

Summary of Responses Pitfield Street Conservation Area Review 2021

Respondent ID	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
PSCA01		05/06/2021	0.01	Support the proposals to designate Pitfield Street Conservation Area	Noted
PSCA02		05/06/2021	0.01	Support the proposals to designate Pitfield Street Conservation Area	Noted.
			0.02	Has concerns on the accuracy of the histoic information on some of the buildings	The consultation is currently a draft and all comments will be acted upon where inaccuracies are identified.
PSCA03		08/06.2021	0.01	Welcomes the well researched appraisal	Noted.
			0.02	Requests further information on Aske House, Fanshaw Street, Finn House, Bevenden St, Haberdasher Estate, Haberdasher St	The properties are outside of the Conservation Area and are not considered suitable for inclusion within the area as they are not considered to be of sufficient architectural and historic interest.
			0.03	Questions whether 6 Charles Square and the Prince Arthur on Brunswick Place were considered for inclusion within the Conservation Area	Consideration was given to including both 16 Charles Square and the Prince Arthur on Brunswick Place. However, ultimately it was felt that the boundary would have become overly stretched including a large section of buildings and streetscape to the Conservation Area. Moreover, 16 Charles Square as a Grade II listed building is already protected in its own right under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990.
			0.04	Questions why the proposal for Pitfield Street are seperate from the South Shoreditch Conservation Area?	Although geographically they are practically contiguous the character is considered to be quite distinctive with larger buildings generally located within the SSCA and a stronger link to the furniture trade. Pitfield Street is more domestic and historically residential in character; for example, the terraces on Buttesland Street are a good example of the type of properties that once occupied this area.
PSCA04		11/06/2021	0.01	Support the proposals to designate Pitfield Street Conservation Area	Noted.
PSCA05		11/06/2021	0.01	Support the proposals to designate Pitfield Street Conservation Area	Noted.
PSCA06		17/06/2021	0.01	Does not support the designngation of Pitfield Street Conservation Area.	Noted.
			0.02	Concern London is full of badly made 18th/19th century houses and that there is nothing in Hackney worth preserving.	The properties within Pitfield Street are considered to be good examples of their age and worthy of conservation area designation as first noted within the 2017 Conservation Area Review Study.
			0.03	Concern over lack of climate change adaption	The designation of the area as a CA is not designed to prevent climate change adaption measures but instead designed to ensure change is managed in a sensitvie manner to ensure the significance of the buildings and areas are preserved.
			0.04	The buildings are not of architectural value and new modern buildings should be constructed.	Disagree, the appraisal demonstrates that these buildings are of suffieint architectural and historic interest to warrent conservation area designation.
PSCA07			0.01	Requested whether their building was being prosed for demolition as it reported to be in a state of disrepair	It is not clear what building this refers to but the proposed designation of the Pitfield Street CA does not propose to demolish any buildings. This would require a planning application and undergo public consultation.
PSCA08		18/06/2021	0.01	Support the proposals to designate Pitfield Street Conservation Area	Noted.
			0.02	Suggest that Fanshaw House should be included within the Conservation Area.	The properties are outside of the Conservation Area and are not considered suitable for inclusion within the area as they are not considered to be of sufficient architectural and historic interest.
			0.03	The spacious parkland in front of Royal Oak Court, fronting Pitfield Street and well planted with mature London plane trees, also merits inclusion.	Consideration for including the spacious parkland into the Conservation Area however whilst this contributes to the verdant character of the conservation area it is not considered to have sufficuent historic and architectural interest to be included within the area. Historically this area was characterised by victorian terraced houses.
PSCA09		21/06/2021	0.01	Support the proposals to designate Pitfield Street Conservation Area	Noted.
PSCA10		21/06/2021	0.01	Requests details on how this will impact Fairchild House	The designation will mean that
PSCA11		22/06/2021	0.01	Support the proposals to designate Pitfield Street Conservation Area	Noted.
PSCA12	Historic England: GLAAS	29/06/2021	0.01	St John the Baptist churchyard is a Tier 2 APA, CA from Old Street to Ashford St is in a Tier 2 APA.	The appraisal has been updated.
			0.02	This CA is crossed by the projected course of London's Civil War defences. Old Street is widely considered (though not yet convincingly proved) to be Roman or pre-Roman.	The appraisal has been updated.

