

HeritageCollective

Heritage Statement

36-37 Chester Terrace, LB Camden

May 2017

Job Ref: 3072A



Project Number:	3072A
Authored by:	Lucy Jarvis
Reviewed by:	Jonathan Edis
Date:	May 2017
Document version	L:\HC\1. HC PROJECTS\PROJECTS\1. LONDON JOBS\Camden jobs\36 & 37 Chester Terrace\2016.12.07_Chester Terrace Pre-App.v1.docx

CONTENTS		PAGE NO.
1.0	INTRODUCTION	4
2.0	PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK	5
3.0	HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT	9
4.0	ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	13
5.0	ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSALS	17
6.0	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	24

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Heritage Statement has been prepared by Heritage Collective on behalf of the owners of No.36 and No.37 Chester Terrace. Originally two separate dwellings, No.36 and No.37 (henceforth referred to as 'the Site') were unified into one dwelling in 2009 and have been in use as such since that time.
- 1.2 The Site is listed grade I as part of a larger terrace of 37 houses & 5 semi-detached dwellings dating to c1825, by John Nash, and located within the Regents Park Conservation Area. Both the listed terrace and conservation area are designated heritage assets in terms of the NPPF.

Purpose of this Statement

- 1.3 It is proposed to make internal alterations, to varying degrees, at lower-ground to third floor. No external works are proposed although a small number of internal changes will result in a slight external change to the rear of the property. Please refer to drawings prepared by Stanhope Gate Architecture, which are discussed within Section 5.0 of this Statement.
- 1.4 The proposals will be subject to planning and listed building consent and this Statement has been prepared to inform the proposals and the pre-application discussions. It will be worked up into a full Heritage Statement to support those applications in due course.

Key Considerations

- 1.5 The following have been taken into consideration:
- The heritage significance of Chester Terrace as a whole and of No. 36 and No.37 in isolation;
 - Character and appearance of the Regents Park Conservation Area;
 - Level of internal alteration and level of survival within the properties;
 - Local guidance and policy;
 - Impact of pre-application proposals on heritage significance.

2.0 PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

2.1 The legislation relating to the historic environment is contained in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Sections 16 and 66 of the Act are of particular relevance to this case because they place a duty on the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the special interest and setting of a listed building. Section 72 requires that special attention is paid to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

2.2 The government's objectives for the historic built environment are set out in Part 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012). That document places emphasis for decision relating to listed building consent and planning permission to be determined by the local authority against their specific policy and guidance. The NPPF is a material consideration in the decision-making process.

2.3 The NPPF defines significance as:

"The value of heritage assets to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic, or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting".

2.4 The NPPF makes it clear that local authorities, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to that asset's conservation, that is:

"The process of maintaining and managing change to heritage assets in a way that sustains and where appropriate, enhances its significance".

2.5 The NPPF recognises a distinction between levels of harm to a listed building or conservation area and defines these as substantial or less than substantial. Paragraph 133 states that proposals that will result in 'substantial' harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the harm or loss of significance is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.

- 2.6 Paragraph 134, which state that *"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"*.
- 2.7 Paragraph 187 states that local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision takes at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

Local policy and guidance

- 2.8 Within Camden's Core Strategy, Policy CS14 "promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage" is of relevance. This policy states that the Council will "ensure that Camden's places and buildings are attractive safe and easy to use...": It will do this by,
- *requiring development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character;*
 - *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;*
 - *promoting high quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces;*
 - *seeking the highest standards of access in all buildings and places and requiring schemes to be designed to be inclusive and accessible;*
 - *protecting important views of St Paul's Cathedral and the Palace of Westminster from sites*
 - *inside and outside the borough and protecting important local views.*
- 2.9 Camden development policies (2010-2025) are set out as part of the borough's Local Development Framework. Policy DP25 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' is applicable. With respect to listed buildings, it states that the Council will:

- *prevent the total or substantial demolition of a listed building unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;*
- *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*
- *not permit development that it considers would cause harm to the setting of a listed building.*

2.10 Although, proposals relate primarily to the listed building, policies concerning conservations areas are also of relevance. Policy DP25 states that the council will:

- *Take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans when assessing applications within conservation areas;*
- *Only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area;*
- *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;*
- *Not permit development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character and appearance of that conservation area; and,*
- *Preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character of a conservation area and which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage.*

2.11 The Regents Park Conservation Area Statement forms supplementary planning guidance. It includes a description of the character and appearance of the conservation area and its constituent parts – the conservation area is divided into six sub-areas. In this instance, most weight should be given to the impact of proposals on the listed building, but consideration of any potential impacts of proposals on the character and appearance of the conservation area is also important.

