

Heritage Assessment

13A Pond Street, London

Introduction

1. This assessment has been prepared on behalf of Spencer Baylin by Heritage Collective. It relates to the alteration and extension of a dwelling at 13A Pond Street, London, which is within Hampstead Conservation Area and within the setting of three listed buildings known as 5-13 Pond Street (listed grade II in January 1999), Roebuck Public House (listed grade II in May 1974) and 17 and 17a Pond Street with attached railings and walls (also listed grade II in May 1974).
2. 13A Pond Street is a former stable and cottage dating from the late Victorian period which was extended as a small house by the Foster Partnership in 1969.
3. A site visit was undertaken on 8 June 2016 in good weather. A further visit took place on 6 October 2016 in conjunction with officers of the London Borough of Camden as part of pre-application submissions and discussions.
4. This assessment should be read in conjunction with the illustrated Design and Access Statement by Gianni Botsford Architects and the Planning Statement prepared by Barton Willmore. Heritage Collective has been actively involved in the evolution of the proposal, which involves the innovative and imaginative adaptation of Foster's extension dating to 1969.
5. Pre-application discussions with the London Borough of Camden resulted in a positive written response dated 14 December 2016 by Fergus Freeney, a Senior Planning Officer. The conclusion of the response was that:

"The scheme is considered to be well designed and appropriate to the site. Subject to assessment of the impact on amenity, basement issues, trees, sustainability and construction the scheme would, in my considered opinion, likely be acceptable were an application submitted."

6. The pre-application response from the London Borough of Camden also noted that:

"The loss of the existing Victorian dwelling is, on balance, considered to be acceptable given the high quality design of the proposal which will likely comply with D25 which requires development within conservation areas to both preserve and enhance the area."

7. This matter is discussed further below.

Relevant heritage policy

8. The decision maker is required by section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting. There is a strong presumption against the grant of permission for development that would harm the setting and significance of a listed building, though the presumption will plainly be lessened if the harm is less than substantial within the meaning in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
9. A broadly similar duty is imposed on the decision maker by section 72(1) of the Act, which requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of a conservation area.
10. This assessment has regard to the local heritage policies of the London Borough of Camden, notably Local Plan Policy D2 (Heritage), and advice on setting, character and appearance issued by Historic England.

The character and appearance of Hampstead Conservation Area

11. Camden Borough Council describes the character and appearance of Hampstead Conservation Area by breaking it into eight sub-areas. Pond Street is in Sub Area 3, Willoughby Road/Downshire Hill. Pond Street is one of five character zones, described in conjunction with South End Green as a grouping on the south east tip of the conservation area dating from the 1880s and 1890s. Pond Street is defined as follows:

"Pond Street was established early in Hampstead's development as a lane down to a pond at South End Green, and the varied row of buildings (mostly listed) on the north side reflect the urbanisation of the area in the 18th and 19th century. Most of the properties are three storey and the houses are set back slightly from the pavement. Nos. 5-13 is an 1860s parade of five stucco shops. No.15 is the handsome stuccoed and pedimented Roebuck Hotel. Nos.17&17a is a three storey stucco house c.1740, set back behind cast-iron railings on low walls. Nos.19&21 is a late 18th century semidetached pair of three storey houses with basements and attic, set behind cast-iron railings. No.23 is the Harken Armoury with its distinctive facade and crow-stepped gable c.1760 (all listed). Nos.27-29 is of interest as a 1928 purpose built nursery; No.31 is wider (four windows), two storey and set back behind a stuccoed wall and railings (listed). Nos.33, 35 & 35a are early 18th century with a later studio extension, in red brick (listed). Today these face the massive bulk of the Royal Free Hospital (which lies outside the Conservation Area). St Stephens Church, built around 1869 by the idiosyncratic architect SS Teulon, provides an emphatic termination to the west of the street, and is identified in the Schedule of Land Use Proposals in the UDP."

12. 13A Pond Street is described below.

The significance of the Victorian part of 13A Pond Street

11. The taller red brick part of 13A Pond Street appears from old O.S. maps to have been built at some time between c.1879 and c.1895, dating it to the later Victorian period. At the time of the 1911 census 13A Pond Street was described as "Stabling next Roebuck P.H." consisting of four habitable rooms occupied by a domestic coachman named James Joy Cawthorne (1856-1932) and his wife and two adult children, both of whom were printer's compositors. The Cawthornes were living in the same building at the time of the 1901 and 1891 censuses. James was repeatedly described as a domestic coachman and the building was described as "stabling" and "at rear of no.15 Pond Street, Roebuck Hotel".
12. O.S maps indicate that from the 1890s the stable and cottage seem to have been within a continuous parcel of land associated with 29 Hampstead Hill Gardens, albeit that there was vehicular access to Pond Street through the archway as at present.

