



Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Advisory Committee	Primrose Hill
Application ref	2017/3847/P
Address	Morrisons Superstore and Petrol Filling Station Camden Goods Yard Chalk Farm Road LONDON NW1 8EH
Planning Officer	Gavin Sexton
Comments by	02 Nov 2017
Proposal	Redevelopment of petrol filling station site to include the erection of a new building of up to six storeys and up to 11,243 sq m GEA floorspace to accommodate a petrol filling station (Sui Generis use), flexible retail/food
Objection	Yes
Observations	Please see attached pdf file for sustained objection.

Documents attached

No details entered

Documents attached

[PHCAAC Advice Morrisons revised Oct 2017](#)

About this form

Issued by	Contact Camden 5 Pancras Square London N1C 4AG
Form reference	21081332

Data Protection

No personal information you have given us will be passed on to third parties for commercial purposes. The Council's policy is that all information will be shared among officers and other agencies where the legal framework allows it, if this will help to improve the service you receive and to develop other services. If you do not wish certain information about you to be exchanged within the Council, you can



Camden

Conservation area advisory committee comments form - Ref. 21081332

Contact Camden

Data Protection

request that this does not happen.

ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee
12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT

18 October 2017

This advice consists of 3 pp.

Morrisons Store and Petrol Station, Chalk Farm Road, NW1 8EH 2017/3847/P revised proposals

Strong objection sustained.

1.0 The PHCAAC reviewed the revised scheme at its meeting on 18 October 2017. While noting a number of modest changes, the Committee saw no substantial changes which addressed our objections of 9 August 2017. The Committee therefore continues to object strongly to the application.

2.0 We would add the following brief comments.

2.1 – 9 August 2017 – our points 2.0 Archaeology. Not substantially addressed here. Our objections remain.

2.2 – 9 August 2017 – our points 3.0 Open spaces and anti-social behaviour.

2.2.1 We note that the applicant acknowledges the existence of the problem by explaining a modest modification to an entrance, see 'Design Development Note' p. 5 Block C revision to 1095_03_07_203 '... This will reduce opportunities for unwanted gathering beside the community open space.'

2.2.2 But while this change may address the issue in this one location, it fails to address the larger problem, which is that spaces like the Linear Park and Interchange Square are vulnerable to abuse, especially given the character and hours of operation of the night-time economy, as we set out in August. This modest revision points to the substantial failure to address a fundamental problem in the overall scheme for the local community.

2.2.3 Our objections on this issue remain.

2.3 – 9 August 2017 – our points 5.0 Traffic, access, and air pollution. We could find no assessment of our concerns in the 'Transport assessment addendum'. Our objections remain.

2.4 – 9 August 2017 – our points 6.0 Heritage issues.

2.4.1 Our fundamental objections to the height, scale, and bulk of the scheme have not been addressed. This continues the applicants' failure effectively to address community objections throughout the development of the scheme.

3. We set out here 3 further considerations on the impact of the scheme on the affected heritage assets, which we advise, confirm that the scheme should be refused.

3.1 The assessment of harm to heritage assets as 'substantial'.

3.1.1 We acknowledge that there would be a range of impacts from the application on a range of heritage assets.

3.1.2 We advise that these impacts broadly are harmful, as we have argued before.

3.1.3 We wish to draw out that the most badly affected assets are the railway/canal associated structures immediately neighbouring the application site. In 3 cases the harm to the heritage assets are self-evidently substantial.

3.1.3.1 The impact on the Interchange Building would be the major loss of the building's landmark significance. This significance is the result of the exceptional height of the tower in terms of the surrounding built context. This exceptional height is a key element in the significance of the Interchange as a listed Building and its importance in the character and appearance of the relevant conservation areas. The loss of significance would be the result of the high buildings proposed. The Interchange seen in the new context would no longer appear as a distinct and outstanding building, but be absorbed into a background of tall, and taller, buildings. This would be a substantial loss to its significance as a Listed Building and in terms of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

3.1.3.2 The impact of the proposals on the Roundhouse would be to crowd, and crowd out, a range of views. These would substantially diminish the exceptional visible power of the building, which depends on the clarity of its form in longer views and its distinctive scale. It appears as an exceptional building in its townscape context at present. The proposals, by their scale and massing, would substantially diminish this exceptional significance: the Roundhouse in longer views would appear merely a part of a more dominant set of buildings, its exceptional status in the townscape substantially lost. This would substantially harm its significance as a Listed Building. It would neither preserve nor enhance the relevant conservation areas.

3.1.3.3 The proposals as a whole would, by their scale and massing, have a substantial impact on the Chalk Farm railway Yard wall. This Listed Building has set the scale for this side of the Chalk Farm Road, as well as helping define its exceptional character. It marks the insertion of the railway buildings, from the 1830s onwards, into an older townscape. The dominant scale of the wall in context is critical to its historic significance. This dominance would be substantially destroyed – not merely harmed – by the proposals. We note that the Safeways application in 1994, and the appeal decision of 1996, both recognized the importance of the wall, and its distinctive scale in the townscape. This distinctive character would be substantially disrupted by the present application. The significance of the surviving sections of the wall would be substantially harmed in terms of both the wall as a Listed Building, and in terms of its role in the character and appearance of the conservation area.

3.2.1 We re-state our major concern (at our 6.8), that it is essential to assess the harm from the application to the whole group of heritage assets affected: the harm not only affects individual buildings but is cumulative over the whole area and its heritage assets. This is, in part, due to the special character of the historic development and of the complex of adjoining areas.

3.2.2 The location of the site is at the heart of an area of north London where the early-nineteenth-century development of London is of exceptional significance. It includes the earlier survivals of the road from London to Hampstead (Chalk Farm Road), the wholly exceptional scheme for Regent's Park, and the buildings associated with the first trunk railway line built in London. The whole area of development witnesses to architectural forms which were both introduced into the existing patterns of development by new transport systems – both canal and railway – and which contrasted with those forms, and influenced later development. These exceptional areas and their scale, architectural forms, and interrelationships currently survive. The proposed development would sit in their midst, introducing a major change of height, bulk, and scale.

3.2.3 We identified individual impacts in August. Whatever the degree of harmful impact on individual buildings, the harm on the whole area of heritage assets is cumulatively substantial. If we only look at the 3 Listed Building discussed above, it is not only the impact on each of them, but the

devastating impact on their surviving inter-relationships – especially of scale in the townscape – which causes truly substantial, cumulative, harm on the wider complex and its significance.

3.3 We note that the latest available advice from Historic England does not reference either the Interchange Building nor the Yard Wall, both Listed Buildings, nor their contribution to the Regent's Canal Conservation Area.

3.4 We further note that earlier advice has not been informed by the Council's 'Framework' document, approved in July 2017, which provides analysis of the complex, and is a material consideration.

3.5 We are aware of the emerging London Plan, and would expect to see the proposals tested against the new required levels of affordable housing, which we understand to be substantially higher than 35%, with an emphasis on affordable rent.

We restate our strong objection to the application.



Richard Simpson FSA
Chair PHCAAC