

SEVEN CAPITAL

THE GREAT EASTERN STREET
HOTEL,
6-67 GREAT EASTERN STREET
including the Griffin Pub and No. 5
Ravey Street

PPS5 (HERITAGE AND
TOWNSCAPE) ANALYSIS

In support of applications (planning
permission, conservation area
consent and listed building consent)

'The demolition of 5 Ravey Street and the rear of 61-63 Great Eastern Street and the development of a three to six storey hotel (C1) with ancillary facilities and the refurbishment of 93 Leonard Street and the change of use of its upper floors from public house (A4) to residential (c3) along with associated landscaping, highways works and plant'.

February 2012

Clarges House
6-12 Clarges Street
London W1J 8HB
Tel: 020 7493 4002
Fax: 020 7312 7548
www.montagu-evans.co.uk

CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Statutory Basis of Assessment and Policy Context	4
	- Statutory Provision	
	- Statutory Development Plan	
	- Other Material Considerations	
3.0	Historical Analysis	10
4.0	Architecture of the Subject Buildings and Statement of Significance	11
5.0	Proposals	17
6.0	The Policy Assessment	27

APPENDICES

1.0	Chris Miele CV and Bibliography
2.0	Historic Maps
3.0	Copy of Application Red Line Plan
4.0	Site Photos
5.0	Griffin Pub, Internal Photos / Works (report by dp9 Architects)
6.0	South Shoreditch Conservation Area Appraisal

1.0 INTRODUCTION – SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THIS SUBMISSION

- 1.1 Seven Capital have instructed this statement from Montagu Evans LLP, and it has been prepared by and under the direction of Dr Chris Miele, a Partner in the firm's Planning and Development Department. Dr Miele specialises in heritage and related townscape matters, and has considerable experience of projects, at all scales and types, in London including in the Borough of Hackney. His background, experience and qualifications are set out in the Appendix of this report. Also taking part in this study has been Paul Crisp and Dr Carol Cragoe of this office, who specialise in planning and heritage and historic research respectively.
- 1.2 This statement considers two unlisted 'showroom-warehouses', built in 1877, shortly after the completion of Great Eastern Street. It also considers the adjacent Grade II listed Griffin pub and the unlisted No. 5 Ravey Street. The Griffin is on English Heritage's Buildings at Risk Register and is in generally poor condition (particularly upper parts), though the pub itself is popular and well used.
- 1.3 As for the former industrial buildings, these are eyesores. They are subject of an urgent works notice, and fully scaffolded. They are not safe to access and the internal structure is severely compromised. For many years they have blighted this important and prominent site in Shoreditch.
- 1.4 Seven Capital, who have a development agreement with the freeholder, are seeking to develop a boutique hotel on the site, and as part of that refurbish and retain the facades of the former industrial buildings as well as refurbish the Griffin pub, providing both heritage assets with a secure future use.
- 1.5 The planning context of this submission is summarised by the agent's (DP9) planning statement. The land comprising the application site is bounded by nos. 61-67 Great Eastern Street, Ravey Street and Leonard Street. The description of development is:
- 'The demolition of 5 Ravey Street and the rear of 61-63 Great Eastern Street and the development of a three to six storey hotel (C1) with ancillary facilities and the refurbishment of 93 Leonard Street and the change of use of its upper floors from public house (A4) to residential (c3) along with associated landscaping, highways works and plant'.
- 1.6 In line with now accepted best practice and policy, Montagu Evans prepared pre-application submissions that provided historical information and analysis of the site and preliminary aspects of the proposals to the local planning authority (this is the course of action advised in PPS5). These documents, which have been incorporated into this statement and developed as appropriate, comprise a statement of significance which summarises the special interest of the South Shoreditch Conservation Area (hereafter the 'CA'). It also summarises the interest of the subject buildings including the listed Griffin pub and the 'showroom-warehouses' (unlisted

buildings of interest in that CA, or undesignated heritage assets – in PPS5 terms), including their contribution to the CA's interest.

- 1.7 This Analysis relies on historical research and the published CA audit. We have also had regard to relevant policy considerations, in particular development plan policies which deal with façade retention.

Key Issues and Findings

- 1.8 From a heritage-conservation perspective there are four important considerations:
- Finding an appropriate and sustainable use for the listed Building at Risk.
 - Defining an appropriate approach to nos. 61-63, which are unlisted buildings of note in the conservation area (and of which it is proposed to retain their facades).
 - The demolition of no. 5 Ravey Street (a much altered late Georgian property in manifestly poor condition).
 - The design of the replacement building, having particular regard to its relationship with retained and refurbished fabric and this part of the conservation are more generally.
- 1.9 In respect of the first issue, it is proposed to repair the external elevations and roof coverings, upgrading the fabric. There will be no new external openings formed. Access to the upper parts will be by a new lobby formed in a former party wall. This entails minor internal changes, including the reconfiguration of a late Victorian stair and the relocation of panelling and etched mirrors (recorded in photographic drawing sheets submitted for approval and the subject of an anticipated condition).
- 1.10 It is proposed to adapt the upper floors as flats, one per floor, entailing limited internal alterations of fabric assessed as having a low significance. We understand that the loss of the first-floor function room has been a point of discussion in the pre-application. English Heritage (whom we consulted) wondered whether the loss of this facility jeopardized the long-term attractiveness of the public house, and therefore its commerciality. This is subject to a further note which has been summarised in DP9's planning statement. Suffice it to say that the current tenant is eager to stay on site and has been in discussion with Seven. He sees no difficulty with these proposals.
- 1.11 In respect of the second issue, Nos. 61-63 Great Eastern Street, these were built in 1877 as a builder's premises and as a speculative commercial premises. Engineering studies – benefiting from earlier survey – conclude that their condition is very poor and that their reuse is not a realistic proposition. Furthermore the position and footprint of their external brick walls make it difficult to retain these elevations, save for the one to the east, which has a loading bay feature of note. Additionally, the

internal planning and functionality of the hotel cannot be reconciled with the existing masonry boxes. Accordingly, taking into account the buildings' condition, the reason for their identification of positive contributor buildings, and the benefits of the scheme overall, we conclude that the proposed demolition of severely degraded fabric and other fabric of little interest is more than justified in respect of PPS5.

- 1.12 With the exception of the listed Griffin public house, which is proposed for refurbishment, the other buildings on the site do not possess any intrinsic architectural or historic interest. No. 5 Ravey Street was originally of some interest, but it has been unsympathetically altered and is in obviously poor architectural and structural condition, with extensive cracking.
- 1.13 The new development that completes this gap site has two components, brick elements based on the pier-warehouse form which is common to the area and at the main entrance and in the upper parts, a contemporary architectural form and materials. The intention is for the historic retained facades and the new elements to sit one beside each other, their combination creating something striking that expresses the dynamism and variety of this part of the Borough.
- 1.14 These new elements have been positioned and shaped with the benefit of computer modelling so that the townscape effects of the proposals have been minimised and are in all cases acceptable.
- 1.15 The language and materials of these new 'pieces' have developed in discussion with ourselves, the officer at the Council, and the Council's Design Review Panel. English Heritage have had an opportunity to review the proposals for the pub on a pre-app basis, with the benefit of a full site inspection and presentation.
- 1.16 This report relies on that visual impact study presented in the Design and Access Statement. The appropriate massing, taken together with the materials and the language/appearance of the architecture, will secure the preservation and enhancement of the conservation area,
- 1.17 The special interest or significance of the site will be conserved in line with statutory provision, PPS5 objectives and the development plan. There is much to commend in this scheme, and very considerable heritage and urban design benefits with no real harm to the significance of the buildings or the conservation area. The economic regeneration benefits only become additional reasons to grant the necessary consents, having regard to heritage considerations.

