
From: Philip Peacock [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 May 2021 15:58
To: Planning
Cc: 'Philip Peacock'
Subject: Planning Application 2021/1164/P and Listed Building Application 2021/1743/L relating to 36 Lancaster Grove

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Attn: Ms Kristina Smith

Dear Madam, We have the following objections to consent being given to the current applications for development of the fire station tower:-

1. The bar to any changes to a Grade 2* listed building is necessarily set high and, in this case, applies in particular to the design of the exterior of the building and its function in relation to the historic fabric and heritage of the building, as well as to relevant features inside the building which are not publicly visible. In this context, it cannot be right to dismiss as incongruous and expendable the essential function and design of the chimney stack on the roof of the tower, accompanied by its six chimney pots. Nor is it correct to assert that these chimney pots cannot be seen from ground level. They are clearly visible at street level on Lancaster Grove, Eton Avenue, Lambolle Place and Eton Garages, and will be even more visible (at first floor level or higher) from innumerable neighbouring properties. The roof chimney forms an essential part of the industrial purpose of the fire station and its design was intended to match that of the higher chimney stacks along the lower roof line of the station. The assembly of chimney stacks is one of the standout features of this unique building, and the integration of the roof chimney with its neighbours is a vital part of the harmony achieved by this aspect of the building's design. Moreover, the lower height of the roof chimney, with its six pots identical in size and dimension to all the other chimney pots, was intentionally designed to stay within the scale and to reflect the rhythm of the chimney stacks elsewhere. As it is the roof chimney serves as a complementary rounding off at the top of the tower and should be preserved as an essential feature of the overall design of this heritage asset (see paragraph 4.1.2 of the Applicant's Heritage Assessment).

2. It is notable that the Belsize Conservation Area Advisory Committee made it clear in an earlier application that its non objection to the proposed development was subject to there being no visible changes to the exterior of the tower. The BCAAC has now submitted its objection to the removal of the tower chimney in the current application. It is also germane that the listing particulars for the station include the statement that it was built to a bespoke design, and was one of the most intact of its kind, and that the survival of original features was notable. In view of these very deliberate citations we suggest that particular weight should be given to the preservation of exterior architectural features, such as the roof chimney, whether or not they can be seen at street level. Much attention has been given in earlier applications and appeals to the importance of retaining the chimney breasts on the 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors of the tower, but none to the chimney on the roof. If retention of the chimney breasts within the tower is important then it must logically follow that the roof chimney itself should be retained.

3. Two further changes to the roof terrace, namely the construction of a balustrade and an entry hatch, formed part of the two previous applications which have been dismissed on appeal but which are now part of this application. However, no details of their positioning, dimensions or materials have been included in the current application. If

permission were to be granted for these two changes, it should be conditional on such structures conforming strictly to the positioning, dimensions and materials specified in the previous applications, so that they cannot later be altered in a way that makes them visible from the street or otherwise compromises the integrity of the tower.

4. More generally, we submit that there is little in any justification for the proposals to include development of the roof space at all, since no reason has been given for the removal or alteration of heritage assets when weighed against the public benefit of securing optimum viable use of the roof space. The tower is viable as a dwelling without the changes proposed to the roof terrace and any perceived benefit of including them in the development does not outweigh the importance of maintaining the roof terrace in its original form.

For the reasons given above we ask that planning and listed building permission for the current proposals be refused. Philip Peacock, 28 Lancaster Grove.



Virus-free. www.avq.com