Summary of Responses Pitfield Street Conservation Area Review 2021

Respondent ID	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
			0.03	Might be worth robustly tackling the internet history tale that there is a C17 Plague Pit here. One is recorded near City Road for sure, but a blogger inferred that Pitfield mean field of the (plague) pit and then made the council put up a plaque, despite having no other evidence. Pitfield being the name of a known local grandee and landowner from the Dorset Pitfield family is perhaps a more convincing explanation.	Noted. Whilst this has been referenced online the appraisal is not considered a suitable vehicle to dispel this myth.
PSCA13				Support the proposals to designate Pitfield Street Conservation Area	Noted.
				Believe that certain parts of the proposed boundary of the conservation area (the "Boundary") ought to be expanded to include architecturally significant and attractive streetscapes in its immediate vicinity.	Noted. The boundary closely follows the recommendations as set out in the 2017 CARS review study. The proposed extensions are discussed in more detail below.
				The Council has set out detailed factual context justifying the designation of the conservation area in the appraisal and management plan published as part of the Consultation (the "Plan").	Noted.
				There is a pressing need for greater protection of the built heritage of the area	Noted.
				(i) Suggested changes on Charles Square and Brunswick Place The clearest case for extension of the Boundary is to encompass Charles Square and Brunswick Place. These areas are adjacent to Pitfield Street, and "face towards" it in that they have a historical contiguity with the commercial life of Pitfield Street. Already in John Rocque's 1746 map, it can clearly be seen that the Charles Square forms a major part of the Pitfield Street suburb (see Figure 4.1), and the same is true in Richard Horwood's 1799 map, both of Charles Square and Brunswick Place (then Craven Buildings – see Figure 4.2). They also feature some of Pitfield Street's most interesting architectural heritage.	Consideration was given to including both 16 Charles Square and the Prince Arthur on Brunswick Place. However, ultimately it was felt that the boundary would have become overly stretched including a large section of buildings and streetscape to the Conservation Area. Moreover, 16 Charles Square as a Grade II listed building is already protected in its own right under s.66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990.
				16 Charles Square: The only remaining house from the original layout of Charles Square, this mid-18th century house is Grade II* listed, and stands as key evidence of the economic character of the area in that century as a fashionable and wealthy suburb. It also bears witness to the civic life of the area, as it later functioned for some time as the Shoreditch County courthouse.	Consideration was given to including the Grade II* listed 16 Charles Square. However, owing to its location, within a Square surrounded by buildings that would negatively contribute to the character and appearance of conservation area it was not considered suitable for inclusion. Moreover, the building is considered to have suitable protection under s.66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990. This also follows the recommendations as set out in the 2017 CARS review study.
				Prince Arthur pub: A pub has been operating at this address since at least the mid-19th century. This well-proportioned purpose-built public house is locally listed. Its ground floor protrudes further into the street than the neighbouring buildings, which makes it a clearly visible landmark from both Charles Square and Brunswick Place, and serves to unite the two spaces visually. The back of the pub is visible from the southwest corner of Chart Street, and presents an attractive and surprising yellow brick wall among more modern buildings	Consideration was given to including the Prince Arthur Public House within the boundary of the conservation area. However, owing to extensive changes in built fabric between Pitfield Street and the public house it was not considered that a boundary extension of this extent was justified. This also follows the recommendations as set out in the 2017 CARS review study.
				16 Brunswick Place: This recently-refurbished building was once the Catherine Street School. It is a fine example of a London School Board schoolhouse, and it features a distinctive large bay on the first three floors on the south side looking down towards Old Street. It is locally listed.	Consideration was given to including the 16 Brunswick Place within the boundary of the conservation area. However, owing to extensive changes in built fabric between Pitfield Street and Brunswick Place it was not considered appropriate. Moreover, there have been extensive changes to Brunswick Place which mean that the character and appearance is quite distinctive to that of the proposed Pitfield Street Conservation Area. This also follows the recommendations as set out in the 2017 CARS review study.
				20-26 Brunswick Place: Just a few addresses down from the schoolhouse, this is an airy Victorian warehouse with interesting door, window and wall detailing on the exterior.	Consideration was given to including the 20-26 Brunswick Place within the boundary of the conservation area. However, owing to extensive changes in built fabric between Pitfield Street and Brunswick Place it was not considered appropriate. Moreover, there have been extensive changes to Brunswick Place which mean that the character and appearance is quite distinctive to that of the proposed Pitfield Street Conservation Area. This also follows the recommendations as set out in the 2017 CARS review study.