2.0 STATUTORY BASIS OF ASSESSMENT AND POLICY CONTEXT

2.0 The following sections set out the statutory basis and policy context for the assessment of the proposals.

A. Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

2.1 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the statutory duty of decision makers considering applications affecting the special architectural or historic interest of a conservation area, noting that, 'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

2.2 There is a similar duty in relation to the settings of listed buildings imposed by section 66 of the same Act. In developing their approach to the new elements, the architects

2.3 This well established 'preserve or enhance' test is met if a development either causes no harm to the special character or appearance of a conservation area or, equally and alternatively, if it enhances that character or appearance.

2.4 There is a parallel obligation set out in section 38(6) of the principal planning act, namely that applications should be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan. That plan here consists of the London Plan as Consolidated with Amendments (and the emerging London Plan), the Hackney Development Plan Core Strategy Policies, Hackney's Retained Saved UDP Policies, the South Shoreditch Conservation Area Appraisal, and the South Shoreditch Supplementary Planning Document.

B. The London Plan

2.5 The London Plan policies are strategic in nature and so in this case more weight falls to the local plan component of the development plan and other material considerations (notably statutory provision, PPS5 and the advice contained in the CA Appraisal). Nonetheless, the London Plan is relevant here because the City Fringe, including South Shoreditch, is identified in its Map 2.4 and in Annex 1, table A1.1 as an Opportunity Area.

2.6 Annex A, table A1.1, notes that the City Fringe, including South Shoreditch, as an Opportunity Area, 'Contains a number of accessible, relatively central sites with significant development capacity, including Bishopsgate/South Shoreditch ... The Area provides particular scope to support London's critical mass of financial and business services and clusters of other economic activity, such as creative industries.'

2.7 The London Plan policies on heritage are also relevant, notably 7.8.C: 'Development should identify value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, where appropriate', is also relevant.

C. Core Strategy

2.8 The Core Strategy (2010) is the primary strategic document in the Hackney Local Development Framework.

2.9 Core Strategy Policy 3 (City Fringe South Shoreditch) states that:

The Council will balance objectives of economic development with protection and enhancement of the local architectural and historic character according to the following principles:

- *Protect and enhance the historic environment,*
- *Encouraging development in locations which maintain the vitality of growing economic sectors, including cultural, leisure and creative activities,*
- *Supporting London's financial and business sectors and those activities in the Shoreditch City Fringe which directly serve these sectors,*
- *Managing the impact of the evening economy.*

South Shoreditch has the potential to contribute approximately 530 net additional new homes, and approximately 168,000 sq m of new employment floorspace with City road contributing a further approximately 7,500 sq m of new employment floorspace

2.10 Core Strategy, 4.23 notes that, 'Development in South Shoreditch should strengthen its position as a major destination characterised by its historic heritage and identity, good transport links and role within the local economy.'

2.11 Core Strategy Policy 25 (Historic Environment): *All development should make a positive contribution to the character of Hackney's historic and built environment. This includes identifying, conserving and enhancing the historic significance of the borough's designated heritage assets, their setting and, where appropriate, the wider historic environment.*

D. South Shoreditch Conservation Area Appraisal

2.12 The South Shoreditch Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA), January 2009, has the status of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and is therefore material to development control in varying degrees. Great Eastern Street is part of the area identified by the CAA as the 'Central Shoreditch Character Area'.

2.13 The CCA identifies 61-63 Great Eastern Street as 'Buildings of Townscape Merit' in figure 21. This category is distinct from 'Locally Listed Buildings'. Hackney's website was searched on 29 November, 2011 and this confirmed that neither property was on the local list. The Grade II listed Griffin pub is shown as such on this map. Neither No. 5 Ravey Street, nor any of the other structures on the site, are marked as being of interest.

- 2.14 It notes (2.1.4) that, 'the national and regional planning policies with significance to the South Shoreditch Conservation Area, have identified the area as one with broad opportunities to play a greater role in the economic and social future of the City. However, there is a potential conflict between such opportunity-led development and protecting the historic assets of an area, particularly where those assets are primarily contained in the built environment and street pattern. The regional level policies go some way to recognising this potential conflict, but it is at a local level that these are more fully addressed.'
- 2.15 The CCA also notes (5.2.7) that, notwithstanding that these properties are 'BTMs', their 'semi-derelict' state means they make a 'particularly negative contribution to the character of the streetscape' (and hence the character of the SSCA). 'Although these warehouses (dating to 1877) are classic Shoreditch commercial buildings, their current unsightly condition and that of adjacent buildings creates a negative visual impact on the otherwise [sic] quality streetscape of this major thoroughfare'.
- 2.16 The CAA's comments about the distinctive character of the Central Shoreditch area are worth quoting extensively as they are relevant to our understanding of the significance of 61-63 Great Eastern Street in the larger CA.
- 2.17 Section 1.3.2 of the CAA notes that, 'The distinctive character of South Shoreditch comes from the mix of quite grand, four and five storey former retail and warehouse buildings that line the main thoroughfares in combination with smaller, lower-scale buildings set behind the main frontages. These are divided by an irregular grid of smaller streets and lanes, the overall result of which is to produce a dense and intimate streetscape behind the wider, open thoroughfares.'
- 2.18 This point – and it is directly relevant to the redevelopment of nos. 61-63 – is elaborated at 3.2.8 which states that,

'The English Heritage 2004 study nicely summarises the main activities occupying these varied industrial buildings (pp.10 & 13).

'The three great manufacturing industries of the late Victorian East End, clothing, furniture and footwear, were all to be found to varying degrees in South Shoreditch. Also present were many characteristic trades of the City fringe, including printers, carriers, builders, druggists or chemists and food processors. Of these, by far the most important was furniture making...

'Much of the commercial and industrial building stock that was used by these trades was generic in terms of architectural form. An exception were the yards of the timber merchants who supplied the furniture and building trades which contain specialist storage structures.

‘Although the majority of building styles were generic, a number of companies built distinctive premises to house their businesses, using Gothic, Baroque and eastern architectural motifs in decoration. The remainder of the building stock actually created its own ‘house style’ by exploiting the functionality of its construction: tall vertical frontages with flat columns dividing large areas of window across 3-4 stories typically. The exposure of increasingly used steel frames on the frontages of these buildings also added to their utilitarian but distinctive form. The emphasis on verticality, even if unintentional, is an element that can be seen throughout the SSCA.’

2.19 ‘The architectural traditions of the SSCA... have created a unified streetscape character for the Conservation Area. A particular aspect of this is the absence of one or more statement buildings of individual scale and/or architectural style... rather it is the collective contribution made by the older building stock of the furniture, printing and smaller trades that define the character of the SSCA’. (4.3.5)

2.20 The CAA’s section 5.2.1 identifies, ‘four and five storey grand showroom-warehouses ... with their plaster and stone decorative details’, as the key characteristic of Great Eastern Street. These are contrasted with, ‘the slightly plainer and smaller-scale showroom-warehouses of Curtain Road [and] the plain brick warehouses and workshops found on Leonard, Luke, Scrutton and Paul Streets’.

E. Hackney South Shoreditch Supplementary Planning Document

2.21 The 2006 South Shoreditch Supplementary Planning Document (SSSPD) is a material consideration for the purposes of section 38(6).