Summary Planning history

No. 36

- 2.12 1988: Permission was granted for 'alterations of existing kitchen adjacent servery and W.C compartment to form larger kitchen on ground floor.' (Planning application 8870380)

No. 37

- 2.13 21st December 2004: Permission granted for internal alterations at second floor level. (Planning application 2004/4659/L)
- 2.14 23rd December 2010: Permission was granted for the erection of 'single-storey acoustic enclosure at basement level for the installation of 3 X condensing units following the excavation of rear yard.' (Planning application 2010/5319/L and 2010/5315/P)

No. 36 and No. 37

- 2.15 10th December 2009: Permission was granted for the unification of No.36 & 37 to form a single-family dwelling, including internal alterations and the formation of new roof terrace. (Planning application 2009/4544/P and 2009/4515/L)
- 2.16 8th March 2011: Permission was granted for the excavation of vaults at lower ground floor of No. 36 & 37, with internal additions and alterations. (Planning application 2011/0140/L and 2011/0138/P)
- 2.17 21st November 2011: Amendments were granted to listed building consent for works to join No. 36 and 37 to form a single-family dwelling. These include: '*internal alterations to create new openings between the properties and formation of new roof terrace namely, works associated with the installation of a staircase from third floor level to access a new roof terrace, new condensing unit & associated plant at lower ground floor level (within the existing front pavement vaults), addition of grille to new rear garage door and other internal alterations.*' (Planning application 2011/2958/L and 2011/2954/P).

3.0 HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT

Post-War Phase

- 3.1 During the Second World War the whole of the terrace suffered from bomb damage. The London County Council Bomb Damage Maps indicate that No. 36 and No.37 suffered "*blast damage, minor in nature*". The neighbouring dwellings on the southern side were damaged beyond repair, whilst the middle portion of the terrace suffered "*general blast damage - not structural*".
- 3.2 After WWII the Regent's Park Terraces were in a poor condition and a committee was formed to report back to the Government on what should be done with them. After much debate, it was decided to completely refurbish the terrace. Chester Terrace was restored in the early 1960s by a subsidiary of Hallmark Securities Ltd., with David Hodges as architect and Holland and Hannen and Cubitt Ltd. as builders. The third report by the Crown Estate Commissioners detailed what was to happen.

*'All the Terrace is being kept as individual houses within the existing main walls, except for two destroyed houses which are being renewed. **Roofs, floors, internal (not party) walls, timberwork** and loose brickwork are being renewed, and internal plaster stripped from the walls and small passenger lifts installed, so that the whole of the internal construction of each of the houses is new. The repairs being made to the shell of the buildings are of such a nature that their strength and stability is very materially increased, resulting in there being given a new life which will surely be at least equal to the 99 year lease which has been granted. The new wood floors and the domestic loading on them is of no more than the structure was originally designed to sustain'.*

- 3.3 The mews property to the rear was demolished - '*Smaller houses, a block of flats, shops and an underground garage are approved for the Mews site and the Albany Street frontage*'.

Current built form

- 3.4 The Site photographs included within this submission highlight the amount of alterations which has been undertaken within No.36 and 37 Chester Terrace. The archival research carried out reveals little about the pre-war condition and level of alteration to these properties. However, the impact of post-war alteration can be clearly seen in the photographs provided.
- 3.5 Aside from the obvious lack of original details, fixtures and fittings, a 21st century roof structure is evident with terrace. The main staircase appears to be of modern construction. It is in its original position at the lower levels but the stair from 2nd and 3rd floor stair was in the middle of the plan pre-2009. The stair is to be retained.
- 3.6 The list description relevant to No.36 and No.37, which is relevant to the whole terrace, has been copied below in its entirety for ease of reference. No.36 and No.37 are not specifically mentioned within the description. The interiors of each of the properties was not inspected by English Heritage (now Historic England) at the time of listing – the listing is primarily a result of the external architectural quality of the group, as defined below and discussed in the following section.

