



KOKO - 1A Camden High Street

HERITAGE STATEMENT

For Listed Building Consent Application (Part Retrospective)

-
1. Structural support to existing temporary propping (retrospective)
 2. Temporary propping for truss replacement (retrospective)
 3. Repositioning of consented column supporting sky lobby (retrospective)
 4. Retrospective consent for other works undertaken
 5. Minor amendments to the consented scheme
-

February 2020

INTRODUCTION

1. This report accompanies a Listed Building Consent application (retrospective) for a number of deviations to the existing consent and for some works undertaken within the Grade II listed KOKO building without consent, as part of the ongoing consented repairs and refurbishment.
2. The works carried out that are not covered by the existing consent, covered by this report for which retrospective consent is sought, is based on the list provided by the contractors OdP and by drawings marked up by the architects AHA in January 2020.
3. 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).."
4. This document is a supporting statement for the retrospective Listed Building Consent application for the works listed (1-5) above. The purpose of this document is to provide an appraisal of the building's significance and the impact of works that have been carried out

and those proposed to be undertaken. This report will assess the impact of the above works on the historic fabric and character of the grade II listed building. This statement also assesses the works in the light of relevant local and national policies. For further information on the history and context of the subject site, please refer to the Heritage Statement produced in support of the consented application.

5. This report is to be read alongside the drawings by Archer Humphreys Architects and Cover letter by HTS (Heyne Tillet Steel).
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. An initial retrospective application for listed building consent to allow the installation of emergency temporary propping (2019/0695/L) was submitted in March 2019 and approved on 13 May 2019 on the understanding that a separate application for the permanent solution would follow.
10. This was followed by a retrospective application (2019/4009/L) for the temporary structural propping, submitted in September 2019, which was consented on 4th November 2019.
11. Further to this, it became necessary to install further structural supports to the consented propping. Additionally, while undertaking the works, the repositioning of a consented column to support the sky lobby was necessary due to site constraints. The column was repositioned by 80mm.
12. A number of other emergency works were undertaken within the building without consent, details of which are provided in the accompanying illustrated statement by OD.

CONTEXT

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

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, the consented sky lobby and consented internal alterations.

SIGNIFICANCE

3. This section provides an outline appraisal of the subject building's significance in accordance with Historic England's latest guidance on significance assessments (October 2019). The Archaeological, Historical, Architectural and Artistic interest of the buildings is appraised below:
4. **Archaeological interest:** The subject site is not located within an area of archaeological priority as defined in Historic England's Camden APA appraisal (October 2018). KOKO (formerly Camden Palace theatre) was built redeveloping a number of early 19th C buildings on the site, which were not of particular architectural or historical importance. The site underwent substantial construction activity when the theatre was built and it is highly unlikely that the site preserves any evidence of previous human activity. The archaeological interest is therefore **low**.
5. **Historical interest:** The theatre venue and nightclub is internally renowned with a number of celebrated artists having performed in the building. Internally, the building preserves much of its original details and finishes, which are representative of a Victorian theatre. The building therefore has a **high** historic interest.
6. **Architectural and Artistic interest:** The external elevations, characteristic dome and details are iconic and representative of a turn of the century theatre building. Original features of architectural merit including the classical Italianate design survive, despite the loss of some features. Internally, a large number of details and finishes survive and are representative of the period. The building's architectural and aesthetic interest is therefore **high**.
7. **Summary:** Due to the building's international popularity as an events venue, and the survival of a large number of features characteristic of a turn of the century theatre, the building has a high historical interest. Likewise, the building's architecturally interesting external elevations, survival of characteristic details as well as interiors would grant it a high architectural and artistic interest.

Proposed Works

Proposal Summary

1. The proposed works are for minor deviations from the part retrospective listed building consent (2019/4009/L) received in November 2019 and a number of works undertaken without consent as part of the ongoing consented repair works at KOKO, Camden.
2. The list of unconsented works has been provided by Od Projects. A number of further works in the building may have been undertaken without consent and these are proposed to be identified and submitted as a separate application in due course.

