

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1164/P	Jane Butler and Tim Crowe	07/05/2021 18:16:59	COMMNT	<p>We wish to oppose the current application.</p> <p>We would support and agree with comments made by P. Peacock (28 Lancaster Grove) but in addition wish to object to internal changes to the tower which undermine the integrity of it's original design and construction by the installation of a one bed residential unit.</p> <p>On reading Vulcan's current advertising we would assume that they also valued this unique architectural heritage ..... as follows:</p> <p>"Drill towers, used for exercise and training, are rare in fire stations and add to their unique character. Firefighters practised rescuing people by attaching a long hook ladder to the upper floors of the tower, then carrying down the 'live' casualties, often trainees, lowering them to the ground via a line of fireman. When hoses were made of canvas the towers were used to hang the 75 ft lengths so they could be dried after use to stop them rotting. During the war, towers were also used for spotting fires so crews could be directed to a fire immediately."</p> <p>The insertion of a residential unit into this tower space would compromise the functional, purpose-built architectural value of this unique heritage building. The original tower with its provision for drill training and hose drying provides an important narrative link with the early history of the London Fire Brigade. This is a unique industrial monument and landmark London fire station of the period, and should be valued as such.</p> <p>An added bonus would be the potential and ongoing interest for 'Open House' events' visitors.</p>
2021/1164/P	L Bleasdale	09/05/2021 19:41:14	COMMNT	<p>A key factor in granting the previous planning permissions was the preservation of the external features . The permissions granted to date have enabled the development to be carried out in line with the need to respect the building's heritage . This latest application is not appropriate or justifiable for a heritage building of this type. The tower, chimneys and roof are an essential part of the design of this Arts and Crafts Grade II* Listed building .</p> <p>All these features are clearly visible from outside the building both from the street and from the surrounding buildings. Contrary to what is said in the application even the roof chimneys can clearly be seen. Removing these and adding a balustrade would be not be in keeping with the original Arts and Crafts design .</p> <p>These proposed changes have been rejected previously and I submit there is no reason to reverse that decision . Indeed it is difficult to justify why the design of the roof terrace should be changed in any way . It is clear that it has not been an essential part of the development.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1164/P	Tom Symes for the Belsize Society	09/05/2021 14:17:23	COMMNT	<p>The Belsize Society objects to these applications for planning consent and listed building consent.</p> <p>The proposals have been debated at length in a number of previous applications and there is no fundamental change made in current applications which mean that the proposals avoid harm occurring to this important building.</p> <p>A full planning application and listed building consent application (2018/4394/P &amp; 2018/4910/L) were submitted to the Council in October 2018. The applications sought external and internal alterations for the conversion of the tower into a residential unit. The Council refused the applications on the 26th November 2018.</p> <p>The full planning application (LPA Ref: 2018/4394/P) was refused for the following three reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed development, by reason of poor-quality internal amenity, would fail to provide high quality residential accommodation, contrary to policies H6 and A1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.</li> <li>2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure car-free housing, would fail to promote healthy or sustainable transport choices, contrary to policy T2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.</li> <li>3. The proposed development, in the absence of a contribution to affordable housing, would fail to maximise the contribution of the site to the supply of affordable housing in the borough, contrary to policy H4 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.</li> </ol> <p>The listed building application (LPA Ref: 2018/4910/L) was refused for the following one reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed demolitions and alterations, by reason of loss of historic fabric and plan form, would cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade-II* listed building, contrary to policy D2 Heritage of the Camden Local Plan 2017.</li> </ol> <p>An appeal was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, however both the planning and listed building appeals were dismissed on 1st of August 2019.</p> <p>The Inspector resolved that all three reasons for refusal under the planning appeal were acceptable. With regard to the listed building consent appeal, externally the proposed alterations were considered minor and it was concluded by the Inspector at paragraph 12 of his report that "Those minor alterations would not materially compromise the external appearance or character of the tower, which contributes to the special interest of the listed building and provides a landmark within the BCA".</p> <p>Internally however, the changes were deemed to be more extensive, with particular reference made to the loss of the tight spiral staircase, infill of the stair void, and the alternation to the barefaced brick walls and exposed concrete floor and ceiling. The Inspector considered that the cumulative effect of all of these changes would result in harm. In assessing the degree of harm, the Inspector considered that the tower forms one part of the listed building, albeit and important one, and that its external appearance, a principal contributor to its significance would be unaffected.</p> <p>Internally, the Inspector concluded that the loss of historic fabric would, in terms of the Framework, amount to 'less than substantial harm', however he was mindful that less than substantial harm still attracts great weight. The appeals were dismissed on this basis.</p> <p>A revised application was submitted in 2019 which sought the conversion of former fire station tower (Sui Generis) to a 1 bedroom residential unit (Class C3) on 2nd to 5th floors plus creation of roof terrace including installation of balustrade and removal of chimneys. An accompanying listed building consent application sought alterations associated with conversion of former fire station tower to a residential unit, including removal of chimneys and infill of central void at 2nd to 5th floors and installation of balustrade at roof level. In response to the earlier refusal, this application proposed a lighter touch to the conversion, retaining more of the historic plan form and fabric. However, ultimately the revised application was refused for three reasons, namely;</p>