2.22 The triangle bounded by Great Eastern, Leonard and Ravey Streets is identified as an opportunity area in the SSSPD Fig. 3 and in Appendix 1. In Fig 8, it is identified as an ‘infill site requiring development’, of the type that has the potential to ‘enhance the visual quality of the district’ (5.5.4).

2.23 It notes, (6.2.1), that the Leonard Circus sub-district, which includes the proposal site, ‘is quieter, presents opportunities for more significant redevelopment and refurbishment’.

2.24 Its policy SSSPD 3.6 on ‘Development and demolitions’ notes that,

‘Development in South Shoreditch must preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area, or their settings. As such, the Council will not normally grant permission for proposals that involve the total or substantial demolition of the which (sic) are considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Permission for the total or substantial demolition of such buildings will only be granted where it can be shown that it would be economically unfeasible or

unviable to repair the structure, and that reasonable efforts have been made to refurbish or re-use the building. In assessing demolition proposals the Council would give consideration to PPG15 and the priority in PPS1 to maximising the use of Previously Developed Land.

- 2.25 Section 11.2 (iv) observes that it desirable to, 'maintain the consistent scale, traditional 5-storey construction with well defined curving corner blocks on Great Eastern Street' ... 'The scale of new development on Ravey and Leonard Street should be set by the warehouse buildings and those on Willow Street by the scale of the warehouse buildings at the east end.'

F. Saved Policy, including EQ13 on Demolition in CAs

- 2.26 Retained saved UDP policies are also relevant.

- 2.27 EQ13 Demolition in Conservation Areas notes that,

'The council will normally grant conservation area consent to demolish or partially demolish non-listed buildings in conservation areas;

(A) Where the existing building does not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area; and/or where demolition is considered acceptable and there are satisfactory proposals for redevelopment of the site....

(B) Where the proposed replacement building, other development or vacant site would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

- 2.28 The proposals require a conservation area consent because the removal of internal fabric and rear/party walls constitutes 'substantial demolition' under the terms of the Shimizu decision. That said, this demolition does not harm the significance of this part of the conservation area because the elements of the complex that reinforce the industrial character of the area will be refurbished and retained as part of the new development, and because the fabric and structure are in very poor condition, and because those secondary masonry elements are of very limited significance in any event.
- 2.29 Saved UDP policy EQ17 seeks the conservation and reuse of listed buildings, having regard to their special interest (and is so based on statutory provision seeking the preservation of listed buildings). Consent is sought for minor internal alterations, and no material change to any external elevation.
- 2.30 Saved policy EQ18, 'The council will normally not permit any development which adversely affects the setting of a listed building' is also pertinent, and again is based on statutory provision.

G. PPS5 – Planning for the Historic Environment (2010)

- 2.31 PPS5 sets out national planning policy on the historic environment. This has simplified guidance on the regulation of the historic environment and has reduced it to a few inter-related concepts.
- 2.32 First is that development control should be based on an appreciation of a heritage asset's significance, and that any asset's sensitivity to change varies in direct proportion to its significance. The PPS distinguishes between designated and undesignated heritage assets. The designated heritage assets here are the South Shoreditch Conservation Area and the listed building.
- 2.33 The undesignated heritage assets are nos. 61-63 Great Eastern Street. In the Conservation Area Appraisal for the area, these two buildings have been identified as buildings of townscape interest, albeit ones detracting from the appearance of the area on the basis of their condition. They have not been identified as locally listed buildings.
- 2.34 PPS5 also advises that the analysis of any proposed development affecting a heritage interest should begin with the special interest of the designated heritage asset as a whole before moving on to consider the particular significance of the affected part. The effect of the development is judged at both scales, but ultimately it is the effect of a development on the significance of the asset as a whole which matters most.
- 2.35 Detailed policies on demolition affecting undesignated heritage assets is set out in HE9 and for the sake of expediency and clarity that discussion is contained in section 4.0, where the point of demolition is considered expressly.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF HISTORICAL EVENTS

- 3.0 The early history of the site is explored in the Archaeological Assessment submitted separately. It is not material to our assessment here, which concerns events and artefacts of the relatively recent past.
- 3.1 The triangular site here discussed was open ground until the mid to late C18, when a scatter of houses first appeared along Willow Walk (roughly on the line of Great Eastern Street). Both Charles Street (now Ravey Street) and Leonard Street were formed in the later C18, and first appear on a map of 1799. The frontages of the triangular site (largely corresponding to the development site) bounded by Willow Walk, Charles (Ravey) Street, and Leonard Street were largely built up by 1799, but with the possible exception of a fragment of a late C18 house on Ravey Street (No. 5), these buildings have all been demolished.
- 3.2 The Griffin Public House was built or rebuilt c.1889, and the other C18 buildings on Leonard Street were rebuilt in the mid C20, although some of the earlier property boundaries were retained.
- 3.3 Great Eastern Street was built in 1876 as part of a series of metropolitan improvements that eased the flow of traffic through the area, following on from the opening of railways. It approximately followed the line of the former Willow Walk, but it was both wider and straighter than its predecessor, resulting in the loss of the C18 houses on the S side of Willow Walk in the area of 61-63 Great Eastern Street. The new road cut diagonally across a number of older streets, resulting in characteristic, curved 'bull-nose' sites at the junctions, including the nearby nos. 59 and 67 Great Eastern Street. See historic maps, Appendix 2.0.

4.0 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONSERVATION AREA AND OF THE SUBJECT BUILDINGS

The Conservation Area

4.0 The first consideration is the significance of the conservation area, the designated asset, as a whole. The Borough have recently published a very detailed Conservation Area Appraisal (hereafter 'CAA', dated January 2009). This is based on a survey which was carried out by English Heritage and one of this report's authors. This CAA is SPD and therefore material to development control decisions in varying degrees. It is complemented by a land-use planning SPD on South Shoreditch.

4.1 The CAA breaks down the area into four sub-areas, and Great Eastern Street falls square in the centre of the one identified as 'Central Shoreditch'. The whole of the area and this part have been designated in recognition of its mid to late C19 small-scale, industrial manufacturing heritage. The 2004 English Heritage historical study (unpublished but accessible on request from the Historical Analysis and Research Team – author Ms J Smith) summarises this interest thus:

'The three great manufacturing industries of the late Victorian East End, clothing, furniture and footwear, were all to be found to varying degrees in South Shoreditch. Also present were many characteristic trades of the City fringe, including printers, carriers, builders, druggists or chemists and food processors. Of these, by far the most important was furniture making...

'Much of the commercial and industrial building stock that was used by these trades was generic in terms of architectural form. An exception were the yards of the timber merchants who supplied the furniture and building trades which contain specialist storage structures' (CAA page 14)

4.2 The CAA goes on to elaborate, on page 24, para 4.3.5:

'The architectural traditions of the SSCA... have created a unified streetscape character for the Conservation Area. A particular aspect of this is the absence of one or more statement buildings of individual scale and/or architectural style... rather it is the collective contribution made by the older building stock of the furniture, printing and smaller trades that define the character of the SSCA.'

4.3 This point – and it is directly relevant to the redevelopment of nos. 61-63 – is elaborated at 3.2.8 which states that

'Although the majority of buildings were generic, a number of companies built distinctive premises to house their businesses, using Gothic, Baroque and eastern architectural motifs in decoration.'

- 4.4 Nos. 61-63 are clearly NOT such buildings. They are, instead, what that same paragraph defines thus as:

'The remainder [and majority] of the building stock actually created its own house style by exploiting the functionality of construction: tall vertical frontages with flat columns dividing large areas of windows across 3-4 stories typically.'