3. This section is to be read alongside the drawings by Archer Humphreys Architects (AHA) and brief note by Heyne Tillet Steel (HTS).
4. Deviations to the consented scheme principally relate to the installation of additional supports to the temporary propping installed for the consented replacement of the truss. Additionally, due to site constraints, the NW structural support (leg) of the proposed sky lobby (consented) has been moved by 80mm from its consented location.
5. A list of other unconsented works, as provided by OdP, are included in the schedule below.

Impact Assessment Schedule

Dwg Ref	Works undertaken without consent	Rationale	Impact	Action
Basement				
1	Area of existing ceiling removed for installation of temporary propping up works for Dome truss. Ceiling to be replaced to match existing.	The existing ceiling is plain and does not have any decorative details. It does not contribute to the special architectural or historic interest of the building.	Negligible: Removal of the plain ceiling at basement level will not impact the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
2	Removal of wall to access splice plate. Following completion of works wall to be replaced to match existing.	The proposed removal of brick wall in a limited area at basement level, in order to install the consented structure supporting the sky lobby	Negligible: Removal of a small section of the brick wall would not impact the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
3	Existing slab broken out (void below cleared up of asbestos) to enable piles + pile caps. Area back filled and slab re-cast.	The RCC slab at basement level is not of high significance. Moreover, this area has been altered in the past.	Negligible: The removal of a small section of the RCC slab would not impact the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
4	Removal of existing metal staircase to enable piles + pile cap installation. Staircase reinstated.	The existing metal staircase is modern and not of significance. It has been reinstated following completion of the works	No impact: The staircase has been removed and reinstated following completion of works in the area	Retrospective consent is being sought
5	Floor structure removed for pile caps. Floor reinstated.	The existing floor structure was previously removed during the duration of the works and reinstated.	No impact: The floor structure has been removed and reinstated following completion of	Retrospective consent is being sought

			works in the area	
6	Removal of wall at H/L to access Sky Lobby Column. To be reinstated following completion of works.	The proposed removal of brick wall in a limited area at basement level, in order to install the consented structure supporting the sky lobby	Negligible: Removal of a small section of the brick wall would not impact the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
6A	Sky Lobby Column moved back by 80mm to clear existing load bearing beam.	The movement of the sky column from the consented position by 80mm would have no impact on its appearance or on the fabric of the listed building	Negligible: Removal of a small section of the brick wall would not impact the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
7	Ceiling at H/L removed to provide access to Sky Lobby column. Brickwork removed and re-built.	The existing ceiling is plain and does not have any decorative details. The proposed removal of brick wall in a limited area at basement level, in order to install the consented structure supporting the sky lobby. These do not contribute to the special architectural or historic interest of the building.	Negligible: Removal of the plain ceiling and brick wall at basement level will not impact the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
8	Opening in wall for maintenance access.	The opening is a very minor intervention in the service area of the building, which has previously been altered. The opening would allow access for maintenance.	Negligible: Removal of a small section of the brick wall would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
8A	Removal of partition in old boiler room.	The partition wall in the old boiler room is not original and is not	Negligible: Removal of the partition wall	Retrospective consent is being sought

		of significance	would not impact the special interest of the building.	
9	Existing timber dance floor removed and replaced.	Dance floor removed to enable installation of piles for the consented sky pavilion structural columns. It is believed that the dance floor had been renewed in the past and the fabric is therefore not of significance.	Negligible: The removal of fabric of low significance will not impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
10	Consented movable staircase omitted.	The consented moveable staircase is not required and therefore omitted from the stage area. Omission of the consented moveable staircase would have no impact on the special interest of the building.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
11	Existing wall removed to install precast core	The proposed removal of a minor section of the wall at basement level to install the pre-case core would not impact the special interest of the building	Negligible: Removal of the a small section of the wall at basement level would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
11A	Existing wall removed to accommodate retaining wall installation	The proposed removal of a minor section of the wall at basement level to accommodate the retaining wall would not impact the special interest of the building	Negligible: Removal of the a small section of the wall at basement level would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
Ground Floor				