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

1. The proposed conversion of the tower to a residential unit would result in 'less than substantial' harm to the listed building as a designated heritage asset which is not outweighed by any planning benefits, contrary to policy D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure car-free housing, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area and fail to promote more healthy or sustainable transport choices, contrary to policy T2 (Parking and car-free development) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a contribution to affordable housing, would fail to maximise the contribution of the site to the supply of affordable housing in the borough, contrary to policy H4 (Maximising the supply of affordable housing) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

The associated listed building application was refused for a single reason;  
The proposed demolitions and alterations, by reason of loss of historic fabric and plan-form, would cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II\* listed building, contrary to policy D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

An appeal was submitted against the above decisions, however both appeals were subsequently dismissed on 20 July 2020.

The appointed Inspector noted that while removing some short chimney stacks below parapet level and their pots, closing the existing opening through the roof and forming a new one would remove some original fabric, the present hatch position could be superficially marked to indicate its position. Given the place of the roof access in the historical significance of the tower and the limited visibility of the stacks below the parapet, these alterations would not harm the historic significance of the listed building.

The external additions to the tower, including the slender, metal handrail would not harm the historical or architectural significance of the building.

The proposal included a glazed screen across the landing of the second floor to separate the proposed dwelling from the stairway leading up from the ground floor which appears to be shared by other flats. The inspector concluded that he could not see any harm to the spatial significance of the section across the second floor from a separating screen.

Regarding the circular stair (second floor to fifth floor) this was noted as being retained and enclosed by glass screens. A new stair to the roof was noted, and it was considered that its details could be conditioned to secure their sensitivity to the utilitarian character and finishes of the tower. Despite some loss of structural fabric, the Inspector found no harm to historic significance from an unobtrusive skylight in the roof deck. It was further noted that new domestic scale services could be accommodated without disturbing the architectural character of the spaces.

However, the open well which was continuous through the floors of the tower is a distinctive historical feature of its design and use. So too the floor upstands, the wall projections, and the changes in heights. The Inspector considered that the infilling of the well would obscure its continuity and the removal of these obstructions would undermine the historic function of the spaces in the tower. Regarding the obstructive elements, it was noted that not all would be removed, however, the spaces were designed to be challenging to move through. The removal of the degree of the historic fabric, was ultimately resolved to diminish the illustrative value of its layout, and part of the historic significance of the listed building.

On affordable housing, the appellant provided a legal agreement to secure the contribution sought by the Council, With regard to parking, a unilateral undertaking was offered by the appellant, which would restrict parking and would require future occupiers to be informed of the parking permit restrictions. The Inspector

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>was satisfied that the car-free housing undertaking and alternative obligation were and acceptable. Finally, in late 2020, listed building consent was sought for the installation of crittal frame sliding door at second floor level. Listed building consent was granted on 15th February 2021. In resolving to grant the proposal, officers noted the safety needs for the installation, to prevent access to the tower. Initially this was proposed to be opaque but, following negotiation, the glass will be clear. Officers noted that the proposal is lightweight and reversible and would not harm the special interest of the grade-II*-listed building.</p> <p>The current proposals seek provision of a self-contained 1 bed dwelling. The applicant states that the architectural design solution takes as its point of departure the main points raised by the appeal inspector in decisions APP/X5210/W/20/3246051 and APP/X5210/Y/20/3246053.</p> <p>Despite the lessons of previous applications and appeals, Belsize Society feels that the revised proposals still do not address the fundamental concerns raised by officers and Inspectors in the previous applications and appeals. The proposal would diminish the historic plan form of the tower, and its illustrative value and would harm the special interest in this important building.</p> <p>This remains an unsatisfactory proposal and the Applicant should accept that the tower cannot be used in this way.</p>
2021/1164/P	Harold Lorenzelli	07/05/2021 14:07:29	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to any proposed work that interferes with the architectural integrity of the building as a whole. Any alteration that affects the outward shape and form of the building is an assault on the original vision of the architect. I live directly opposite the old fire station in a second floor flat from where I can appreciate the beauty and design of the structure. Furthermore, I strongly object to the removal of interior features associated with the original function of the tower. I understand that internal features on the ground floor have been preserved in the main engine hall and I see no reason not to apply the same scruples to what may be hidden from sight. It is right and proper that we protect our heritage in principle and practice.</p>
2021/1164/P	Thomas Budd	08/05/2021 14:47:03	OBJ	<p>I object to this application. My family and I live close to the former fire station, on the other side of Lancaster Grove. The building - in particular, the roof, the chimneys and the tower - are clearly visible from our property and from numerous nearby properties. The changes to the exterior of the tower proposed in the application will significantly degrade its appearance and detract from the visual amenity of this important heritage asset.</p> <p>A similar planning application in relation to the tower was rejected by Camden in the recent past and I see no reason why a second application should be entertained. The remainder of the development has been carried out sensitively and in a way which is respectful of the building's history and architecture. However, this proposal ticks none of those boxes.</p> <p>I have had the benefit of reading Philip Peacock's submission in relation to the proposal. The points that he makes are compelling and I agree with all of them.</p>