- 4.5 At other places in the CAA the collective contribution of townscape is reinforced, for example, at para 4.6.3, page 29:

'North along Great Eastern Street from its junction with Curtain Road... the quality of this vista derives from the broad open nature of the street framed on each side by imposing and architecturally characteristic late C19 showroom-warehouses of the highest quality...'

- 4.6 The Central Shoreditch Character Zone or area is, the CAA states, dominated by Great Eastern Street (hereafter GES), with a scale of four to five traditional storeys stepping down generally to lower development in the hinterland of this street. The language of brick pier warehouses predominates. Their uniformity, and the singular nature of this street, reflect the fact that GES was a new street, cut in one go, in the mid 1870s as part of a series of metropolitan improvements that eased the flow of traffic through the area, following on from the opening of railways.

- 4.7 The emphatic nature of the Victorian intervention has generated a series of oblique junctions or 'bull nosed corners' as some have called them. These occur regularly and make a significant contribution to the special interest of the area's townscape. The site contains one such corner, to the west, but it is vacant. As you will be aware, the architects are seeking to respond positively to that feature.

- 4.8 The SSCA specifically comments on strategic planning objectives. At para 2.1.3, in a discussion of the London Plan SRDF encompassing this area, the Appraisal states:

'Although the London Plan necessarily takes a strategic view for the whole of London, its influence at a local level must not be overrated' [our emphasis].

- 4.9 Thus, and in distinction to many sensitive areas of land, the CAA advises that land use objectives will be considerations of particular weight when dealing with heritage matters. It falls to DP9 to advise on land-use planning, but from our perspective this formulation in adopted heritage policy indicates that economic development objectives will be significant considerations when striking any balance of advantage in relation to perceived harm to a heritage asset (notwithstanding my conclusion that there is no such harm).

Comments on nos. 61-63 GES: Typical, Speculatively-built, Industrial-Commercial Buildings

- 4.10 English Heritage has prepared two detailed studies of the South Shoreditch Area and its industrial buildings, notably those associated with the furniture trade. These are an unpublished report by J Smith, 'An Industrial Suburb': The Commercial Buildings of South Shoreditch 1850-1980', (2004) and a book, J Smith and R Rogers, *Behind the Veneer: The South Shoreditch Furniture Trade and its Buildings*, (2006).
- 4.11 Although it does not specifically discuss Nos. 61-63 Great Eastern Street, *Behind the Veneer* identifies three building types as characteristic in the area: timber yards, workshops and so-called 'showroom-warehouses' which were 'essentially commercial warehouses', almost all of which date from between 1870 to 1910. 'Most were built on a generous scale, ranging from three to five storeys over basements, with plain brick frontages of solid respectability' (page 22). Often these industrial buildings were erected speculatively, like many other small-scale warehouse buildings across the East End.
- 4.12 In the case of showroom-warehouse, display areas were on the ground, first and sometimes even upper floors. Basements were used for packing. Other areas could be used for storage, sometimes of unfinished elements. The structure of these was typical: cast-iron columns often of standard cruciform section, supporting substantial primary girders with joists running between and softwood plank floors. There were no internal finishes. Furniture was displayed by type, stacked closely together, and the higher quality items were on show individually through large ground floor windows. Occasionally fully furnished display rooms were formed within this simple structure (not unlike the way that modern department stores create real environments for display of furnishings).
- 4.13 We have consulted the gazetteer EH prepared as part of its study of South Shoreditch. The following is based on that entry. Nos. 61-63 are in every way typical. They were built in 1877 by Henry Staines, who occupied no. 61, the three-storey block, himself (Nb. At its fig. 11, the previous DBA wrongly gives the date of the 1874-76 OS map as 1894-96, suggesting that the buildings are later than they are. The adjoining building at no. 63 was speculatively built by Staines as well. This explains why the buildings have broadly similar detailing, albeit with subtle variations. It is interesting to note that their external architecture does not conform to the typical, brick warehouse type, though the scale, details, materials and character of these elevations are clearly part of the industrial vernacular for which the area is deemed special. In particular, the strongly horizontal emphasis of nos. 61-63 is different from the strongly vertical emphasis that characterises the area.
- 4.14 Staines used the open part of no. 61 for smaller buildings, accessed from a yard. There was a single-storey lean-to, an adjoining store and single-storey covered entrance. These do not survive as a group. The builder retained the leases until the 1920s, but his firm had been replaced by a French motor car accessory business by

1918 and later, after WWI, by an upholsterers' warehouseman firm, whose signage remains.

- 4.15 In the 1880s, no. 63 was occupied by cabinet makers, and by 1899 it was occupied by fine art publishers who continued here until 1918. There was a fire in 1923, and the building was used by a bent-wood furniture company in the 1930s. The rear extension could date to c.1900 during the occupation by the publishers.
- 4.16 Both buildings have been vacant for many years, and are in a very poor state of repair.

Statement of Significance: Nos. 61-63 Great Eastern Street

- 4.17 Notwithstanding their 'typicality', this pair of buildings does not ever appear to have been used as the type of showroom-warehouses that characterised the South Shoreditch area, even though their configuration allowed that possibility. No. 61 was built for a builder, and no. 63 was used for small-scale manufacturing.
- 4.18 They have, then, no real significant associations with the furniture trade. Thus, they are little different in their associations to buildings of similar form occurring in Clerkenwell or around the Commercial Road.
- 4.19 The buildings have been vacant/underutilised for many years (in the author's memory for at least 25), and they are now unsafe and require temporary measures to ensure their stability. A structural survey undertaken a decade ago identified serious defects, including serious movement and damage from water ingress, which is particularly damaging to the timber and iron structure found in buildings of this type and date. In summary, the buildings are not now remotely capable of beneficial use. Recent structural survey work as reported and discussed with us concluded that the whole of the internal structure would likely need to be removed. Significant masonry (brick) repairs are also required to ensure structural stability. Thus, there is no realistic prospect of retaining the integrity of these buildings, or their characteristic internal structure. This structural survey work will be developed for submission with the anticipated applications.
- 4.20 Any improvement to the situation, therefore, would be counted a significant planning benefit to the conservation area (irrespective of the demolition point) just as the beneficial and optimised reuse of the site would have demonstrable other planning benefits.

The Griffin Public House, 93 Leonard Street

- 4.21 The Griffin Public House is Grade II listed, and the list description provides a date of circa 1889. The architect is unknown. The building is in red brick with extensive stucco dressings and encaustic tile decoration. It has ornamental cast iron window boxes to the second floor windows. It is, according to the list description, a

characterful pub from the High Victorian period with a good façade and internal survivals of note. See Appendix 5.0 for photographs.