1	Areas of existing ceiling removed for installation of temporary propping up works for Dome truss. Ceilings to be reinstated to match existing.	The existing ceilings are original and of significance. However, in order to install the temporary propping it is necessary that a small section is removed. This is proposed to be reinstated following the works.	Minor adverse: Removal of a small section of the decorative plasterwork ceiling would have a minor impact on the special interest of the building. Mitigation: Repairs and reinstatement of the ceiling in this area would mitigate any adverse impact.	Retrospective consent is being sought
1A	Existing non original bars removed to make way for temporary props.	The existing counters used for cloak rooms are not original and have no significance.	Negligible: Removal of the non-original bars/ counters would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.	The alterations are extremely minor and involve the creation of openings at floor and ceiling level for the installation of the consented supports for the sky lobby. They would not impact fabric of significance or the special interest of the building as a whole	Negligible: Removal of small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2A	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing. Sky Lobby Column moved back	Same as above The 80mm (3 inch) change of position is minor and was undertaken based on site constraints.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought

	by 80mm to clear existing load bearing beam.			
2B	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.	Same as point 2	Negligible: Removal of small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2C	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.	Same as point 2	Negligible: Removal of small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
3	Temporary propping locations	Indicates the location of temporary propping installed for the replacement of the truss (consented)	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
4	Partial demolition of existing wall relocated to this location to optimise the production area side of stage	The proposed slight change of location of opening within this wall would not have an impact on the special interest of the building. The wall in question does not have any architectural details or finishes of significance.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
5	Adjustment to consented door opening	A minor change of location of the consented door opening in a wall located within the service area would not have an impact on the special interest of the building.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought

5A	Adjustment to consented door opening	A minor change of location of the consented door opening in a wall located within the service area would not have an impact on the special interest of the building.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
6	Adjustment to substation door opening as per UKPN requirements. Refer to Bayham Place Elevation.	A minor change of the dimensions of the consented door opening on the north wall facing Bayham Place would not have an impact on the special interest of the building.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
7	Adjustment to consented window and door openings. Refer to Bayham Street Elevation	Existing windows WG-16, 17 + G18 openings adjusted to match ground floor plan. Proposed window openings and doors adjusted to match ground floor plan and proposed louvers omitted from underside of windows and above door as these are no longer required.	Negligible: The works are of a minor nature and will have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
8	Adjustment to consented opening made larger	The works would involve removal of a small section of the wall fabric in the area where the building connects with the Hope & Anchor building to the rear.	Negligible: Extent of wall fabric proposed to be removed is minimal and the works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
9	Adjustment to stage door joinery. Refer to Crowndale Road Elevation	Crowndale Road elevation conveys the correct joinery arrangement. The ground floor plan was	Negligible: The works are of a minor nature and will have no impact on the	Retrospective consent is being sought

		adjusted to match the elevation.	special interest of the building	
First Floor				
1	Areas of existing ceiling removed for installation of temporary propping up works for Dome truss. Ceiling to be replaced to match existing.	The existing ceilings are original and of significance. However, in order to install the temporary propping it is necessary that a small section is removed. This is proposed to be reinstated following the works.	Minor adverse: Removal of a small section of the decorative plasterwork ceiling would have a minor impact on the special interest of the building. Mitigation: Repairs and reinstatement of the ceiling in this area would mitigate any adverse impact.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removal of feature locally. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.	The alterations are extremely minor and involve the creation of openings at floor and ceiling level for the installation of the consented supports for the sky lobby. They would not impact fabric of significance or the special interest of the building as a whole	Negligible: Removal of small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2A	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing. Sky Lobby Column moved back by 80mm to clear existing load bearing beam.	Same as point 2 above The 80mm (3 inch) change of position is minor and was undertaken based on site constraints.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought

2B	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.	Same as point 2 above	Negligible: Removal of small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2C	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.	Same as point 2 above	Negligible: Removal of small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
3	Consented proposed staircase and proposed opening in existing wall omitted.	Proposed staircase would have an impact on the fly tower second floor gallery above. Therefore omission of staircase is proposed to retain current aesthetic. Fire engineer has confirmed omission does not impact the fire strategy for the scheme.	Negligible: Omission of the proposed staircase would have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
4	Adjustment to consented proposed opening in existing wall made smaller.	The adjustment is extremely minor and would involve the removal of a minor amount of fabric to make the internal opening between the KOKO and the Hope & Anchor building.	Negligible: Extent of wall fabric proposed to be removed is minimal and the works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
5	Existing nib to be demolished	The removal of the wall nib is a very minor alteration in the service area of the building. Its removal would not have an adverse impact on the	Negligible: Extent of wall fabric proposed to be removed is minimal and the works have no impact on	Retrospective consent is being sought

		special interest of the building	the special interest of the building	
6	Area of glazing to now be louvred to provide sufficient ventilation to the first floor kitchen. Refer to Bayham Place Elevation.	The louvred window detail in this service area of the building which is of low significance and where previous alterations have been undertaken.	Minor adverse: The proposal would result in loss of some fabric, however this is mitigated by the benefits accrued by the proposal.	Retrospective consent is being sought
Second Floor Plan				
1	Existing area of balustrade removed for installation of temporary propping up works for Dome truss. Balustrades to be replaced to match existing.	The existing balustrade is not original and is not of significance. The removal of this fabric would not have an impact on the special interest of the building.	Negligible: The fabric proposed to be removed is not of significance and would not impact the special interest of the building,	Retrospective consent is being sought
2	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.	The alterations are extremely minor and involve the creation of openings at floor and ceiling level for the installation of the consented supports for the sky lobby. They would not impact fabric of significance or the special interest of the building as a whole	Negligible: Removal of small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2A	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing. Sky Lobby Column moved back by 80mm to clear existing load bearing	Same as point 2 above The 80mm (3 inch) change of position is minor and was undertaken based on site constraints.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought

	beam.			
2B	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.	Same as point 2 above	Negligible: Removal of small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2C	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.	Same as point 2 above	Negligible: Removal of small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
3	Temporary propping locations	Indicates the location of temporary propping installed for the replacement of the truss (consented)	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
4	Area of floor to be demolished from proposed consented works	Area of floor demolition is required for the consented proposed level change between the Fly tower and Koko second floor area.	Negligible: The proposed demolition of a small section of the slab in the dressing room area, would not result in loss of fabric of significance. The works would not harm the special interest of the listed building	Retrospective consent is being sought
5	Area of floor to be demolished further from proposed consented works	Area of floor demolition is required to rationalize head heights for the consented proposed staircase.	Same as above	Retrospective consent is being sought
Third Floor				

1	Areas of existing ceiling removed for installation of temporary propping up works for Dome truss. Ceilings to be replaced to match existing.	The existing ceilings are original and of significance. However, in order to install the temporary propping it is necessary that a small section is removed. This is proposed to be reinstated following the works.	Minor adverse: Removal of a small section of the decorative plasterwork ceiling would have a minor impact on the special interest of the building. Mitigation: Repairs and reinstatement of the ceiling in this area would mitigate any adverse impact.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.	The alterations are extremely minor and involve the creation of openings at floor and ceiling level for the installation of the consented supports for the sky lobby. They would not impact fabric of significance or the special interest of the building as a whole	Negligible: Removal of small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2A	Removal of existing parapet wall for Sky Lobby Column with new supports. Column moved back by 80mm.	Same as point 2 above The 80mm (3 inch) change of position is minor and was undertaken based on site constraints.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
2B	Low level and high level removal of floor and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.	Same as point 2 above	Negligible: Removal of small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2C	Low level and high level removal of floor	Same as point 2 above	Negligible: Removal of	Retrospective consent is being