Summary of Responses Pitfield Street Conservation Area Review 2021

Respondent ID	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
				Touchard House: This council block was built in the early 1950s in the place of buildings that suffered bomb damage during the War. It has a number of distinctive features, including the L-shape of its structure, wrapped around a garden, and the covered passage penetrating the joint of the "L" diagonally, and containing pram sheds for residents. This passage, as well as the pedestrian alley running down the east side of Touchard House and the view of the Prince Arthur to the southwest, visually unite Chart Street with Charles Square.	Consideration for including Touchard House within the Conservation Area was given. However, the building is considered to make a negative/neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation area where it fails to relate in planform, materiality and architecture to the wider conservation area. As such the recommendation is to draw a tightly, well defined boundary. This also follows the recommendations as set out in the 2017 CARS review study.
				Bevenden Street, to the northwest of the Boundary, is a narrow tree-lined street, the eastern extreme of which falls within the Boundary. This street has a number of interesting properties on it, set out in Figure 4.10, and discussed in further detail below. Given its proximity to the conservation area and the contiguity of atmosphere and streetscape between this area and the adjacent streets within the conservation area, it is appropriate to include it within the conservation area also.	Noted. However, upon review the properties of Bevenden whilst of some interest are not considered sufficient enough to warrant inclusion within the Pitfield Street Conservation Area. This also follows the recommendations as set out in the 2017 CARS review study.
				Finn House: This attractive 1937 apartment block was designed by Noel Sheffield, a longstanding partner of Stock Page Stock, who acted frequently for the Haberdasher's Company in respect of their landholdings here and elsewhere. The brick construction, projecting bays at each end, and the protruding staircases on either side of the centre, give it a grand lateral symmetry that echoes more famous buildings of that era, including particularly Cambridge University Library and the Bankside Power Station by Giles Gilbert Scott. The building to the immediate west, also called Finn House, is built in a distinct style but with clear reflections of the eastern building.	Whilst Finn House is considered to have some heritage value this is low level and is not considered to positively contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area and is considered to make a neutral contribution and as such it is considered suitable for inclusion within the CA. The proposed boundary follows the recommendations as set out in the 2017 CARS review study.
				21 Bevenden St and Fullwood's Mews: 21 Bevenden Street is a locally listed Edwardian former pub. The external decoration of the building is unusual: its corners are decorated with pink granite pilasters, while the ground floor front features two shallow oriel windows directly adjacent to each other. Behind it sits Fullwood's Mews, which contains an attractive, apparently Victorian warehouse still in commercial use, as well as a number of appealing mews houses.	21 Bevenden St and Fullwood's Mews are of architectural and historic interest as can be demonstrated by the local listing. However, owing to their location set away from the main conservation area and the extent of redevelopment between them and Pitfield Street they are not considered suitable for inclusion within the Conservation Area.
				Regmar House: Also known as Bevenden House or 3 Haberdasher Street, this locally listed building has hosted a number of businesses, including notably the now-defunct courier firm Lewis Day. It is built in a distinctive interwar style: the broad sweep of its front and large circular windows are an attractive example of streamline moderne, which echoes other streamline-influenced buildings in the area, such as Fairchild House and Aske House (see below). A recent renovation of the building resulted in the restoration of an old clock from the building to the Haberdasher Street entrance.	Regmar House is of architectural and historic interest as can be demonstrated by the local listing. However, owing to its location set away from the main conservation area and the extent of redevelopment between them and Pitfield Street they are not considered suitable for inclusion within the Conservation Area. The proposed boundary follows the recommendations as set out in the 2017 CARS review study.
				Aske House: This block of flats sits directly opposite Fairchild House, and was built only shortly afterwards in 1952. Like Fairchild House, its balconies evoke streamline moderne. Sharing this feature with Fairchild House, but combining it with a smaller scale and different colour of brick, Aske House serves as a visual counterpoint and gives balance to the streetscape.	Aske House is similar to Fairchild House but lacks the architectural detail and refinement. As such it is not considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the area sufficiently to be included within the Pitfield Street CA.
				Consideration for including the warehouses on the north side of Corsham Street was given. However, owing to their location set away from the main conservation area and the extent of redevelopment between them and Pitfield Street they are not considered suitable for inclusion within the Conservation Area. The boundary follows the recommendations in the 2017 CARS study.	Noted, these buildings are under consideration for inclusion within the Hoxton Street CA.
PSCA14	Historic England		0.01	Historic England welcomes the proposal to designate a Pitfield Street Conservation Area in accordance with the requirement to maintain an up to date evidence base for the historic environment and to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. The Appraisal and Management Plan is clear and well-structured and, particularly in the statement of significance, makes a cogent case for the designation of a conservation area focused on Pitfield Street based on special architectural and historic interest.	Noted.
			0.02	The appraisal should reference the APAs	The appraisal will be updated to reflect this.
			0.03	Suggests explore the addition of Aske House within the conservation area.	Aske House is similar to Fairchild House but lacks the architectural detail and refinement. As such it is not considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the area sufficiently to be included within the Pitfield Street CA.
			0.04	Suggests explore the addition of the locally listed Academy Buildings within the conservation area.	As demonstrated by the fact the buildings are locally listed they are of architectural and historic interest however owing to the proximity to the Hoxton Street Conservation Area they are under consideration for inclusion within this area.