"Grand palace-style terrace of 37 houses & 5 semi-detached houses. c1825. By John Nash. For the Commissioners of Woods, Forests and Land Revenues. Built by J Burton. Stucco. Slate mansard roofs with attic dormers. EXTERIOR: the longest unbroken facade in Regent's Park (approx 280m) with an alternating system of bays (ABCBABCBA). At either end projecting pavilion blocks connected to main facade by thin triumphal arches. Main Block (Nos 6-38): symmetrical composition of 3 and 4 storeys. 3 windows to each house. "A" bays, screen of 8 free-standing, fluted Corinthian columns supporting an entablature with modillion cornice above which a recessed attic storey with round-arched windows. Round-arched ground floor openings; architraved heads linked by impost bands. Recessed doorways with panelled doors and fanlights. Windows with margin glazing. 1st floors with architraved sashes and continuous cast-iron balconies. "B" bays, round-arched ground floor openings; architraved heads linked by impost bands. Recessed doorways with panelled doors and fanlights. Windows with margin glazing.

Architraved 1st and 2nd floor sashes; 1st floor with continuous cast-iron balcony. Main projecting modillion cornice at 3rd floor level. Cornice and blocking course above 2nd floor. "C" bays, slightly projecting with screen of 6 attached, fluted Corinthian columns supporting an entablature with modillion cornice above which 2 recessed attic storeys with cornice at 3rd floor level and pediment above. Round-arched ground floor openings; architraved heads linked by impost bands. Recessed doorways with panelled doors and fanlights. Windows with margin glazing. 1st & 2nd floors with architraved sashes; 1st floor with continuous cast-iron balcony. INTERIORS: not inspected. SUBSIDIARY FEATURES: attached cast-iron railings to areas. Linking triumphal arches with round-arched vehicle entrance flanked by pedestrian entrances. Inner elevations with 4 attached Corinthian columns supporting a modillion entablature above which a scrolled frieze, cornice and blocking course. Outer elevations with 4 Corinthian pilasters supporting a modillion entablature with panel inscribed "Chester Terrace", cornice and blocking course. Nos 4 & 5 and Nos 39 & 40: to south and north of arches respectively. Channelled stucco ground floors. Square-headed doorways with panelled doors and fanlights. Recessed sashes, upper floors with architraves; 1st floors with continuous cast-iron balconies. Main cornice at 3rd floor level. Cornice and blocking course above 3rd floor. Right hand return of No.4 pedimented with blind windows. No.3: fronting on to Chester Gate. 2 storeys and basement. 4 windows. Forms the terminal return to main block. 3 central bays slightly projecting. Greek Doric prostyle portico; panelled door and fanlight. Recessed sashes, those flanking the portico with shouldered architraves (left hand blind). Right hand bay with projecting bay window surmounted by parapet with central balustraded panel. Cornice and blocking course with central feature of segmental-headed cut out block flanked by panelled dies. Left hand angle with enriched pilaster strip and surmounted by anthemion acroterion; right hand angle with anthemion acroterion only. Symmetrical west frontage to garden; 2 windows, 1st floor with balconies. Bust of Nash on bracket between 1st floor windows. Parapet with central urn. INTERIOR not inspected. SUBSIDIARY FEATURES: attached cast-iron railings to garden and flanking steps. Nos 1, 2 & 41, 42: projecting pavilion blocks fronting Regent's Park and linked to main block by triumphal arches. Similar to "C" bays. 4 storeys. 5 windows and 3-window returns. Attached Corinthian columns (paired at angles) rise through 1st and 2nd floors to

support entablature with projecting cornice; Corinthian pilasters to other fronts. Round-arched ground floor openings; windows architraved with margin glazing. Upper floors with recessed sashes; 1st floor with cast-iron balconies except central window. 2nd and 3rd floor form attic storeys (2nd floor windows architraved) with cornice at 3rd floor sill level and cornice and blocking course above 3rd floor. INTERIORS: not inspected. HISTORICAL NOTE: No.13 was the residence of CR Cockerell, architect and antiquary (English Heritage plaque). (Survey of London: Vol. XIX, Old St Pancras and Kentish Town (St Pancras II): London: -1938: 120)."