	and ceiling for installation of Sky Lobby Columns. Removed fabric to be reinstated to match existing.		small sections of the floor and ceiling would not impact the special interest of the building.	sought
3	Temporary propping locations	Indicates the location of temporary propping installed for the replacement of the truss (consented)	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
4	Proposed consented fire escape staircase from 4 th floor terrace omitted	Area of flat roof over existing Koko staircase is required therefore new proposed staircase is to be omitted. Fire engineer has accepted this omission.	Negligible: Omission of a consented staircase in this location would have no impact on the special interest of the listed building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
5	Area of floor to be demolished further for proposed consented works	Area of floor demolition is required to rationalize head heights for the consented proposed staircase.	Negligible: The proposed demolition of a small section of the slab in the dressing room area, would not result in loss of fabric of significance. The works would not harm the special interest of the listed building	Retrospective consent is being sought
6	New door from boiler room to new MEP gantry within roof void	The proposed opening at third floor level would allow for access to the consented MEP gantry within the roof void on the north side. The extent of fabric proposed to be removed is minor, and the wall and is not of high significance.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought

Fourth Floor				
1	PV cells omitted from this location as PV cells above core will provide required power/ output	The omission of PV cells from this area will have no impact on the listed building.	No impact: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
2	Consented proposed fire escape staircase and door omitted	Area of flat roof over existing Koko staircase is required therefore new proposed staircase is to be omitted. Fire engineer has accepted this omission.	Negligible: Omission of a consented staircase in this location would have no impact on the special interest of the listed building.	Retrospective consent is being sought
3	Area of existing sloped roof to be retained (not to be demolished) and doorway omitted	The omission of these works will have no impact on the special interest of the listed building.	No impact: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
4	New brickwork balustrade to edge of steps	The proposed low balustrade will not be visible from street level. The works would not have an impact on the special interest of the listed building	No impact: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
5	Consented glazed end panels now to be solid metal panels with sloping parapet. Refer to Crowndale Road Elevation	The proposed alteration to the glazing pattern would be an aesthetic improvement over the current scheme. The bulk, massing and form of the sky lounge remains unchanged. The proposed amendment is minor.	Negligible: The works have a negligible impact on the special interest of the building	This application is for minor amendment to the consented scheme
6	New roof connected to existing fly tower roof to form gutter and to remove potential pigeon nest	The proposed new roof over the void would be an enhancement over the currently consented	No impact: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought

	in the void below	scheme and would not have any adverse impact on the special interest of the listed building.		
7	Consented parapet separating 2 no flat roofs omitted, creating 1 no single flat roof (omitting maintenance deck)	Omission of the parapet wall in the roof area would have no impact on the special interest of the listed building	No impact: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
8	Location for condensers for basement		It has not been possible to assess the impact of the proposed works	Retrospective consent is being sought
9	Location for louvers with enclosures	A new enclosure is proposed with louvers to conceal required terminating services at this location.		
10	Removal of existing parapet wall for sky lobby column with new supports. Column moved back by 80mm.	It is partial removal of existing parapet with a new wall built around the column.		Retrospective consent is being sought
Roof Plan				
1	PV cells omitted from this location as PV cells above core will provide required power/output.	The omission of PV cells from this area will have no impact on the listed building.	No impact: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
2	Consented proposed fire escape staircase and door omitted.	Area of flat roof over existing Koko staircase is required therefore new proposed staircase is to be omitted. Fire engineer has accepted this omission.	No impact: This omission of consented works will have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
3	Area of existing sloped roof to be retained (not to be	The omission of these works will have no impact on the special	No impact: The works have no impact on the	Retrospective consent is being sought

	demolished) and doorway omitted.	interest of the listed building.	special interest of the building	
4	Relocated chimney flue	The chimney flue was originally placed centrally in this area, in the consented drawings. This has been slightly moved.	Negligible: The works are a minor amendment to the consented scheme and have no impact on the special interest of the building	This application is for minor amendment to the consented scheme
5	Existing rooflight glazing to be replaced to meet building regulations	Current rooflight is in poor condition and does not meet building regulations. The proposed glazing is in the heritage style by the Standard Glazing Company. Existing upstands will be retained and made good.	No impact: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
Crowndale Road				
1	Adjustment to consented louvers	The proposed louvers is minor and the loss if fabric would be minor.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
2	Existing rainwater pipe relocated to beside wall nib	The rainwater pipe is consented on the return of the same wall. Moving it to beside the wall nib would reduce its visual impact	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	This application is for minor amendment to the consented scheme
3	Proposed parapet wall to mansard roof	The proposed parapet wall is a minor amendment and its impact on the special interest of the listed building is negligible.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	This application is for minor amendment to the consented scheme
4	Existing sloped roof now to be retained	The existing small section of sloping roof	No impact: The works have no	Retrospective consent is being

