



Stephen Levrant Heritage Architecture Ltd.
62 British Grove
Chiswick
London
W4 2NL

KOKO - 1A Camden High Street, Hope and Anchor Public House- 74 Crowndale Road, 1 Bayham Street and 65 Bayham Place

**HERITAGE STATEMENT - For Listed Building Consent and Planning Application
Proposed Alterations to: Basement and minor alterations throughout KOKO (both internal and external)**

August 2018

INTRODUCTION

1. On 2nd May 2018, consent was granted for alterations to the above site (2017/6058/P and 2017/6070/L). The consented scheme includes the following:

"Redevelopment involving change of use from offices (Class B1) and erection of 5 storey building at the corner of Bayham Street and Bayham Place to provide pub at ground floor and private members club (Class Sui Generis) on upper floors following demolition of 65 Bayham Place, 1 Bayham Street (façade retained) and 74 Crowndale Road (façades retained), including enlargement of basement and sub-basement, retention of ground floor and basement of Hope & Anchor PH (Class A4), change of use at 1st and 2nd floor from pub (Class A4) to private members club (Class Sui Generis), mansard roof extension to 74 Crowndale Road, creation of terraces at 3rd and 4th floor level, relocation of chillers and air handling unit to 3rd floor plant enclosure with additional plant (5x a/c condensers and 1 cooling unit) at roof level, erection of glazed canopy to Camden High Street and Crowndale Road elevation and erection of 4th floor glazed extension above roof of Koko to provide restaurant and bar to private members club (Sui Generis).."

2. This document provides a heritage appraisal of the proposed changes to the consented scheme. This comprises proposed floor area extended at basement and sub-basement levels. It also provides an overview of the potential impact which the proposal may have on the special interest of the listed building.
3. For further information on the history and context of the subject site, please refer to the Heritage Statement produced in support of the above applications. The consented works are closely linked with these proposals.
4. For full details of the design rationale, please refer to the accompanying drawings prepared by Archer Humphryes Architects Ltd (AHA) and structural engineer's drawings by Heyne Tillett Steel (HTS).

CONTEXT

5. Koko, originally named Camden Palace Theatre, is a grade II listed building located within the Camden Town Conservation Area, in the London Borough of Camden. The buildings at Bayham Street and Bayham Place and The Hope & Anchor pub are part of the proposals under the aforementioned

consented scheme. The buildings are adjacent to the rear of the theatre. They are not included in the grade II listing, but are 'positive contributors' in the Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal, 2007.

6. Koko is an internationally renowned music venue and a significant contributor to Camden's cultural identity. The Hope & Anchor closed some time ago and is currently vacant.
7. The significance to the listed building is mainly attributed to the exterior and the entrance, auditorium and fly tower (where much of the scenography equipment still exists). The circulation space which flanks the auditorium and the utilitarian spaces at back of house (BOH) and in the basement and sub-basement are of secondary significance.

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

NOTE: Refer to AHA's 'Proposed Alterations and Justification', Drawings 'As proposed' and HTS's proposed plans for further details of the proposed works.

8. Alterations to the sub-basement plan comprises the extension to the consented development, adding 49m² of storage, production office and retained AMP room.
9. The basement level will accommodate refrigerated storage.
10. 3 new louvers ground floor Crowndale Road.
11. New location for the pile foundations; these will be offset at 700mm (centre line from piling) from the listed building to minimise impact. See detailed drawings by HTS.
12. Proposed sump to sit within extended lift pit & accessible from stair lobby. Detailed design by HTS.
13. Minor alterations within the Hope & Anchor Pub including new post for structural support, and some minor reconfiguration of the layout (not an LBC or planning matter, but will be dealt with in an S73 application).
14. Minor alterations to the service entrance (within the listed building) at Bayham Place elevation, which includes additional louvre and ventilation grilles at ground floor level.
15. Windows to the Hope & Anchor to be replaced with slimline double glazing. Windows to match the previously existing including accurately replicated glazing bar profiles, pattern and horns.
16. Window openings to no.1 Bayham Street façade adapted to coincide with floor levels. Mouldings & timber window frame design to match existing. New windows to be double glazed.
17. No.2 flues within the Bayham Street/Bayham Place development.
18. First and second floor: minor reconfiguration of internal layout in the area north of the auditorium. This is to accommodate a louver for plant ventilation.
19. First floor: reconfiguration of the kitchen to accommodate enlarged 'cold store'.
20. First floor: minor alteration to the door between function room and the 'artists gallery'. The existing double door will be changed to a single acoustic door.
21. Third Floor: small louvers – one visible on the left-hand side of the window. Refer to MEP package.
22. Fourth floor: Fenestration doors in the sky lobby will be altered from sliding to folding doors.
23. Minor alterations to the fourth floor terrace, including relocation of new steps, additional riser and increase in wall depth by 1.5 bricks (new wall, refer to 4.8 in AHA drawing).
24. Fourth floor: the core that accommodates plant will be slightly extended.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