4.0 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

No.36 and No.37 Chester Terrace

- 4.1 Given that both properties that make up the Site are now in use as one dwelling, their significance has been assessed as such below. Taken as individual buildings, each property has been subject to a similar level of alteration, all of which accords with WWII damage and the extensive 1960s renovation and rebuild, along with later alterations.
- 4.2 *Architectural/aesthetic value/significance:* The Site is of primary architectural interest through the quality of its external form and association with one of the most complete terraces bounding Regents Park, designed by John Nash. It contributes to the overall character of the terrace and, externally, remains largely in its early 19th century form. The terrace demonstrates a very high level of composition and quality craftsmanship.
- 4.3 The interior has been subject to considerable alteration, and was largely reconstructed post-war (as were the interiors of the other properties within the group). Each property has a similar internal arrangement, a large proportion of the fabric and the general internal construction now being mid-20th century in date. The areas within the property that are of most significance are: i) the broadly readable (but altered) hierarchy of internal spaces from ground to third floor; and, ii) traditional sash windows. Unsympathetic cornices and skirting boards are present in many rooms and are not original.
- 4.4 The interior is of no particular, intrinsic, merit. Detailing is post-WWII - in most cases post 2009 - throughout and, although a sympathetic layout was reinstated, as far as possible (the addition of the lift altered the room proportions), the associated detailing is of no particular value in its own right. In addition, the Site is comprised of two originally independent properties and the changes undertaken to amalgamate them have resulted in a considerable shift from the original arrangement, albeit the overall internal arrangement still references a more traditional layout, with ancillary spaces at lower-ground and 2nd floor and principal rooms at ground and first.

- 4.5 The existing roof form is not original and, along with the majority of internal partition walls and cornicing, date to the 1960s and c.2009 when the property was comprehensively renovated initially as part of the wider improvements made to the Chester Terrace, post war and subsequently in more recent years.
- 4.6 *Historical value/significance:* The Site is of historical significance only insofar as it forms part of a group of properties that survives as one of the most complete terraces in Regents Park.
- 4.7 The group can be attributed to John Nash, an influential and prolific architect of the period.
- 4.8 *Artistic value/significance:* The property is of no artistic interest as far as its interior is concerned. It is of some artistic value through the level of craftsmanship evident in the quality of its external elevations, and the composition and detail of the external form of the wider terrace when seen and appreciated as a whole.
- 4.9 *Archaeological and evidential value/significance:* The property is of some evidential value as a surviving example of how the wealthier classes of the early to mid-19th century conducted their lives and how the area around Regents Park developed. The Site was originally two dwellings, amalgamated into one. Externally, two single dwellings is still very much the impression given, despite the alterations undertaken to allow the amalgamation internally. Through these changes a sense of internal hierarchy does remain.
- 4.10 In summary, the Site is of very high, and primarily architectural/aesthetic, interest through the quality of its elevations and its contribution to the wider composition, and overall aesthetic, of the terrace. The interior is of limited value today, with the general hierarchy of spaces being one of the only surviving elements of interest which contributes to the property's overall heritage value – something which will be maintained as part of proposals.
- 4.11 The property has been substantially altered, along with its setting (discussed below) due to the mid-20th century redevelopment to the east, which included the loss of the mews properties associated with the terrace.

Further Assessment

- 4.12 An assessment of the heritage value of specific features and fabric within the building, which contributes to its overall significance, has been set out at Appendix 5.2 of the DAS, with input from Heritage Collective, entitled 'Schedule of works & Impact Assessment'. This schedule includes photographs of all the areas discussed.

Regents Park Conservation Area

- 4.13 The Regents Park Conservation Area Appraisal is broken up into sections according to six sub-areas which combine to make up the conservation area. '*Regents Park and Terraces fronting the park and their mews*' is sub-area 1, and takes in the application site.

- 4.14 The appraisal notes, at p.27:

"Chester Terrace is set back from the park with a strip of contained shared gardens with flowering plants, shrubbery and trees. Chester Terraces is the longest unbroken façade in the park (287m/840ft) with a complex alternating system of bays (ABCBABCBA) totally 99 bays, marked by giant Corinthian columns attached and detached in groups which rise from ground floor level. Balconies run continuously between and behind the columns. At either end are projecting wings, connected to the main façade by theatrically thin triumphal arches inset with the name 'Chester Terrace' across the full street width".

