



KOKO - 1A Camden High Street

HERITAGE STATEMENT and DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

For Listed Building Consent Application Proposed Works for Temporary Structural Support

January 2019

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 is a supporting statement for the retrospective Listed Building Consent application for temporary structural support (see proposal below). The purpose of this document is to provide a heritage appraisal of the works that have been carried out to the building. This report will assess the impact of the above works on the historic fabric and character of the grade II listed building. It also includes a policy justification for the works. 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.
3. During the site inspection by the Project's Structural Engineers (Heyne Tillet Steel – HTS) on 12th June 2018 it became evident that *'the existing truss which supports the dome and the western roof of Koko nightclub has suffered from severe corrosion, probably caused by water*

*ingress over the life of the building*¹. There is the risk that the corrosion may lead to the truss' failure².

4. Temporary props designed by Contractor Design Solutions (CDS) and were installed by Tower Demolition in end-July 2018 and mid-October 2018 to support the loads from the dome and the roof. These props were installed as an emergency procedure to make the building safe, considering the fragility of the truss, and the danger to Life and Public Safety.
5. On 2nd October 2018, a meeting was organized with the Conservation Officer of LB of Camden (Colette Hatton). The Conservation Officer agreed that the temporary measures can be dealt with as a Retrospective LB Application.

CONTEXT

1. 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. Koko is an internationally renowned music venue and a significant contributor to Camden's cultural identity.
2. The consented works that are more relevant to this application comprise the conversion of KOKO's dome to be used as a member's bar.

RECORDED DEFECTS

3. HTS have routinely monitored the building fabric. The full details of the defects of the site can be found in the following documents:
 - HTS Site Visit Report No. 10 – Dated 12/07/18
 - HTS Site Visit Report No. 11 – Dated 07/08/18
 - HTS Site Visit Report No. 12 – Dated 16/08/18
 - HTS Interim Truss Inspection Report – Dated 27/07/18
 - HTS Roof Truss Summary Note – Dated 14/12//18

DESIGN AND ACCESS

Proposal Summary

4. As stated in HTS's report, the Temporary Works comprises the following:
5. *The proposed temporary works scheme has been designed by Contractor Design Solutions (CDS) and involves temporary props (Megashor's) supporting the existing roof beams,*

¹ HTS' Interim Inspection Report dated 27.07.2018 (Truss Inspection) – the document sets out the condition and the risks associated with the corrosion of the historic truss.

² A full detail of the recorded defects can be found in the following previous Heyne Tillett Steel reports submitted as part of this LBC application.:

- HTS Site Visit Report No. 10 – Dated 12/07/18
- HTS Site Visit Report No. 11 – Dated 07/08/18
- HTS Site Visit Report No. 12 – Dated 16/08/18
- HTS Interim Truss Inspection Report – Dated 27/07/18

transferring the roof loads down through the building onto spread footing at the lower ground floor level.

6. *A pair of megashor props with a Megashor beam at the head and base of the storey height will act as a box frame, carrying the load from the level above down to the slab below. A corresponding frame will align with the frame above, transferring the load down to ground.*
7. The props scheme is detailed on the drawing TD.18.120.10 rev A by CDS, 25.09.2018. Please refer to the accompanying drawings prepared by Archer Humphryes Architects Ltd (AHA), marking the location of the proposed props and the following Heyne Tillett Steel report:
 - · HTS Site Visit Report No. 10 – Dated 12/07/18
 - · HTS Site Visit Report No. 11 – Dated 07/08/18
 - · HTS Site Visit Report No. 12 – Dated 16/08/18
 - · HTS Interim Truss Inspection Report – Dated 27/07/18
 - · HTS Roof Truss Summary Note – Dated 14/12/2018
8. As agreed with the Conservation Officer of LB of Camden on 2nd October 2018, Retrospective LB consent is sought for the above Emergency Temporary Works carried out in July and October 2018.
9. A new LB and Planning Application for the replacement of the historic truss will be submitted in due course. The temporary props will be removed when the replacement truss will be installed (expected 2019). Following this, any areas that were cut into to accommodate the props will be made good. Any materials introduced will match the existing like for like.
10. The decorative areas that have been affected are on the ground and first floors. Some of the plasterwork has been cut at the prop junctions. This will be remediated, and a plaster specialist will be consulted to take samples and ascertain the exact materials to carry out the repairs.
11. The section below describes how the proposal affects different aspects of the site including layout, use, scale, landscape and context, appearance and access.
 - **Layout:** the proposal will not alter the existing layout. The props are located near existing walls and will be removed once the truss above has undergone remedial works to ensure its stability.
 - **Use:** not affected by the current proposals.
 - **Scale:** not affected by the current proposals.
 - **Landscape and Context:** not affected by the current proposals.
 - **Appearance:** part of the decorative plasterwork on the ground and first floors have been cut out to allow for the positioning of the props in correspondence with the location of the truss. This will be repaired by a specialist once the props are removed, leaving the aesthetic of the rooms intact and in keeping with their historic character.
 - **Access:** not affected by the current proposals.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