25. Impact to the existing fabric is limited to the sub-basement and basement levels which are not located within the listed building and will not impact the perception of the space or original layout.

-
26. Amendment within the listed building are all minor and located in areas of low significance. There will be some minor removal of fabric where the new louvers are located; this will impact the historic fabric and will be visible from the public realm, however, due to their size and location, their visual impact is mostly negligible. This proposal aids the function of the building, providing necessary ventilation that is key maintaining acceptable level of air quality and ensuring any equipment is kept at the required temperatures.
 27. The extension in the sub-basement level will not be visible from any of the spaces that are of historic interest and in terms of layout, is set away from the building. Impact on the listed building in terms of historic interest is therefore negligible. Impact on the historic fabric is also negligible, as the pile foundations will be offset from the listed building.
 28. Proposed external alterations are minor and impact on the heritage and townscape is considered to be negligible and hardly visible (relative to the consented scheme) from the public realm.
 29. The replacement of the windows to the Hope & Anchor will be like for like in the glazing pattern, glazing bar profile and materials. Though the glazing will be double, the overall fenestration, configuration and materiality will be retained, thus be in keeping with the historic character of the building and conservation area. This alteration is to improve acoustic
 30. Proposed alterations to the interior of the listed building are de-minimis and will not adversely impact the special historic interest of the building.

JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

31. Section 66: General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions.
32. Section 66 states that in the determination of planning applications which affect 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.' This report has considered the physical impact of the proposal on the listed building and has determined no harm will occur.

NPPF Considerations:

33. In July 2018, the National Planning Policy Framework was updated (from March 2012). The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and outlines how these should be applied.
34. This section discusses the impact of the proposals according to the NPPF. The NPPF contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development sympathetic to the conservation of designated heritage assets. The government's definition of Sustainable Development is one that incorporates all the relevant policies of the Framework contained within section 16.

NPPF Paragraph 185:

35. *Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. This strategy should take into account:*
 - a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
 - b) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;*
 - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and*

d) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

Response: The proposals do not harm the significant historical features of the theatre. Impacts on the historic fabric is limited to areas of less significance. The alteration will ensure operational requirements are met and the building is able to successfully function as a music venue.

NPPF Paragraph 189:

36. *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. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.*

Response: As recommended by NPPF, an assessment of the significance of the heritage asset has been provided and can be found in chapter 4: Assessment of Significance in the Heritage Statement of the extant consent (2017/6058/P and 2017/6070/L). It is believed that the assessment is proportionate to the importance of the assets being considered. The assessments and analysis that have been carried out have not only informed the design process, but are also believed to be sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of the listed building.

NPPF Paragraph 190:

37. *"Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal."*

Response: An impact assessment on the proposed changes to the extant consent has been undertaken as part of the overall assessment of the proposals for this application.

NPPF Paragraph 192:

38. *"In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:*

a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness."

Response: The proposal has been driven by the need to ensure continual and sustainable solution for the listed building and to meet all current standards in a respectful manner towards the historic environment. The proposed alterations are minimal, will have a negligible impact and will ensure continued effective use and operation of the building.