- 4.15 It goes on to observe that the space created between Cumberland Place, Chester Terrace and Chester Place is a complex one which is the result of Nash's overall theatrical composition.
- 4.16 Other than the above examples, Chester Terrace is mentioned relatively little within the document. It does, at p.90, make the point that '*the whole of the internal construction of each house is new*' as announced by the Commissioners in 1962 (already noted above).
- 4.17 The terraces which surround Regents Park are effectively the transition zone between the parkland and housing. Immediately to the east (rear) of Chester Terrace is the substantial, and quite dense, 1960s housing development

which was built post-war and resulted in the loss of the mews properties associated with Chester Terrace.

- 4.18 This sub-area runs from Cumberland Footbridge to Park Square East. All the terraced properties around the park were built, and most importantly designed, to be seen from it. They are statement buildings and Chester Terrace is one of the finer surviving examples. Although all these terraces were built with varying elevational treatments, rendered to look like stone, the Estate had always been keen to see the variation in finished removed and regularised. Over the years, this has been achieved.
- 4.19 It is the eastern side of the Park which has seen the most redevelopment in the 20th century, through the construction of the high-density houses to the east of Chester Terrace.
- 4.20 Key views within the conservation area include the view of Chester Terrace as seen from Chester Road and from Chester Place.

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSALS

- 5.1 The Design & Access Statement (DAS) prepared by Stanhope Gate Architecture provides a summary of discussions had with officers at Camden during the pre-application process. Officers' advice has been summarised and the client team's response set out within that document. In addition, a detailed study of the evolution of the floor plans for the Site has also been included within the DAS.
- 5.2 This section provides an assessment of the proposals on heritage significance. The most relevant elements of the scheme have been discussed below, and tally with the description of the proposed alterations within the DAS (pages 18-19).

Lower ground floor

- 5.3 **Proposal:** Removal of the floor build-up including slab to the internal spaces, rear light wells and a portion of the front light well of No. 36. The internal floor level will be lowered by 300mm, the rear light wells by 250mm, and the portion of the front light well by up to 150mm. Replacement drainage to all.
- 5.4 **HC Comment:** It is the external form and appearance of the terrace that is of most importance in heritage terms and that will remain wholly unaffected by this element of the proposals.
- 5.5 The lowering of the lightwells to the front and rear will not be evident from street level, once complete, as the lightwells are of limited visibility. This change would not affect the appearance of the building.
- 5.6 The lowering of the slab will not undermine the existing brick corbelled foundations or require any removal. The non-original existing partitions will be removed and replaced after the works have been undertaken.
- 5.7 This change will still preserve what is left of the internal hierarchy of the building. This modest increase in floor to ceiling height at LGF will not change the existing character of the LGF and it will still very much feel like a subservient space. The changes associated with the lowering of the slab will

not result in any noticeable change to the external appearance of the property.

- 5.8 The LGF is subservient and has been subject to change. The proposed change to improve the floor to ceiling height at this level is considered appropriate. Furthermore, this change reflects the height found within other properties within the terrace at LGF level. There will be no harm to historic fabric, or fabric of value.
- 5.9 **Proposal:** Removal of 1 no. column and replacement of 1 no. wall with a new column in the cinema.
- 5.10 **HC Comment:** The cinema room comprises largely modern fabric of limited heritage value. The layout of the LGF has been altered over time and partition added. This alteration would retain a sense of the original room proportions and not result in unacceptable loss to historic fabric. Specifically, the beams and columns to be replaced as 1960s insertions.
- 5.11 **Proposal:** Removal and replacement of all partitions, including reordering those to the kitchen, WC, utility room, and staff room.
- 5.12 **HC Comment:** The existing partitions at LGF are largely modern and the historic plans provided within the appendices to this Statement and the appendices accompanying the DAS demonstrate this. This element of the proposals is not considered result in harm to heritage significance as it affects a part of the building that is subservient, maintains the sense of hierarchy within the building and maintains sympathetic room proportions.
- 5.13 **Proposal:** Creation of an additional WC to the new staff room.
- 5.14 **HC Comment:** The addition of a new WC would be discrete and in a part of the property that has already been subject to change. It is a subservient addition that is wholly appropriate at this level and will not result in any unacceptable loss to historic fabric.
- 5.15 **Proposal:** Replacement of the internal stairs and steps to rear light wells to suit the proposed change in floor level.