13. The former stable and cottage is constructed in red brick on two storeys, with a half hipped clay tile roof. There is a small gabled wing on the northern side.
14. The interior of the former stable and cottage has been significantly altered during the 20th century and subjected to a number of external alterations including partial rendering and partial removal of walls. It is a structure of modest architectural and historic interest.

The significance of the 1969 extension to 13A Pond Street

15. In 1969, the Foster Partnership obtained planning permission for the extension of the former stable and cottage. The resulting single storey extension wraps round two sides of the Victorian building with a partly flat roof (doubling up as a first floor terrace) and a glazed lean-to entrance lobby approached from Pond Street. It is well concealed in an area surrounded by walls and trees and by the gardens of neighbouring properties.
16. Norman Foster (b.1935) is now Lord Foster of Thames Bank. He and his firm Foster + Partners have an international reputation as designers of landmark buildings including the Willis Faber & Dumas headquarters in Ipswich, 30 St Mary Axe in London, and Wembley Stadium. It is axiomatic that the 1969 extension to 13A Pond Street has some intrinsic architectural and historic interest as an early work by Foster, and it is by far the most important part of the building.

The heritage approach to demolition and alteration in this case

17. In terms of area, the 1969 Foster extension accounts for more than half the footprint of the building as a whole. Therefore, the proposed removal of the former Victorian stable and cottage does not amount to the total demolition of the building.¹ Instead it constitutes an alteration within a logical process that retains and preserves the Foster extension and which replaces the relatively unimportant Victorian structure with a contemporary solution that integrates with the part of the building dating to 1969.
18. Given that this is not a case which involves demolition in the formal sense of the expression it is questionable whether there need be a strict application of the

¹ Shimizu (UK) Limited v Westminster City Council (House of Lords, February 1997).

twelve questions posed by Historic England when considering the contribution made by buildings to conservation areas in its guidance *Measuring and Assessing Change in Conservation Areas* (January 2005). Indeed, it is difficult to see how the answers to the questions (which are not criteria and which are not binding on the decision maker) could help in the assessment of a building that is in itself intrinsically architecturally contradictory in its present form, and within which it is proposed to preserve the architectural element that is of greatest heritage significance - namely Foster's extension of 1969. To the extent that they are relevant, the twelve questions are answered for completeness in Appendix 1.

Change within the setting of nearby listed buildings

19. The replacement of the former Victorian stable and cottage with a contemporary design solution that integrates with the retained Foster extension will bring about change within the setting of the three listed buildings at 5-13 Pond Street, The Roebuck, and 17 and 17a Pond Street. The latter structures date from the 1740s, but the Roebuck and 5-13 Pond Street date to the 1860s, facing south onto Pond Street itself. Insofar as there will be a change within the setting of the listed buildings it will not affect the streetscene or the principal front elevations. Instead there will be an effect to the rear, in an area where the significance of the listed buildings is much harder to appreciate, and where there is extensive tree planting and screening by boundary walls. Views of backs of the listed buildings are restricted, and there will be no erosion of the significance of the group.

Change within Hampstead Conservation Area

20. The proposed replacement of the Victorian stable and cottage with a contemporary design solution will also have an effect on the character and appearance of Hampstead Conservation Area. That effect will operate in a very similar way to the effect on the setting and significance of the listed buildings described above. That is to say that there will be no effect on the streetscene and only a minimal effect on the character of the area of gardens in the angle formed by Pond Street and Hampstead Hill Gardens. The Design and Access Statement demonstrates that the visual effect of the proposal will be small as a result of the filtering effects of trees and other vegetation, and that the change in form, grain, scale, size and bulk will be minimal.

21. Despite the small change that will result in terms of effects on the setting of nearby listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area, the preservation of the Foster extension of 1969 by the imaginative reinvention of part of the building in a contemporary form will in itself be an important conservation exercise that will locally preserve the significance of the historic environment. There will be a significant local enhancement.

Conclusion

22. The proposed alteration to 13A Pond Street is an example of the intelligent management of change in which an important structure by Foster + Partners dating to 1969 will be preserved by the removal of the former Victorian stable and cottage (which is only of limited architectural and historic interest) and its replacement with a new structure. This will preserve the setting and significance of the nearby grade II listed buildings in Pond Street, and it will preserve the character and appearance of Hampstead Conservation Area.
23. Section 66(1) of the Act will be triggered to the extent that special regard must be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed buildings. However, there will be no loss of significance and no harm. Paragraphs 132 to 134 of the NPPF are not engaged.
24. Section 72(1) of the Act will be triggered to the extent that special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Hampstead Conservation Area. It has already been established that the character and appearance of the conservation area will be preserved in its entirety, but there will also be a significant local enhancement in the private area to the north of Pond Street resulting from the imaginative reworking of the Foster building of 1969 by Gianni Botsford Architects.
25. In summary, the high quality contextual design of the proposals will preserve the settings of adjacent listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area. The proposals are therefore in accordance with Local Plan Policy D2 (Heritage) and national policy contained in the NPPF.

