

Unit 2, Brunswick Centre, London, WC1N 1AE
Leon

04 May 2017



HERITAGE STATEMENT

Heritage Statement

1. This Heritage Statement has been prepared to accompany a listed building consent application for the retention of replacement plant at Unit 2, Brunswick Centre, London, WC1N 1AE.

Site Analysis

2. The application site comprises a ground floor commercial unit located within the mixed-use complex of the Brunswick Centre.
3. The Brunswick Centre comprises a complex of commercial retail and food and drink-led businesses with residential accommodation above. The local area is characterised by a variety of commercial uses, as is typical of a mixed-use urban area. The wider local area contains a variety of building styles and heights.
4. The Brunswick Centre is a grade II listed complex and lies within the designated Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The Brunswick Centre was built between 1967 and 1972 to the design of Patrick Hogkinson and is recognised as the pioneering example of a megastructure in England and an example of low-rise, high-density living. The Brunswick Centre comprises two linked blocks of 560 flats that incorporate two rows of shops at raised ground level over basement car parking on two levels and a cinema. The complex is principally formed from concrete walls and metal framed glazing. Historic England's listing description states that the interior finished of the flats, shops and cinema have been inspected and are not of special interest. The Brunswick Centre was listed on 14/09/2000, whilst the Bloomsbury Conservation Area was designated on 01/03/1984.

Proposal

5. The proposal comprises the retention of the replacement plant installed at the application site. The layout, form and positioning of this plant is fully detailed within the accompanying plans and documents. The replacement plant has been installed to update and upgrade upon the plant that existed at the site prior to the applicant taking on the lease for this unit. The previous plant comprised three 20kw Daikin R407c units and a single Daikin 3.5kw system R410a, which were installed within the external plant cage at the site. The external elements of the replacement plant are contained within the same plant cage and details of both have been included within the application documentation.

Planning Policy

6. The NPPF states that in relation to Heritage Assets, only where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to/or total loss of significance of a designated Heritage Asset should local planning authorities refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss. This gives a presumption in favour of development that does not cause substantial harm, or where the substantial harm can be justified. In this case, the proposed modest and temporary placing of furniture on the highway will not be the cause of substantial harm; therefore there is a presumption in favour of the grant of consent.
7. The Development Plan comprises the adopted Camden Core Strategy 2010 – 2025 and the adopted Camden Development Policies 2010 – 2025. Both the Core Strategy and the Development Policies were adopted by the LPA on 08/11/2010 and therefore both documents pre-date the NPPF and their material planning weight must be considered accordingly weakened by this. Whilst work is on-going with the emerging replacement Local Plan, this is not yet formally adopted and its material planning weight is thus minimal at present. Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy addresses the conserving of heritage and requires that heritage assets and their settings are preserved and enhanced. Policy DP25 of the Development Policies concerns conserving Camden's heritage. This requires development within designated conservation areas to preserve and enhance their character and appearance; whilst only supporting alterations to listed buildings where they would not harm the special interest of the building. For the reasons rehearsed in this Heritage Statement, it is not considered that the application proposals result in any material conflict with this local planning policy context.
8. It is considered that the proposed retention of the replacement plant will not materially conflict with the aspirations of both national and local planning policies. The retention of the replacement plant is a reasonable and necessary element to allow the applicant's business from this unit to continue. It is therefore considered to be a justified and reasonable proposal, which will assist in the continued economic success of this existing beneficial use of a listed building. In addition, given that the existing use is open to the public, ensuring the continued economic success of the property will continue to allow public access into this listed building for leisure orientated purposes.

Assessment

9. The proposed retention of the replacement plant is considered to be a justified, reasonable and necessary part of the applicant's business at this site. The layout, form and positioning of the replacement plant closely matches the plant that previously existed at this site, prior to the applicant taking on the lease of this unit. It is also considered that the replacement plant results in no net material impact upon the historic character and fabric of this listed building and that this plant has a neutral impact upon this listed building. No historic fabric will be removed as a consequence of the retention of the replacement plant and the external elements are contained

within the same plant cage that contained the previous plant installed at the site. There will therefore be no demonstrable, material impact upon the architectural or historical character of the host listed building; the settings of both the host and the neighbouring listed buildings; and the character and appearance of this part of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

Prepared by

Bidwells LLP