- 5.16 **HC Comment:** The existing steps down to the lightwells are of limited value and later insertions. The proposed replacement stairs will be sympathetic to the building and will not bring about any harm to heritage significance.
- 5.17 **Proposal:** Replacement of external doors to the front light well of No. 36 and rear light wells to suit the proposed change in threshold level; to match the character of the existing and rear doors to include fanlights.
- 5.18 **HC Comment:** This is effectively a replacement like-for-like but will bring about an improvement to the overall appearance of this part of the building. The replacement doors will be entirely in-keeping and sympathetic to the building. The existing doors are not of any heritage interest and there will be no harm caused due to their removal and replacement.
- 5.19 **Proposal:** Addition of wall lining to the internal perimeter of the property.
- 5.20 **HC Comment:** The structural aspects of the building are largely original but the plasterwork and other interior finishes are almost entirely modern. The introduction of wall lining to the internal perimeter walls will not result in any harm to heritage significance or change the appearance of the building. In addition, this approach will allow for the services and wiring to be run through the lining, instead of impacting on the original walls. This is beneficial.
- 5.21 **Proposal:** Minor alterations of the vents on the rear elevation.
- 5.22 **HC Comment:** This is a very minor alteration that will not result in any notable change to the external form and appearance of the building. There will be no harm caused.

Ground floor

- 5.23 **Proposal:** Widening of opening between reception and entrance hall and insertion of columns.
- 5.24 **HC Comment:** The proposed approach retains columns either side of the opening to ensure the separation between the entrance hall and reception area is still readable. The existing opening is reasonable in size but the new

slightly larger opening will create a more appropriate entrance to the building, allowing in more light to the entrance hallway and improving circulation.

- 5.25 This change will not be apparent from street level in views towards the building and will, therefore, not result in any change to the external appearance of the building from within the conservation area, and how it is read as part of a comprehensive, designed, group.
- 5.26 No historic fabric of significance will be lost due to this change, which is considered acceptable.
- 5.27 **Proposal:** Creation of additional gallery area in existing cloakroom with opening to reception.
- 5.28 **HC Comment:** There is a slightly awkward existing arrangement within this part of the property as it stands today. The insertion of the lift is partly responsible for this and the proposals actually improve how the spaces are read within the building and are an enhancement on the existing arrangement. As previously, no historic fabric of significance will be lost or harmed due to this aspect of the proposals.
- 5.29 **Proposal:** Addition of nibs to entrance hall.
- 5.30 **HC Comment:** At present the entrance is a relatively open space, which would historically not have been the case. The introduction of nibs to the entrance hall reinstates a sense of proportion within the hallway and the sense of moving from one part of the property to the other. This is an entirely acceptable addition to the ground floor and one that will, in fact, enhance the existing arrangement.
- 5.31 **Proposal:** Reorganisation of cloakroom and WC area to No. 37.
- 5.32 **HC Comment:** This change affects entirely modern fabric of no heritage value and the proposed changes create a far better internal arrangement within this part of the building. There will be no harm to heritage significance.
- 5.33 **Proposal:** Alteration to door to kitchen.