Summary of Responses Pitfield Street Conservation Area Review 2021

Respondent ID	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
			0.05	Suggests explore the addition of Enfield Cloisters within the conservation area.	The council is considering the inclusion of the Enfield Buildings within the Hoxton Street CA and Locally Listing.
			0.06	Consideration should be given to expanding the detailed on the post-war green space within the management plan.	The appraisal will be updated to reflect this.
			0.07	Recomends additional detail to the conditions and threats by building typology	Noted. Additional details has been provided however owing to the varied and diverse nature of the area it has not been divided into typologies as the treats are similar throughout.
			0.08	Minor observations on spelling mistakes were also provided.	The appraisal has been updated.
PSCA15			0.01	Support the proposals to designate Pitfield Street Conservation Area	Noted.
			0.02	Recomended the curation of shops on Haberdasher Place is looked into and the signage updated to be more in keeping within the CA.	The designation of a conservation area does not have the power to change shopfronts, however when an application is submitted within these it will undergo careful scrutiny to ensure that it preserves/enhance the character and apperance of the CA.
PSCA16		30/06/2021	0.01	Support the proposals to designate Pitfield Street Conservation Area	Noted.
			0.02	Suggest that the area should be extended to include the old Victorian warehouses on the north side of Corsham Street	Consideration for including the warehouses on the north side of Corsham Street was given. However,
PSCA17		30/06/2021	0.01	In relation to 90-92 Bevenden Street you will observe that there has been enormous development on the street and especially directly opposite where the view was of the church , and is now blocked by an eight story block with a roof terrace.	Noted. Although granted prior to CA designation this application has to consider the setting of the Grade II* listed church.
			0.02	We all appreciate the was need for denser living in the area but I would remind the council that planning permission was obtained in respect of 90-92 Bevenden Street. for what are essential investments and changes to make the building economically viable and worth conserving and investing in going forward.	Noted.
			0.03	For personal and financial reasons this planning permission was not acted on within the required time and has now lapsed but I ask to be considered that given the developments abutting and opposite the site that have been permitted AND BUILT since, special mention should be made that whilst following adoption of the conservation zone, and since this building will be then sited within more restrictive planning restrictions, it would be iniquitous to not automatically extend this lapsed permission for necessary refurbishments and reasonable extension and investment , as was previously granted.	Noted. However, the designation of the Conservation Area will require that any future applications will have to ensure that they preserve or enhance the character and apperance.
			0.04	Your report describes on page 27 the windows to the building at 90-92 Bevenden Street as "good quality critical style", whilst having being sufficient (we believe)to meet relevant legal standards, many of the apertures are seized, all are single glazed, most are decrepit and whilst nobody would want ugly jarring modern UPVC windows, the council must appreciate that the building needs to provide good shelter to a modern standard, and the costs of upgrading these windows as needed for modern comfort and environmetal needs, comes at an enormous cost which was it hoped would be defrayed by a concomitant return from investment as outlined in the now lapsed planning permission.	The designation of the area as a conservation area does not prevent the replacement windows. Any future application should look to preserve or enhance the character of the CA e.g. replacement windows in a similar style.
			0.05	Putting this building in aspic and not allowing the permission to be noted favourably by your plan, may ultimately do this building , which as you note, makes a positive contribution, a great disservice by making the necessary investment m ore difficult which ultimatly would fund the needed remedial works including replacing the critical windows with sensitive substitutes, and doing other works to make the building (which is an original industrial building with little accommodation to modern standards of accommodation) suitable for continued use .	The designation of the Pitfield Conservation Area does not preserve the building is aspic, it is about managing the process of change to ensure that the special interest of the area is preserved/enhanced.
PSCA18		30/06/2021	0.01	Support the proposals to designate Pitfield Street Conservation Area	Noted.