		was consented to be removed, however this is now proposed to be retained. Its retention will not have an impact on the special interest of the building.	impact on the special interest of the building	sought
5	Glazing now to metal panels to allow for concealment of structural truss connection with new sloped parapet matching parapets locally.	The proposed alteration to the glazing pattern would be an aesthetic improvement over the current scheme. The bulk, massing and form of the sky lounge remains unchanged. The proposed amendment is minor.	Negligible: The works have a negligible impact on the special interest of the building	This application is for minor amendment to the consented scheme
6	New brickwork balustrade to edge of steps. Refer to proposed 4 th floor plan - AHA/KKC/GA-104.	The proposed low balustrade will not be visible from street level. The works would not have an impact on the special interest of the listed building	No impact: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
7	Window replaced with louvre	The proposed change is minor and involves replacing a glazed timber window with a louvred window. The window is not historic and of significance.	Negligible: The works have a negligible impact on the special interest of the building	This application is for minor amendment to the consented scheme
8	Revised chimney flue	The chimney flue was originally placed centrally in this area, in the consented drawings. This has been slightly moved.	Negligible: The works are a minor amendment to the consented scheme and have no impact on the special interest of the building	This application is for minor amendment to the consented scheme
9	Painted window frames and cills	The window frames and cills are proposed	It has not been possible to assess the	Retrospective consent is being

		to be painted	impact of the proposed works	sought
Bayham Street Elevation				
1	Adjustment to consented window and door openings with louvres omitted	The consented window openings are further widened, and louvres omitted, to match the windows further along the elevation.	Minor adverse: The proposal would result in loss of some fabric, however this is mitigated by the benefits accrued by the proposal.	Retrospective consent is being sought
2	Adjustment to consented existing windows	The adjustment is of a minor nature	It has not been possible to assess the impact of the proposed works	Retrospective consent is being sought
3	Painted window frames and cills	The window frames and cills are proposed to be painted	It has not been possible to assess the impact of the proposed works	Retrospective consent is being sought
3A	Painted elevation	The elevation in this area is proposed to be painted	It has not been possible to assess the impact of the proposed works	Retrospective consent is being sought
4	Rooflight glazing replaced	Current rooflight is in poor condition and does not meet building regulations. The proposed glazing is in the heritage style by the Standard Glazing Company. Existing upstands will be retained and made good.	No impact: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
5	Cast iron rainwater pipe and hopper added	The proposed rainwater goods are essential in this location. The cast iron goods would be of appropriate design	No impact: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought

6	Brick parapet to mansard roof	The proposed parapet wall is a minor amendment and its impact on the special interest of the listed building is negligible.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	This application is for minor amendment to the consented scheme
7	Mansard windows aligned with second floor Hope & Anchor windows below	The proposal would involve a minor change to the location of the mansard roof window to align it with windows at the floor below.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	This application is for minor amendment to the consented scheme
8	Revised chimney flue	The chimney flue was originally placed centrally in this area, in the consented drawings. This has been slightly moved.	Negligible: The works are a minor amendment to the consented scheme and have no impact on the special interest of the building	This application is for minor amendment to the consented scheme
Bayham Place Elevation				
1	Louvres updated	The louvered window in this service area of the building is enlarged. Though this would lead to some loss of fabric, this is in an area of low significance where previous alterations have been undertaken.	Minor adverse: The proposal would result in loss of some fabric, however this is mitigated by the benefits accrued by the proposal.	Retrospective consent is being sought
1A	Louvres added	A new louvered window is proposed in this area. Though this would lead to some loss of fabric, this is in an area of low significance where previous alterations have been undertaken.	Minor adverse: The proposal would result in loss of some fabric, however this is mitigated by the benefits accrued by the proposal.	Retrospective consent is being sought

