



Cumulative

3 Mitigation and Residual Effects

- 3.1 Mitigation measures for the Proposed Development would remain unchanged from those reported in the March 2018 TVBHA:
- 3.2 The acceptability of permanent likely effects of the completed Proposed Development has been an integral part of the design approach. It has been implemented through the design development process and has been used to adapt and modify the Proposed Development to take account of likely townscape, visual and heritage constraints and opportunities. Likely adverse effects have been considered throughout the design process and are avoided by the submitted design for the Proposed Development.
- 3.3 Residual effects of the Proposed Development are summarised in Table 7-1. There would be no change to the effects reported in the March 2018 TVBHA.

Table 7-1 Summary of residual effects

Receptor		Likely Effect	Likely Cumulative Effect
Built Heritage			
Likely effects on the character and appearance of the Regent's Canal Conservation Area			
	Regent's Canal Conservation Area	Negligible to major, beneficial	Negligible to major, beneficial
Likely effects on the setting of the Kings Cross Conservation Area			
	Kings Cross Conservation Area	Negligible to moderate, beneficial in winter; negligible in summer	Negligible to moderate, beneficial in winter; negligible in summer
Likely effects on the heritage significance of listed structures and landscapes			
	Tomb of Sir John Soane, his wife and son in St Pancras Old Church Gardens	Negligible	Negligible
	Old Church of St Pancras	Negligible	Negligible
	Burdett-Coutts Memorial	Negligible	Negligible
	Nos. 5 to 16 Goldington Crescent	Negligible	Negligible
	Penfold Pillar Box, St Pancras Way, outside Parcel Force London Central Office	Negligible	Negligible
	6-22, Royal College Street	Negligible	Negligible
	75-85, Royal College Street	Negligible	Negligible
	85C, 87 and 89, Royal College Street	Negligible	Negligible
	91-99, Royal College Street	Negligible	Negligible
	Gasholder No. 8	Negligible	Negligible
	St Pancras Gardens	Negligible	Negligible
Likely effects on the heritage significance of non-designated heritage assets			
	Jubilee Waterside Centre	Negligible	Negligible
	Retaining wall to former Midland Railway Goods Yard	Negligible	Negligible
	Oblique Bridge and earlier abutments	Negligible	Negligible
Representative Townscape Views			
1	Parliament Hill (LVMF 2A.1)	Minor, neutral	Minor, neutral
2	Primrose Hill (LVMF 4A.1)	Minor, neutral	Minor, neutral
3	Regent's Canal Towpath, looking south	Moderate, beneficial	Moderate, beneficial
4	Elm Village (day)	Major, beneficial	Major, beneficial
4N	Elm Village (dusk)	Major, beneficial	Major, beneficial
5	Regent's Canal Towpath, looking north	Major, beneficial	Major, beneficial
6	Regent's Canal Towpath, Kings Cross Gasholders	Moderate, beneficial	Moderate, beneficial
7	Camden High Street, junction with Plender Street	No effect	No effect
8	Plender Street, junction with College Place	Minor, neutral	Minor, neutral
9	Midland Road, outside St Pancras Station	Negligible	Negligible
10	St Pancras Gardens, St Pancras Old Church	Minor, neutral in winter; negligible in summer	Moderate, neutral in winter; negligible in summer
11	St Pancras Gardens, Tomb of Sir John Soane	Minor, neutral in winter; negligible in summer	Minor, neutral in winter; negligible in summer
12	St Pancras Way, junction with Pancras Road	Moderate, beneficial	Moderate, beneficial
13	St Pancras Way, outside No.22	Moderate, beneficial	Moderate, beneficial

4 Conclusions

- 4.1 Five views have been rerendered and reassessed to consider the likely effects of the Proposed Development in comparison to the Consented Development. The remaining views have been remodelled but not reassessed and are included in Appendix A1; the revised design of the Proposed Development would not make a noticeable change to these views. As the townscape and visual assessment demonstrates, while the upper levels of Plot A would be slightly taller and would have an amended architectural treatment that would be appreciated in closer local views, and Plot B would have a taller plant enclosure and increased openness of its brick base onto the canal, the Proposed Development would make no material change to the effects on local views in comparison to the Consented Development. Therefore, as concluded in the March 2018 TVBHA, the likely effects of the Proposed Development on two designated LVMF SPG views and 11 representative townscape views, from positions agreed with LBC officers, would range from no effect to major, beneficial. As for the Consented Development, the Proposed Development, taller than the existing former sorting office on the Site, would make a major change to the composition of close views within the Regent's Canal Conservation Area. Although the architectural treatment of the upper levels of Plot A would be noticeably different from that of the Consented Development, its quality would remain very high and the Proposed Development would continue to have a beneficial effect on the composition of all views assessed. Like the Consented Development, it would integrate comfortably with the scale and grain of existing context and enhance the activation and permeability, and the richness and architectural quality of the canal edge and street frontages to St Pancras Way and Granary Street. As a result, important representative views of the designated townscape, both within the Regent's Canal Conservation Area and outside it, would be enhanced. There would be no change to the effects reported in the March 2018 TVBHA.
- 4.2 As for the Consented Development, the subdivision of the large Site of the Proposed Development into a number of smaller plots with variations in their use would break up the long canal frontage. The resulting variation in the roofscape and architectural treatment, which would be further reinforced by the Proposed Development, would complement the meandering picturesque alignment of the canal and the existing finer grain of the western canal edge to the north of the Site.
- 4.3 As concluded in the March 2018 TVBHA, the Proposed Development would therefore significantly enhance the character and appearance of the Regent's Canal Conservation Area. It would also preserve the character and appearance of the setting of the King's Cross Conservation Area. Like the Consented Development, the Proposed Development would not harm the heritage significance of the listed structures assessed, the registered landscape of St Pancras Gardens, or non-designated positive contributors to the Regent's Canal Conservation Area included in this assessment.

References

1-4 Historic England, *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets* (2017)

1-5 DCLG, *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)* (2012)

1-5A DCLG, *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)* (2019)

1-7 GLA, *The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London: Consolidated with Alterations since 2011* (2016)

1-7A GLA, *The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London* (March 2021)

1-11 London Borough of Camden, *Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 – Design* (2011)

1-11A London Borough of Camden, *Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 – Design* (2019)

Appendices

A1

Supplementary Views

Introduction

B1.1

This following pages contain views prepared to supplement the AVRs in the main section of the report.



Consented Development



Proposed Development