- 4.22 The Public House is also on English Heritage's Heritage at Risk Register. There it is said to be in 'poor' condition because, according to the register, of a lack of maintenance.
- 4.23 Apart from the ground floor we were only able to inspect the first floor at the rear. This consists merely of a stair bay and single open room. Judging from survey drawings this arrangement obtains above as well. The building appears to be of standard traditional construction (masonry bearing walls with timber joists and internal bearing partitions) and in reasonable architectural condition at least.
- 4.24 Our understanding of this building has developed in the course of our analysis, and its history is by no means straightforward. What follows is our best judgment on the basis of physical inspection (in this case the documentary record is less helpful and would be inconclusive).
- 4.25 The building appears to be of three phases. The corner section occupies the site of a single, older house, which formed part of a terrace facing south. This was late Georgian in date, and some internal floor structure (ground floor) may survive from this period. The rear of this property faced a yard parallel to Ravey Street, and that wall, with an older window, survives as an element in a later Victorian stair compartment (first to second).
- 4.26 The second phase, again working from visual analysis, appears to have been the construction of a new range on the site of the former garden. This is the rendered, three-storey extension of the corner building. Its incised details follow a continental stylistic innovation, sometimes called the Neo-Grec, which was introduced in this country around the 1860s. We conclude that the building was constructed sometime between then and the 1880s. This element is in particularly poor condition, with obvious structural deflection, invasive vegetation, water ingress and so forth. In the construction of that new range, a stair was formed in a compartment formed of new structure and older Georgian structure, in which a window survives (which is the clue to the puzzle).
- 4.27 That stair, interestingly, does not actually align with the external elevational treatment, which is not surprising given the expedient nature of that second phase.
- 4.28 The third and final phase was the refacing or possibly rebuilding of the original corner house, in the late C19, resulting in the very attractive red brick façade with faience faced pub front. There is a very slight possibility that this work entailed retention of older fabric but we cannot be sure, and the isolated inspection opportunities (via damaged fabric or loose floorboards) was simply inconclusive. It is, in any event, an academic point because the intention is to retain this fabric, upgrading it in a manner

that is suitable to the property's listed status. A condition on the consent relating to detailed matters is anticipated.

- 4.29 The significance of the Griffin Pub lies primarily in its external architectural form and decoration (faience tile frontage), and its proportions relative to its corner position. The scale of the building reflects a previous phase of development (C18). The interior is of note, and very handsome as well as characteristically late Victorian. The upper parts are of no real significance, that is, of limited cultural heritage value, lacking any 'features' and being comprised of standard structure and materials. The most significant proposed alteration, see below, is the removal of the stair from first to second, and located on the join of the two parts. This is a late Victorian feature of standard design.
- 4.30 The plan form in the corner element, the focus of the listing, consists of a stair bay on two upper floors, what appears to be a former party wall and a partition subdividing what appears previously to have been one room.
- 4.31 The rear component, which is rendered and not singled out as special in the listing designation. It is on separate levels to the front part, and the stairs to this part of the building (from first to second floor only) are probably contemporary with the addition of this space, and are of a standard design that could be c.1880, c.1900, or even from the 1930s.
- 4.32 The level change between the two sections suggests that this was the original party wall line, but the scale of the partition appears inconsistent with that.
- 4.33 Our appraisal concludes, then, that the upper parts have been altered to some extent, and that the original arrangements were probably re-organised when the two properties became one. This combination took place some time ago, possibly when the faience frontage was installed.

Statement of Significance: The Griffin Public House

- 4.34 The Griffin Public House is Grade II listed, and its tiled façade is characteristic of the pubs built in this area in the late C19. Its primary significance lies in its façade and in the ground floor areas, both of which would be preserved and restored under these proposals. The upper floors are of less significance, and have in any case been altered.

Statement of Significance: No. 5 Ravey Street

- 4.35 No. 5 Ravey Street has limited interest in the development of the wider area, but the extensive rebuilding and alteration it has undergone has removed the majority of its historic value and significance.

5.0 PROPOSALS

5.1 The proposals are for a boutique hotel with supporting facilities, including at basement level. These facilities include restaurant/bar intended primarily for guest use and meeting/conference rooms. The proposals also include the refurbishment the Griffin public house the upper parts of which will be converted to two new residential units respectively (first and second). These will be self-contained residential accommodation in Class C3 use, and separately accessed and serviced from Ravey Street.

5.2 The construction of the hotel requires a basement across most of the site, including on or close to the party wall of the Griffin and to the rear of the retained facades. Both structures will require underpinning. Accordingly the proposals for these properties have been developed in consultation with Seven's structural engineer, who has prepared a separate method statement dealing with these significant works. In particular this statement looks at:

The measures needed for maintaining the structural stability of the retained facades during internal demolition and construction; and

The measures needed for maintaining the stability of the Griffin Pub during works of excavation.

5.3 Additionally, the engineers have reviewed the proposed alterations to the listed building (formation of openings to internal partitions and supporting structure) and confirm these works present no risk to the fabric provided they are done correctly. On such projects, involving excavation next to historic properties, it is normal for any condition on a planning consent or other specialist consent to require a detailed method statement for approval by the Council before the commencement of the relevant part of the work, and that is anticipated here.

Comments on Conservation Issues for the Griffin Public House: Alterations and Their Justification

5.4 The primary significance of the pub lies in its character as a place of popular refreshment, its external architecture (particular of the corner building), and its characterful ground floor interior which includes original or at least significant pub fittings. The faience faced ground floor is of particular importance and attractiveness.

5.5 The significance of these architectural characteristics is undermined by the current poor condition of these elements, and by the poor decorative order and condition of the rendered component. The proposals are to clean, repair and refurbish these elevations, and the interiors. The precise methods and approaches would be subject to a condition on any listed building consent as is usual.

5.6 To form access to upper parts, the proposal is to break through the current north party wall, accessed by a lobby reached off Ravey Street. Refurbishment of the public

spaces and façade of the Griffin in connection with use by the hotel is entirely in keeping with the existing use of the building, and will enhance the significance of this listed building.

- 5.7 The proposals call for the residential conversion of two upper floors, for use as one unit per floor. This is on the basis that class C3 residential is desirable in this location. The building can accommodate it with minimal changes and, critically, this use provides a secure future use that will ensure occupation and therefore maintenance of an important listed building. It is precisely the building's under-occupation which has led to its very poor condition and inclusion on the At Risk Register.
- 5.8 In pre-application discussions the question of whether the loss of a function room on the first floor compromised the viability of the pub. This issue has been dealt with in greater detail in a letter from dp9 to Rachel Godden at English Heritage, which we quote at length here:

Firstly we've considered the historic layout and use of this space with Chris Miele at Montagu Evans. So far his research has not shown any historical information about the use of the upper floors of the pub. However the space does not appear in its design to have been intended to be a special function room, and could easily have served other ancillary purposes at some point in its history.

The more important point therefore is the one you made about any change of use to the upper floors assisting not undermining the long term safeguarding of the physical fabric. Of course the current situation has arisen due to a lack of maintenance over a very long period. The pub itself is very popular and trades well without the function room which has not been in use for many years. We have asked the landlord to confirm when it was last used. A survey of other traditional type pubs in the area indicates most do not have function rooms and this is not a critical element to running a successful pub in a central London area such as this, particularly when it is experiencing massive investment and growth in jobs and residents.

With our proposals the pub will continue to operate as a pub much in the same way albeit its management will be overseen by the hotel operator. The pub will be part of the hotel offer although to the public appear independent. Its future is therefore ensured by the hotel operator who own and manage the pub.

In terms of the most appropriate uses for the upper floors, residential fits very well. We considered hotel rooms but they would need much greater intervention to the listed building. Two self contained residential flats likely to be sold on leases offer much greater protection to the building in terms of obligations on insurance and maintenance.

If the function room was to be retained, which would accommodate amplified music, then there would need to be significant alterations to the building to comply with current building regulations. Given the tight footprint configuration and acoustic issues it would also make it impossible to also accommodate residential at the remaining parts of the upper floors, leaving them with no identified use.