Appendix 1

Guidance issued by Historic England (formerly English Heritage) on the identification of important buildings in conservation areas has been available in various forms for many years. It was originally expressed in terms of ten questions, and is now contained in a checklist of twelve questions in Table 1 of *Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management (Advice Note 1)* dated February 2016.

It is generally accepted that the questions are not criteria to be met or otherwise, and that a balanced overall assessment is required. Historic England's position, set out in paragraph 61 of the guidance, is that *"A positive response to one or more of the following may indicate that a particular element within a conservation area makes a positive contribution, provided that its historic form and value have not been eroded"*.

The twelve questions have been answered in tabular form on the next page, addressing the building in three ways, (1) taking the Victorian part in isolation, (2) taking the Foster extension of 1969 in isolation, and (3) taking the building as a whole.

Two significant "yes" answers have been highlighted, demonstrating that the Foster extension is the only part of the building that has any claim to be of any heritage significance.

With regard to Historic England's advice in paragraph 61, quoted above, it should be noted that the historic form and value of Foster's extension of 1969 have not been eroded, whereas the historic form and value of the Victorian part of the building have been eroded. This adds weight to the proposition that the Victorian element of the building can be rebuilt without causing residual harm.

	Question	Victorian Building	Foster's Extension 1969	Whole Building
1	Is it the work of a particular architect or designer of regional or local note?	No	Yes	No, only to the extent that the Foster extension of 1969 is of local interest.
2	Does it have landmark quality?	No	No	No
3	Does it reflect a substantial number of other elements in the conservation area in age, style, materials, form or other characteristics?	Age – yes Style – no Materials – yes, brick and tile Form – Not particularly Other characteristics - no	Age – no Style – no Materials – no Form – No Other characteristics - no	Age – overall, no Style – overall, no Materials – to some extent (brick and tile) Form – overall, no Other characteristics - no
4	Does it relate to adjacent designated heritage assets in age, materials or in any other historically significant way?	Age – yes, 19 th century Materials – to some extent (brick) Historically significant way – not significantly	Age – no Materials – no Historically significant way – not significantly	Age – to some extent (19 th century) Materials – no Historically significant way – not significantly
5	Does it contribute positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets?	Only a small contribution at the rear of the listed buildings in Pond Street.	Only a small contribution at the rear of the listed buildings in Pond Street.	Only a small contribution at the rear of the listed buildings in Pond Street.
6	Does it contribute to the quality of recognisable spaces including exteriors or open spaces within a complex of public buildings?	Recognisable spaces – general contribution to the quality of the private garden area north of Pond Street. Public buildings – not applicable	Recognisable spaces – general contribution to the quality of the private garden area north of Pond Street. Public buildings – not applicable	Recognisable spaces – general contribution to the quality of the private garden area north of Pond Street. Public buildings – not applicable
7	Is it associated with a designed landscape, e.g. a significant wall, terracing or a garden building?	Not associated with a designed landscape.	Not associated with a designed landscape.	Not associated with a designed landscape.
8	Does it individually, or as part of a group, illustrate the development of the settlement in which it stands?	Yes, but any building will do this irrespective of whether it is in a conservation area and irrespective of whether it is significant at all.	Yes, but any building will do this irrespective of whether it is in a conservation area and irrespective of whether it is significant at all.	Yes, but any building will do this irrespective of whether it is in a conservation area and irrespective of whether it is significant at all.
9	Does it have significant historic associations with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature?	Historic road layout – no significant associations. Burgage plots – not relevant Town park – not relevant Landscape feature – no significant associations	Historic road layout – no significant associations. Burgage plots – not relevant Town park – not relevant Landscape feature – no significant associations	Historic road layout – no significant associations. Burgage plots – not relevant Town park – not relevant Landscape feature – no significant associations
10	Does it have historic associations with local people or past events?	No	Yes, Lord Foster.	The building as a whole has an association with Lord Foster, but it is only the extension of 1969 that is of local heritage interest.
11	Does it reflect the traditional functional character or former uses in the area?	Yes, but any building will do this irrespective of whether it is in a conservation area and irrespective of whether it is significant at all.	Traditional functional character – no, in the sense that the form of the extension consciously differs from the traditional functional character of other buildings. Former uses - yes, but any building will do this irrespective of whether it is in a conservation area and irrespective of whether it is significant at all.	Yes, but any building will do this irrespective of whether it is in a conservation area and irrespective of whether it is significant at all.
12	Does its use contribute to the character or appearance of the area?	No more than any other domestic building.	No more than any other domestic building.	No more than any other domestic building.

Table 1 – Analysis of the twelve questions posed by Historic England in relation to unlisted buildings in conservation areas.