- 5.34 **HC Comment:** This door is not original. The replacement will be entirely in-keeping with the character of the property and there will be no harm to significance.
- 5.35 **Proposal:** Reorganisation of No. 36 desk area, WC and door to service entrance.
- 5.36 **HC Comment:** The desk area within the part of the property that is No.36, along with the WC make for an awkward arrangement of small rooms. The proposed alterations are considered informed and appropriate, retain the proportions of the principal rooms at this level and do not result in any unacceptable loss of fabric.
- 5.37 **Proposal:** Creation of a new opening between family kitchen and lounge with the insertion of columns.
- 5.38 **HC Comment:** At present and on plan the original separation between Nos 36 and 37 is still evident. However, now amalgamated into one dwelling differences between both sides of the larger house have emerged. The proposed opening between the family kitchen and lounge is considered acceptable for the following reasons: a sense of the original proportions and hierarchy of rooms is retained; the approach taken here almost mirrors the arrangement within No.37 and would, therefore, reinstate an element of uniformity and symmetry to the floor plan at this level; and, the columns help to retain emphasis between the rooms avoiding a loss of definition in floorplan.
- 5.39 **Proposal:** Alteration to window reveals to front elevation with addition of shutters.
- 5.40 **HC Comment:** Shutters are not out of character with the property and are a sympathetic and appropriate way of enhancing the appearance of the windows both internally and from the outside whilst also providing privacy. There will be no harm to significance due to this element of the proposals.
- 5.41 **Proposal:** Addition of pendant lighting to principal spaces.

- 5.42 **HC Comment:** No harm to significance, and improvement on the existing and entirely appropriate for the building.

First floor

- 5.43 **Proposal:** Alteration to dining room and right wall.
- 5.44 **HC Comment:** (Please refer to drawings by SGA) This change does not result in any unacceptable harm to or loss of historic fabric and is entirely appropriate.
- 5.45 **Proposal:** Insertion of a new opening & door between the library and drawing room.
- 5.46 **HC Comment:** As above. This element of the proposals does result in the removal of the party wall fabric. This will result in slight, less than substantial harm, and needs to be weighed in the planning balance. These changes will not fundamentally alter the existing layout at first floor.
- 5.47 **Proposal:** Alteration to window reveals to front elevation with addition of shutters.
- 5.48 **HC Comment:** As previously at ground floor. This is a consistent approach and appropriate for the property.
- 5.49 **Proposal:** Addition of pendant lighting to principal spaces.
- 5.50 **HC Comment:** As previously.

Second floor

- 5.51 **Proposal:** Alteration of doors to master sitting room.
- 5.52 **HC Comment:** The existing doors are not original and the proposed replacement doors are sympathetic to the building – there will be no harm to significance.

- 5.53 **Proposal:** Alteration to 'Hers' dressing room.
- 5.54 **HC Comment:** The existing 'Hers' dressing room does not retain any historic fabric of interest and is a modern alteration as existing. The proposed layout of the new dressing room is more in-keeping with the property and an improvement on the existing
- 5.55 **Proposal:** Addition of partition wall to master bedroom to create additional dressing space.
- 5.56 **HC Comment:** The overall proportions of this room would only be subject to a minor change due to this element of the proposals. No historic fabric of importance would be affected and the hierarchy of the room and second floor generally would not be subject to any harm. The alterations proposed to this part of the property, taken as a whole, create a far better and more sympathetic arrangement than the existing.

All floors, lower ground to third

- 5.57 **Proposal:** Removal and replacement detailing of: cornices, skirting, architraves, doors, joinery, fireplaces, stair balustrades, floor finishes, portion of lighting in ceilings, lift car and lift doors.
- 5.58 **HC Comment:** All replacement details will be of high quality and appropriate for the building. None of the existing details are original or comprise any fabric of particular heritage interest. In all instances details will be improved and generally enhance the overall quality and appearance of the building's interior. There will be no harm to heritage significance.

6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 This Heritage Statement has provided a summary assessment of the impact of the proposals on the heritage significance of No.36 and No.37 Chester Terrace, which is one single family dwelling.
- 6.2 It is the conclusion of this Statement that the proposals do not result in any unacceptable loss to historic fabric or harm to the significance of the Site. Furthermore, the alterations proposed do not result in any harm to or loss of significance to the Regents Park Conservation Area.
- 6.3 The alterations proposed are intended to improve on the existing arrangement by removing unnecessary partitioning, creating better circulation and reintroducing more appropriate and better quality detailing.
- 6.4 In those areas where rooms are opened up and partitioning removed, wall nibs are retained and/or columns introduced to ensure there is a visual distinction between spaces and clear reference to the original room proportions.
- 6.5 The proposals are considered informed and appropriate. This Statement satisfies the requirement of paragraph 128 of the NPPF insofar as it provides a proportionate assessment of the significance of designated heritage assets affected by the proposals and assesses the impact of the proposals on heritage significance.