- 5.9 Even if, for the sake of argument, the first floor were necessary for commercial reasons (which we understand it is not), then that would still leave the second floor without an identified use. Residential might be possible, but a single unit above a pub function room would not, in our view, be desirable.
- 5.10 Therefore, the principle of the proposals represents the optimum viable use of the heritage asset for its original and a complementary purpose.
- 5.11 Looking in more detail at the actual proposals, these entail certain relatively modest alterations which are necessary because of the very shallow depth of plan of the buildings. This prevents any internal corridors. The tight dimensions likewise mean that efficient planning is essential. The proposed removal of the partitions from first and second of the corner unit does not materially affect the building's significance. And neither does the reconfiguration of an ordinary late Victorian stair, subject to the detailed design of that (which is intended to match the original).
- 5.12 The opening up of a more substantial wall, possibly a former party wall enclosing the existing stair bay, is needed to provide kitchen facilities. Stubs and a downstand element will preserve a record of the existing plan form. This is, clearly, a more substantial intervention, albeit one that is necessary to achieve workable, good quality residential accommodation.
- 5.13 The consent would be subject to a building recording condition, and reporting and analysis that would help to unravel the history of the building further, adding to public understanding and appreciation.
- 5.14 The removal of chimneybreasts at first and second floor is likewise essential to make best use of the space. It is proposed, furthermore, to reconfigure the existing stair, but the design of this can easily be maintained, replicating or reusing existing elements. This stair clearly post-dates the original build on the site – one of the stair compartment walls is plainly a former external wall (retaining a redundant, encapsulated rear window from the original build, on first floor). Its detailing and form suggest a date C19 date, and so an association with the second or third building phase. It is an ordinary feature of no special design interest.
- 5.15 The subdivision of the long space to provide facilities is, again, another necessary alteration.

- 5.16 None of these works requires removal of floor structure. Furthermore, the anticipated operations are typical and routinely, and successfully, carried out on buildings of this age and type, listed and not. The Engineering Statement provided with the application discusses the type of operations which are anticipated. That statement also considers the scope of works needed to secure the listed building from harm during the construction process of the proposed development. Again, these are routine and a detailed method statement would be required as a condition on the relevant consents (planning and listed building we anticipate).
- 5.17 The loss of the stair between the first and second floor constitutes harm to the original plan form of the building, and hence its significance. However, that harm is very limited in nature and necessary, in our judgment, in order to plan the proposed new residential units. Providing that accommodation ensures a secure future use for the upper parts of the building, and so promotes its conservation. On that basis, we conclude that the building's special interest, historical and aesthetic significance is conserved, in line with PPS5.
- 5.18 Furthermore, any very limited harm must be set against the clear planning benefit deriving from reusing a building on the At Risk Register. The proposed conversion would include a refurbishment of the pub element, and that would better reveal its significance. Any residual harm, we conclude therefore, is clearly outweighed by the proposed alterations. These works would be secured through the implementation of the main hotel consent.
- 5.19 There are two areas of detailed design work required for a successful outcome. These are the reconfiguration of the stair and the creation of a stair compartment, dividing that stair from the retained pub space. In particular there are etched mirrors and decorative features which would have to be relocated and/or remade in facsimile. Again, this is nothing special or exceptional about this sort of work, and it may be satisfactorily controlled through the application of a specific condition on the listed building consent. The drawings submitted for approval include photographs of the features and spaces identified, and these will provide a control for the discharge of the anticipated condition. Thus, in our view, the information submitted in respect of the listed building, as part of these applications, is sufficient to enable the authority to assess the effects on the building's special interest, and so determine the applications in line with PPS5 advice.

5 Ravey Street

- 5.20 Our initial review of the site suggests that no. 5 Ravey Street, the building adjoining the Griffin, originated as a late Georgian house (late C18 or early C19), and in scale and proportions is typical of the first phase of the area's development. Many better examples survive, however, including re-frontings and later redevelopments of older plots that adhere to the earlier scale of development. Thus the property has some limited historic interest as a reminder of an earlier phase of development in the area.

- 5.21 However, the property has been extensively altered. An access appears to have been formed, removing ground floor fabric completely. The upper floors have been rendered, and the windows are not original. The condition is obviously very poor (the front façade is bowing and cracking significantly). Furthermore, the building has not been singled out as a positive contributor building in the conservation area appraisal. We concur with that assessment.

The Proposed Façade Retention of nos. 61 and 63 – Considered with Reference to Detailed PPS5 Advice

- 5.22 In this part of our scheme analysis, we look specifically at the proposed substantial demolition of nos. 61 and 63, bearing in mind that the elements proposed to remove are either severely damaged and in extremely poor condition or are of limited interest (rears) at best. The discussion of necessity, and for the sake of convenience, deals with the detailing advice on demolition in PPS5.
- 5.23 Here by way of introduction we observe that there is a substantive difference in policy between façade retention and genuine demolition, even if the effect of the well known (in some circles) Shimizu decision is to treat both as similar, that is, demolition means total or substantial demolition.
- 5.24 The designated heritage asset for the purposes of PPS5 is the conservation area as a whole. The buildings are undesignated heritage assets specifically identified as buildings of townscape value, that is, of value because their façades contribute to the streetscape. It is stating to the obvious to say that this contribution can only be on the frontage to GES. The rears of these buildings have no architectural refinement and are utilitarian in character. They were never intended to be seen, which explains their plain character. They are of limited interest only, and do not make any real contribution to the townscape of the area.
- 5.25 The Borough maintains a local list, and there are published criteria for inclusion on that list. This process is supported by a core strategy policy. The criteria for inclusion on the local list recognise more than just townscape. These criteria include historic interest. This distinction is reinforced by our historical analysis: these were not built as furniture trade buildings, notwithstanding superficial resemblances to that typology, and that lack of specific associations reduces their historical value in relative terms. The buildings are not on the local list.
- 5.26 Likewise, and as documented by the CCA, their contribution is to the general character of Great Eastern Street as a planned, Victorian commercial boulevard. That contribution lies, again, with the facades, their materials, detailing and obvious age.
- 5.27 PPS5 HE9.5 is the starting point for the application of policy in respect of these buildings. This paragraph provides advice on how one determines the level of harm development proposals may cause to larger, designated heritage assets, that is, conservation areas. It states:

'Not all elements of a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. The [detailed] policies in HE9.1 to HE9.4... apply to those elements that do contribute to [...] significance.'

5.28 The subject buildings clearly contribute positively to the significance of the CA as a whole by their characteristic qualities of their elevations.

5.29 English Heritage have published a checklist questionnaire (12 points) that help to define the contribution an undesignated heritage asset can make to a conservation area. In conclusion, and with reference to these criteria, these buildings are NOT the work of a notable designer; they do NOT have landmark quality because they are background, mid-block ranges of typical design; they do NOT actually reflect the brick pier language that characterises the best warehouse-showroom architecture, though they are characteristic; they do NOT have significant historic associations. They do contribute to the character of an established group, but of course the features that do that are the facades only (including the eastern return elevation).

5.30 HE9.5 provides further observations apropos such undesignated assets:

'When considering proposals [affecting cultural significance], local planning authorities should take into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the World Heritage Site or Conservation as a whole'. [Our emphasis].

5.31 If proposals cause total or substantial loss of significance of the designated heritage asset (that is the CA as a whole), then the provisions of HE9.2 and HE9.3 engage because there is 'substantial harm' to the designated heritage asset. In such cases these two provisions require an applicant effectively to demonstrate that there is no viable way of maintaining the asset affected or that its demolition is necessary to deliver substantial community benefits. HE9.3 advises that marketing may be demonstrated to establish practical redundancy and prove non-viability.

5.32 For my part I do not see how the demolition of fabric which is in such very poor condition, and the retention of the elements which contribute to townscape quality, can be said to cause 'substantial harm' to the conservation area, the designated asset. The only element formally confirmed as having value – the facades – are retained. Notwithstanding that, we are mindful that in such cases the question needs to be asked and carefully considered: why can't such buildings be retained to some degree beyond their facades and the eastern return?

