: 789/713-728: Leases and plans of warehouses in Castle Street (WCA)
- 15 Horwood, Survey of London, 1813 (LMA)
- 16 Ref: 89.3 Print of Seven Dials, looking east towards Earlham Street and Castle Street, 1830 (CLA)
- 17 Alfred Barnard, *The Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland*, Volume 1 (1889)
- 18 Photograph of Langley Street, 1875 (Collage)
- 19 Alfred Barnard, *The Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland*, Volume 1 (1889)
- 20 Goad's Fire Insurance Map, 1888 (LMA)
- 21 Ref: 789/713-728: Leases and plans of warehouses in Castle Street (WCA)
- 22 Drainage plans: 27-33 Shelton Street and 42-54 Earlham Street (CLA)
- 23 Ibid
- 24 Photograph of the Seven Dials Warehouse from Neal Street, 1976 (Collage)
- 25 Drainage plans: 27-33 Shelton Street and 42-54 Earlham Street (CLA)
- 26 Ref: 89.3: An ephemera file on 42 – 48 Earlham Street and 27 – 29 Shelton Street (CLA)
- 27 Ibid.
- 28 Statutory List Description, see Appendix II
- 29 All applications relating to the Seven Dials Warehouse, 27-33 Shelton Street and 42-54 Earlham Street (Camden Council Online Planning Records)
- 30 The Seven Dials Estate Conservation Area Statement, 1998 (Camden Council Online Planning Records)
- 31 Historic England. *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 2 – Managing Significance in Decision-Taking* (2015), p. 3
- 32 Historic England. *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 2 – Managing Significance in Decision-Taking* (2015), p. 5
- 33 The Seven Dials Estate Conservation Area Statement, 1998 (Camden Council Online Planning Records)

London Office

12 Devonshire Street
London, W1G 7AB

Tel: 020 7245 9888

www.insall-architects.co.uk