2	Substation door opening adjusted as per UKPN requirements. Doors updated with overhead and side louvre.	A minor change of the dimensions of the consented door opening on the north wall facing Bayham Place would not have an impact on the special interest of the building.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
3	Consented area of façade glazing to be replaced with vertical louvres to provide ventilation to first floor kitchen		It has not been possible to assess the impact of the proposed works	Retrospective consent is being sought
4	Revised chimney flue	The chimney flue was originally placed centrally in this area, in the consented drawings. This has been slightly moved.	Negligible: The works are a minor amendment to the consented scheme and have no impact on the special interest of the building	This application is for minor amendment to the consented scheme
Section AA				
1	New roof connected to existing fly tower roof to form gutter and to remove potential pigeon nest in void below.	The proposed detail would be a huge improvement of the roof detail and avoid the requirement of the pigeon nest. It does not have an impact on the fabric or on the special interest of the building.	Negligible: The works have no impact on the special interest of the building	Retrospective consent is being sought
2	Location for condensers for basement		It has not been possible to assess the impact of the proposed works	Retrospective consent is being sought
3	Consented moveable staircase omitted	The consented moveable staircase is not required and	Negligible: The works have no impact on the	Retrospective consent is being sought

		therefore omitted from the stage area. Omission of the consented moveable staircase would have no impact on the special interest of the building.	special interest of the building	
--	--	---	----------------------------------	--

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

6. The proposed works would have an impact on the fabric of the listed building. A majority of the works for which retrospective consent is sought would have no impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets or on the character and appearance of the conservation area as a whole.
7. A few works which impact the external elevation of the building and for which retrospective consent is sought are of a very minor nature and are assessed as having negligible impact on the special interest of the building, the setting of nearby heritage assets or on the character and appearance of the conservation area as a whole.
8. Impact to the existing fabric is limited to the areas affected by the proposal. The proposals have taken into consideration the historic fabric of significance and have incorporated strategies to minimise loss of fabric of significance.
9. The installation of the posts and beams have required removal of fabric in localised areas. As this is localised to the structural junctions, the removal of fabric is limited. In terms of reversibility, once the temporary structure is removed, these areas will be reinstated in a like for like manner.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

NPPF Considerations:

10. 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.
11. **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 in this report. 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.

12. **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. A detailed item by item impact assessment has been tabulated in the section above. Impacts on the historic fabric is limited and localized to small areas of the theatre.

13. **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."*
14. **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."*
15. **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 to allow for the consented works to be carried out. Any part of the proposals considered

to cause any minor adverse impact, namely the minor loss of fabric where the structural junctions occur, are mitigated by the heritage benefits accrued by the scheme.

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

16. *“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 is included within this statement.

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 this statement. There is no occurrence of substantial harm.

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 Heritage Statement 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

17. KOKO is a Grade II listed building located within the Camden Town Conservation Area. This application follows on listed building and planning consents (2017/6058/P and 2017/6070/L) received in May 2018 and the retrospective consent (2019/4009/L) received in November 2019.
18. As part of execution of the above consents, a number of works have been undertaken beyond the scope of these consents. An item by item listing of these works with the rationale and justification is found in the impact assessment schedules above. These are assessed as having a negligible impact on the special interest of the listed building, and in a majority of cases have been undertaken to enable undertaking the consented works.
19. A number of minor amendments to the consented scheme is proposed. These have been included in the impact assessment schedule above and are assessed as having a negligible impact on the special interest of the listed building and on the character and appearance of the conservation area as a whole.
20. 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.
21. It is considered that the proposed works cause “no harm”. Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in heritage terms and are minor works undertaken as part of the consented works or minor amendments from the consented scheme for which retrospective consent is now being sought.



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