5.33 Here we conclude that the appropriate policy provision is HE9.4, namely that demolition of severely compromised fabric causes some, but less than substantial, harm.

- 5.34 HE9.4 advises in such cases that the balance of judgment should turn on the benefits of the development, and in the first instance heritage benefits. Here such benefits would include improving the appearance of a site whose dereliction detracts from the area (as documented in the adopted Appraisal).
- 5.35 This assessment concludes there is no significant harm to heritage interests consequent upon the demolition. Even if a different conclusion is reached, on the basis of different judgments, then the decision must take into account the level of harm and any countervailing benefits on a proportional basis.
- 5.36 Such benefits would include heritage benefits, such as, for example, the refurbishment and optimisation of the public house, as well as other land-use planning benefits. These are defined by DP9 in their planning statement. Such benefits would include employment (which hotels are accepted to provide, though they fall outside the B1 class) and contribution to the local economy. The quality of the proposed building is another potential benefit.

Technical Considerations

- 5.37 Here, on this site, the technical considerations start with the very poor condition of nos. 61 and 63, which are the subject of temporary propping.
- 5.38 Engineering surveys from about a decade ago and more recently (outlined in an accompanying document) conclude the interior structure is in very poor condition and much of it beyond meaningful repair. In any event, the removal of internal structure on its own cannot be controlled by the planning system where a building is not listed.
- 5.39 That leaves the external walls, the demolition of which is controlled by the planning system. Here the reasons supporting a demolition consent have to do with optimising the use of the site.
- 5.40 As described in the engineering report, it is practically impossible to provide the extent of basement required for a hotel of this kind (including additional public facilities and supporting areas) whilst maintaining the brick structural boxes of the buildings. The cost and complexity of temporary propping mean this is not a practicable or desirable proposition, particular bearing in mind that the buildings are not listed.
- 5.41 The second set of considerations affecting the retention of structure are practical ones, arising from the desired use and necessary brief requirements flowing from this.
- 5.42 First, the site's development capacity is constrained by rights of light to the rear. This, and the presence of the Griffin Pub, a modestly scaled listed building, limits the scale of development along Leonard Street. That means making best use of the front of the

site, but again only to a certain height because of townscape considerations, and the desire to achieve a largely uniform height along Great Eastern Street .

- 5.43 To achieve required levels of accommodation the plan along the main frontage needs to be that of a double-loaded corridor, with rooms to the front and a shared courtyard. The eccentric geometry of the buildings' masonry boxes would, if retained, compromise the efficient organisation of the hotel interiors, and that would affect the brief adversely. Efficiency of layout is always a particularly important development consideration, and particularly so in hotel design.
- 5.44 It is technical possible to retain more side walls, but these would need rebuilding and new openings, thus resulting in the practical rebuilding of the structures.

The Replacement Building: First Consideration – Setting of the Listed Building

- 5.45 Ultimately, the application of the section 72 test and consequent policy relies on the appropriateness of the replacement building, its design quality and characteristics seen in relation to the surrounding area including the setting of the listed pub.
- 5.46 On that second point, it should be noted that there are scale contrasts throughout the area, the result of its distinct phases of development. Remnant Georgian properties, or their later Victorian redevelopment to the earlier proportions, sit beside larger scale, purpose-built industrial buildings. That occasional contrast, taking place within certain limits is part of the area's character today.
- 5.47 Notwithstanding that the scale and position of the proposed new building has been adjusted locally to avoid stark transitions in scale. The western edge along Leonard Street has also been set back to reveal the corner quoining of the listed building. The tonality and palette of the majority of the cladding, to lower parts, is also a complementary brick.
- 5.48 Thus, the replacement building preserves the setting of the listed building; indeed, by improving a dead, vacant frontage and removing an eyesore near it, the development enhances that setting. The increased vitality in the setting of the listed building is also beneficial.

The Replacement Building as a Whole

- 5.49 The proposals have been shaped by a local view impact analysis from inception of scheme design. Early information and viewpoints have been presented to the local planning authority pre-application as the basis for discussion and design development. These have also taken into account relevant recent consents.

- 5.50 We refer the reader to the view impact studies presented in the architect's Design and Access Statement.
- 5.51 In broad terms, the scale of the proposals (height) is comparable with that of the surrounding area, and responds to that of Great Eastern Street. That scale has been set in part by seeking to integrate the floor levels in the lower parts of the development to the floor levels of the retained facades. This of necessity increases the scale of development (floor to ceiling heights are more generous on lower floors); however, the final datum conforms in general terms.
- 5.52 And as demonstrated by the views analysis, the impacts will be relatively limited by the geometry and alignment of surrounding streets (where the townscape grain is generally tight) and by interposing development. In many situations the very fact that the proposals fill the site is beneficial, because the new building would occlude views of unattractive party walls and flanks which were never intended to be seen.
- 5.53 The maximal view position is from the junction of Great Eastern Street and Charlotte Road, over a relatively limited area which is more open as a result of the geometry of the former avenue. Here is the greatest effect on the setting of the retained frontages.
- 5.54 The design at this point has been shaped by this townscape view, and the separate parts of the development are intended both to reduce the scale effect of transition and to provide a pleasing architectural composition. Overall the perimeter of the development is brick clad, and making use of the language of the brick and internal framed building.
- 5.55 Thus, in Leonard Street, what is proposed is a relatively neutral backcloth with regular openings, a masonry building, apparently, with holes formed in it, and smaller details relieving that bulk. This is the very same approach taken in the design of many speculative warehouse buildings, and indeed some very good examples in Leonard Street. These were studied during the design development process.
- 5.56 That building returns to Great Eastern Street, and complements the retained facades. A separate 'piece' or brick range angles into the site from the east, corner building, forming an entrance area. This device creates a sense of event in the conservation area, one suitable for the use (which is publicly accessible). That piece also reinforces the prevailing material of the area and complements the facing materials of the retained façade.
- 5.57 Sitting beside that brick architecture reflecting local precedent, is another architectural language, a simpler and more overtly contemporary one of a limited palette entailing fair faced concrete and louvres.
- 5.58 The design as a whole works from the combination of these two parts, their proportions, and their materials. One palette, the brick, reinforces the prevailing character of the area. The other palette (concrete, metal and glass) is different but no

less appropriate in an area of varied character that includes notable contemporary designed interventions. This is not a staid or traditional historic area, but one with a dynamic architectural quality and a dynamism and excitement arising from its vitality and uses.

- 5.59 This approach, which does not seek to mask or camouflage the intervention, is true to the spirit of the area.
- 5.60 At different points, the two different approaches, taken together with the retained facades, produces a dramatic and interesting composition in its own right.
- 5.61 The use and its expression at ground floor will add to street vitality, and as a result the whole will improve the way the area appears and functions.

6.0 ASSESSMENT AGAINST POLICY

6.1 In this concluding section the statement considers the proposals against statutory provision, development plan policy and material considerations, including PPS5.

A) Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

6.2 For the reasons set out in Section 4, the proposals preserve the special interest of the conservation area; indeed, this assessment concludes that the CA's character and appearance are enhanced, exceeding the statutory minimum.

6.3 Preservation is achieved by development which has suitable scale, materials, and architectural expression. And it is also achieved by the retention of elements which make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

6.4 Furthermore the site, which currently detracts from the appearance of the area and contributes nothing to its character, is brought back into beneficial use. The site has been an eyesore in a prominent location in an important conservation area in the City fringe for many years, and the proposals represent an integrated solution to that by recognising what is special from a heritage perspective.