-
12. Impact to the existing fabric is limited to the area directly underneath the truss supporting the dome. The temporary supports are visible from inside the listed building but are not perceivable from outside.
 13. The installation of the posts and beams have required cutting out of decorative plasterwork on the ground and first floors. As this is localised to the structural junctions, the removal of fabric is limited. In terms of reversibility, once the temporary structure is removed, the plaster will be repaired like for like and follow the original decorative motifs.
 14. This proposed alteration is a necessary health and safety intervention. It is a temporary addition to the listed building that will be removed once remedial/structural works are carried out to the existing truss (part of a separate application).

JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

15. **Section 66:** General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions.

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.
16. The temporary works were carried out as a matter of urgency. There are circumstances in which temporary emergency works are allowed (refer to extract from the Act below) and it is evident from the information submitted as part of this application.
17. **The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (Section C9, Part 1 Chapter II, 9, 3)** states:

(3) In proceedings for an offence under this section it shall be a defence to prove the following matters—

 - a. that works to the building were urgently necessary in the interests of safety or health or for the preservation of the building;*
 - b. that it was not practicable to secure safety or health or, as the case may be, the preservation of the building by works of repair or works for affording temporary support or shelter;*
 - c. that the works carried out were limited to the minimum measures immediately necessary; and*
 - d. that notice in writing justifying in detail the carrying out of the works was given to the local planning authority as soon as reasonably practicable.*

NPPF Considerations:

18. The National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and outlines how these should be applied. 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. This statement deals principally with Section 16 of the NPPF, "Conserving and enhancing the

historic environment,” however heritage considerations and issues are prevalent throughout the framework.

19. **NPPF Paragraph 189** states: *“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.”*

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 are also believed to be sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of the theatre.

20. **NPPF Paragraph 190** states: *“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 listed building has been undertaken as part of the overall assessment of the proposals for this application. Impacts on the historic fabric is limited and localized to small areas of the theatre. The works are temporary and any damage caused by the works (namely, on the ground and first floor plasterwork), will be repairs like for like, thereby preserving the special interest of the theatre.

21. **NPPF Paragraph 192** states: *“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 the building safety. In the current state, the truss in question was at risk of collapse beneath the dead load of the dome. The additional support is a vital temporary solution for the listed building to meet health and safety standards. Once the temporary props are removed, any impact on the historic fabric will be remediated by like for like repair. The historic character of the listed building will therefore be preserved.

22. **NPPF Paragraph 193** states: *“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.”*

23. **NPPF Paragraph 194** states: *“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: 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.”*

24. **NPPF Paragraph 196** states: *“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, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”*

Response: It is considered that the proposed works cause “no harm”. The proposed works are aimed to ensure building safety and allow for the consented works to be carried out. Any part of the proposals considered to cause any minor adverse impact, namely the removal of small sections of the plasterwork where the structural junctions occur, are mitigated by ensuring the building can be used safely and preventing potential collapse and damage to the listed building. Additionally, the works are temporary and will essentially be ‘reversed’ following the removal of the props. The special interest of the grade II listed building will therefore be preserved.

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

25. *“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 the importance of 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. These works will enable the continued consented works to be carried out.

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 and the relevant investigations of the roof area (the truss) have been carried out and different solution options have been explored, 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. The Heritage Statement prepared for the consented scheme (2017/6058/P and 2017/6070/L) includes a historic background on the building and the area and includes a full significance assessment.

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. The Heritage Statement prepared for the consented scheme (2017/6058/P and 2017/6070/L) includes a historic background on the building and the area and includes a full significance assessment.

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 assets 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 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.

CONCLUSION

26. The proposed works have been carried out as a matter of urgency to ensure the health and safety of people on site and the safety of the listed building. This will prevent any potential damages that may have occurred from collapse.
27. This proposal is key in allowing people to enter the site in compliance with health and safety regulations and will allow for the consented works to progress safely.
28. 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.
29. The proposal is consistent with section C9, Part 1, Chapter II, 9, 3 (a) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; the works were necessary to ensure health and safety and for the protection of the building.
30. 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 are temporary and will not impact the special interest of the theatre.

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