NPPF Paragraph 193:

-
39. *“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.”*

NPPF Paragraph 194:

40. *“Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: 56 a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.”*

Response (to para 1393 and 194): It is considered that the proposed works cause “no harm”. None of the historic fabric in the listed building will be altered or impacted as a result of the proposed works. The historic character will be preserved; any proposals to replace early fabric (this is only implicit in the proposals to the Hope & Anchor windows) will be replaced like for like and therefore preserve the historic character of the positive contributor and the conservation area.

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) – March 2014; ID 18a: Conserving & enhancing the historic environment (Updated: 10 04 2014)

PPG Paragraph: 003 - Reference ID: 18a-003-20140306

41. *“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.

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.”

Response: The proposals recognise that the conservation of heritage assets must be in a manner appropriate to its determined significance and that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource. This is implicit in the proposed development. Equally important is the definition of ‘conservation’ as the “active process of maintenance and managing change”. Over the years, the site and the wider conservation area have been subject to change; and it is necessary for it to continue to change in order to maintain its character as a welcoming and amenable building.

PPG Paragraph: 009 - Reference ID: 18a-009-20140306

“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 (see How to assess if there is substantial harm).”

Response: Heritage assets can be adversely affected by physical change or change to their setting. It is contended the nature, extent and importance of the significance of the affected heritage assets has been properly assessed thereby enabling an acceptable and justifiable proposal to be developed.

PPG Paragraph: 017 - Reference ID: 18a-017-20140306

“How to assess if there is substantial harm?”

What matters in assessing if a proposal causes substantial harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.

Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.

While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later inappropriate additions to historic buildings which harm their significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all. However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm.

Policy on substantial harm to designated heritage assets is set out in paragraphs 132 and 133 to the National Planning Policy Framework.”

Response: The impact on the significance of the heritage assets has been fully considered in the Impact Assessment chapter of the Heritage Statement prepared for the consented scheme (2017/6058/P and 2017/6070/L). There is no occurrence of substantial harm.

PPG Paragraph: 019 - Reference ID: 18a-019-20140306

“How can proposals avoid or minimise harm to the significance of a heritage asset?”

A clear understanding of the significance of a heritage asset and its setting is necessary to develop proposals which avoid or minimise harm. Early appraisals, a conservation plan or targeted specialist investigation can help to identify constraints and opportunities arising from the asset at an early stage. Such studies can reveal alternative development options, for example more sensitive designs or different orientations, that will deliver public benefits in a more sustainable and appropriate way.”

Response: The significance of the grade II listed building has been fully assessed and informed the design process. This issue has been fully addressed in the Heritage Statement prepared for the consented scheme (2017/6058/P and 2017/6070/L).

Historic England’s Good Practice Advice 2015

Planning note 2 Para.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.”

Response: The significance of the grade II listed building has been fully assessed and informed the design process. This issue has been fully addressed in the Heritage Statement prepared for the consented scheme (2017/6058/P and 2017/6070/L).

Planning note 3 Para.12:

“Amongst the Government’s planning objectives for the historic environment is that conservation decisions are based on the nature, extent and level of a heritage asset ’ s significance and are investigated to a proportionate degree. Historic England recommends the following broad approach to assessment, undertaken as a series of steps that apply proportionately to complex or more straightforward cases:

Step 1: identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected

Step 2: assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

Step 3: assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance [...].”

Response: The steps above have been fully complied with. The significance of the heritage assets affected by the proposals has been assessed, as well as the effects of the proposed development. The proposal is assessed as causing no harm to the listed building and no impact on the conservation area. Furthermore, the proposal ensures the continued use of this site as a renowned London music venue, which is very much compatible with the building’s original use.

CONCLUSION

42. The proposal is consistent with the spirit of local policies and national conservation principles, including NPPF policy principles guiding the determination of applications for consent relating to all heritage assets.
43. It is considered that the proposed works cause “no harm”. There is no proposed removal of significant or original fabric. Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of heritage. The proposed alterations will not adversely alter the special interest of the listed building or the conservation area.

**Stephen Levrant: Heritage Architecture
Architects and Heritage Asset Consultants**