6.5 Furthermore and additionally, and staying with statutory provision, the form of the development, its scale and position, ensures the preservation of the setting of the refurbished listed building, satisfying Section 76 of the 1990 Act.

6.6 Section 16, on listed building consents, is set aside because of the special interest of the building and any features of note are preserved.

B) The London Plan

6.7 Although The London Plan is strategic and so contains no detailed policies applicable to the determination to these consents, it should be noted that it identifies the City fringe, including Shoreditch, as an Opportunity Area. This provides the context for the application of other relevant policies, and also for national policies, bearing in mind the importance of the City fringe for the support it can provide to the financial and business services sector to the south of the City and also to the clusters of economic activity, including creative industries, which are found in abundance in south Shoreditch.

6.8 Furthermore the development accords with Policies 7.8.C, in as much as it conserves, restores, reuses and incorporates heritage assets into a new development, providing them with a sustainable future and use through design characteristics that are entirely appropriate to their special interest.

C) Core Strategy

- 6.9 In relation to Policy 3, specifically on the south Shoreditch City fringe, the proposals balance the objectives of economic development and heritage protection by protecting and enhancing the historic environment and by encouraging development in locations which support the creative industries that contribute to the special interest of the Conservation Area. Other aspects of this policy are dealt with by DP9 in their Planning Statement.
- 6.10 At Para 4.23 the Core Strategy seeks development which would strengthen south Shoreditch's position as a destination which is characterized by, *inter alia*, its heritage. The positive approach taken towards heritage assets on the site, including the proposals for the Griffin pub, achieves the objectives outlined in the supporting text.
- 6.11 Similarly, Policy 25 of the Core Strategy is satisfied because the proposals restore important heritage features in a conservation area, enhancing the area's historic significance and the significance of the individual assets, both designated and undesignated. Thus the proposals respect the importance of the wider historic environment, its special interest, and the general attractiveness of this area.

D) South Shoreditch Conservation Area Appraisal

- 6.12 The significant parts of numbers 61 and 63 are retained, reflecting their status and importance as "buildings of townscape merit" identified in Figure 21 of the Conservation Area Appraisal.
- 6.13 The appraisal recognises that, quite apart from being an area of historic interest, south Shoreditch has a role to play in the economic and social future of the wider City. The proposals reconcile any potential conflict between these two competing objectives by positively embracing the historic environment and its character within the proposed development.
- 6.14 The proposals achieve the area appraisal objectives by taking properties which are in a semi-derelict state and so make a negative contribution to the area and in turning them into positive features improving the quality of the streetscape on Great Eastern Street, which is a major thoroughfare in the area.
- 6.15 In this way the character of the area, which includes larger 4 and 5 storey retail and warehouse buildings lining principal boulevards, will be retained. The proposals also provide activity to the hinterland of Great Eastern Street and that irregular grid of smaller streets and lanes, introducing vitality and an appropriate scale of development. Thus, characteristics identified at 1.3.2 are reflected in the development.

- 6.16 For these reasons, the unified streetscape characteristic of the area, and in particular of this sub-area, is respected and reinstated. This reinforces the collective contribution made by older building stock, by means of a new building which reveals its defining characteristics (the brick pier warehouse type).

E) Hackney South Shoreditch Supplementary Planning Document

- 6.17 The proposals provide a comprehensive approach to land bounded by Great Eastern Street, Leonard and Ravey Streets, an opportunity identified in the south Shoreditch Supplementary Planning Document at Figure 3 Appendix 1. They answer the objectives of infill development by enhancing the visual quality of district. This is, in fact, a site that has been an eyesore for many years, and so the proposals provide a very significant contribution to the visual amenity of the area.
- 6.18 Thus those policies, and the advice in the SPD, which are based on the then current PPG5 15 Guidance and PPS1 Guidance on the use of previously developed land, are fully satisfied.
- 6.19 The consistent scale of significant townscape particularly at Great Eastern Street is respected in full by the proposals.

F) Saved Policy, UDP

- 6.20 Turning now to Saved UDP Policies, we have the following observations.
- 6.21 The Council's policy EQ13 on demolition in conservation areas is fully satisfied. The significant aspects of the buildings that justify their identification as positive contributors to the character of the CA are fully respected, repaired and incorporated into the new development, thus continuing the positive contribution which the buildings make to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 6.22 The proposals also satisfy Part B of the policy because the proposed replacement building on this vacant site both preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 6.23 EQ17 which seeks the conservation and reuse of listed buildings is fully satisfied by the proposals in respect of the Griffin Pub. The application of this policy deserves particular weight in the decision making process because the building is formally identified as one being at risk by English Heritage. When implemented, the proposals would result in the removal of this building from the At Risk Register.
- 6.24 Policy EQ18, seeking the preservation of the setting of listed buildings, has also been fully satisfied by virtue of the scale of development, its position and height at certain points relative to the listed building, and the use of complimentary materials. Furthermore the proposals provide a secure future use for the whole of the building, including the upper parts. And by bringing derelict land on the doorstep of the pub

into intensive and beneficial use, the commercial attractiveness of the pub unit will be increased.

G) PPS 5, Planning For the Historic Environment

- 6.25 The proposals are fully compliant with PPS5. The design has been informed by an understanding of the special characteristics of the surrounding area and in particular by this part of the area, all of which are included within the important conservation area. Furthermore a historic buildings appraisal has informed the approach to the detailed proposals for the pub as set out in new listed building consent application. The approach to the sensitivities of the listed building and the retained facades has been enhanced through engineering analysis. The application is supported by technical information which demonstrates that the development can be implemented without any risk to either the standing fabric or to the retention of the facades.
- 6.26 It is accepted that a more detailed method statement would be required, and such is normally secured through a condition on conservation area consent and planning permission which would be anticipated here.
- 6.27 Thus the significance of the South Shoreditch Conservation Area, the whole of it, and this part of it, is conserved by the proposals. More than that, the proposals better reveal that significance through refurbishment and appropriate new design, and through the optimisation of the use of the Griffin Public House.
- 6.28 This assessment has considered how the advice set out in HE9 is applicable to these proposals. It has done so on the basis that what is proposed might, technically, be described as substantial demolition, but in fact does not result in the total removal of significant elements from the site. Therefore, and applying the advice in HE9, such harm that may arise from the removal of rear and party walls of utilitarian character must of necessity be extremely limited, and is decisively out-weighted in this case by benefits to the retained elements, the wider heritage benefits, and the general improvement in the character of the area, the way it appears, and the way it functions all of which, are consequent upon the new development.

Conclusions

- 6.29 We find much to recommend in these proposals. They deliver very substantial heritage benefits of weight and significant heritage benefits.
- 6.30 A significant heritage benefit is the refurbishment and reuse of the public house which is on the At Risk Register. The weight to be given to this benefit is increased by that building's presence on the At Risk Register.
- 6.31 The proposals also entail the refurbishment of significant townscape features in the older warehouse properties, numbers 61 and 63 Great Eastern Street.

- 6.32 The architecture of the proposed new development better reveals the characteristics of the conservation area and in addition adds a different architectural language which is appropriate and of intrinsic interest. The combination of all the new elements in the proposals is particularly striking, and satisfies the intention of National Planning Policy advice in cases such as this.
- 6.33 Therefore, and reflecting only on heritage planning considerations, this assessment concludes that the proposals are fully compliant with statutory provision, development plan policy, and material considerations including PPS5 and locally adopted supplementary planning documents.