PREFACE

Since the designation of the first conservation areas in 1967, the City Council has undertaken a comprehensive programme of conservation area designation, extensions and policy development. There are now 54 conservation areas in Westminster, covering 76% of the City. These conservation areas are the subject of detailed policies in the Unitary Development Plan and in Supplementary Planning Guidance. In addition to the basic activity of designation and the formulation of general policy, the City Council is required to undertake conservation area appraisals and to devise local policies in order to protect the unique character of each area.

Although this process was first undertaken with the various designation reports, more recent national guidance (as found in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 and the English Heritage Conservation Area Appraisals and Conservation Area Management documents) requires detailed appraisals of each conservation area in the form of formally approved and published documents. This enhanced process involves the review of original designation procedures and boundaries; analysis of historical development; identification of all listed buildings and those unlisted buildings making a positive contribution to an area; and the identification and description of key townscape features, including street patterns, trees, open spaces and building types.

Given the number and complexity of Westminster’s conservation areas, the appraisal process has been broken down into three stages, the first of which is complete. The first stage involved the publication of General Information Leaflets or mini-guides for each conservation area, covering in brief a series of key categories including Designation, Historical Background, Listed Buildings and Key Features.

The second stage involved the production of Conservation Area Directories for each conservation area. A Directory has now been adopted for 51 of the City’s conservation areas and includes copies of designation reports, a detailed evaluation of the historic development of the area and analysis of listed buildings and key townscape features.

The City is now working on a programme to prepare Conservation Area Audits for each of its conservation areas. This will form the third and final stage of the appraisal process. As each audit is adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance, it will incorporate the Directory for that conservation area.
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INTRODUCTION

1.1 Conservation Areas are areas of special architectural and historic interest, the character and appearance of which is it desirable to preserve and enhance. They are areas which are recognisable for their distinctive and interesting townscape.

1.2 The City Council has a statutory duty to review the character and boundaries of its conservation areas. This Audit is the third, and final stage of a review process. The overall appraisal strategy is based upon the English Heritage publications Conservation Area Appraisals and Conservation Area Management.

1.3 The Audit describes both the historical development, and character and appearance of the conservation area. It is designed to identify and explain important local features such as unlisted buildings of merit, unbroken roof lines and local views. In addition the audit also seeks to apply relevant Unitary Development Plan policies to the local context in order to preserve and/or enhance the character and appearance of the area (see below).

1.4 The first stage (Mini-guide) and second stage (Directory) documents have already been adopted. The Mini-guide is a leaflet which provides a brief description of the area and its characteristics. The Directory provided a detailed source of factual information such as listed building descriptions. This has now been incorporated as part of the Audit providing an Appendix of factual information.

1.5 The Conservation Area Audit for Hanway Street was adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Customer Service on 23 March 2006. The Hanway Street Conservation Area was designated in September 1989. The designation reports can be found in the Directory, Section 1, at the back of this document. This Audit describes the character and appearance of the Hanway Street Conservation Area at the date of adoption.

The draft replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP) as agreed by full Council 13th December 2004, along with the UDP which was adopted in July 1997, is the statutory document setting out planning policies for developing land, improving transport and protecting the environment in Westminster. Relevant policies from the replacement UDP are referred to throughout the audit.
2 CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARIES

2.1 The Hanway Street Conservation Area is situated to the eastern periphery of the City of Westminster. From the western point of Perry’s Place, the Conservation Area follows the northern front of Oxford Street to include a short stretch of the Tottenham Court Road. The area abuts the boundary with the London Borough of Camden and includes the arced thoroughfare of Hanway Street, as well as the southern end of Rathbone Place.

2.2 London Borough of Camden first invited Westminster City Council to consider the area bounded by Hanway Street/Tottenham Court Road/Oxford Street in 1988. Camden’s proposals for a Bloomsbury Conservation Area included Hanway Place and north Hanway Street, and Westminster’s Soho Conservation Area covered the south side of Oxford Street. However, borough and conservation area boundaries excluded the remainder of Hanway Street and the Oxford Street/Tottenham Court Road frontages, which were also considered to be of value. Westminster considered the Conservation Area boundary should be extended to include the south end of Rathbone Place as Camden’s Charlotte Street Conservation Area and Westminster’s Charlotte Street West cover the north and eastern edges of this street. The current boundaries of the conservation area are shown below.

Figure 1: Boundaries of the Hanway Street Conservation Area
3 HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT

3.1 The Hanway Street Conservation Area lies within the boundaries of the ancient marsh and forested county of Middlesex and the Hundred of Ossulton. It is also located within the eastern extremity of the Parish of St Marylebone, which derives its name from the small ‘bourne’ (a Saxon word for brook) that used to run to the west of Oxford Street. A church dedicated to the Virgin Mary was sited at the brook and named ‘Mary at the Bourne’, which was later corrupted to ‘Marylebone’.

3.2 Through the Middle Ages and Tudor period, the vicinity around the Conservation Area remained largely as undeveloped marshland, although it came under the ownership of various religious foundations including the Leper Hospital of St Giles in 1110 and Burton St Lazar in 1354. With the Dissolution of the Monasteries in 1536, Henry VIII disposed of the land and it eventually came to the Berners family in the 17th century. At this time little existed in this area other than a few scattered plots around Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road. An ancient lane cutting between these followed the line of what is now Hanway Street.

3.3 The beginning of the 18th century saw London’s West End become increasingly fashionable, and the first planned development around the Conservation Area began with the building of the small Berners Estate to the north of Oxford Street in 1718. This was centred around Berners Street and Rathbone Place, in what now forms the eastern half of the conservation area. A principal builder on the Berners Estate was Thomas Rathbone, who gave his name to Rathbone Place. A stone let into the wall at the east corner with Oxford Street is inscribed ‘Rathbone’s Place, 1718’.

3.4 Another stone, laid at No. 4 Hanway Street dated from 1721, and the first written record of the street appears in the Overseer’s Survey of 1723. The street name is likely to have derived from Thomas Hanway, a commissioner of the Royal Navy, although the exact provenance is unknown.

3.5 In 1739, a Marylebone gardener named Thomas Huddle extended the Berners’ development along the Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road frontages. Gradually the Tyburn Road evolved into a developed urban street, which became known as Oxford Road (later Oxford Street) when the Earl of Oxford purchased some of the fields to the west in the late 18th century.

3.6 Rocque’s Map (Figure 2) indicates that by 1746 the east corner of the conservation area had been completely developed, including Rathbone Place, Hanway Street, east Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road.

3.7 During the mid 18th century, Rathbone Place extended as far north as the Merchant’s Water Works, with the Black Horse Stable Yard extending eastwards; and the houses to the west overlooking the open ground beyond. At this time, the area was home to affluent middle classes and J. T Smith said of Rathbone Place c. 1750: ‘it entirely consisted of private houses and its inhabitants were all of high
The young sculptor Joseph Flaxman lived at No. 17 Rathbone Place.

Figure 2: John Roque’s Plan of the Cities of London & Westminster, 1746
(Copyright, Westminster City Archives)

By the mid 18th century, Hanway Street and the Oxford Street/Tottenham Court Road frontages had also been developed and the Black Boar Inn (later the Boar and Castle) was established on east Oxford Street. At this time, buildings along Hanway Street consisted of lace shops and other establishments selling luxury items, with residential premises above. Given the close proximity to the major cross-roads of Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road, as well as the nearby stable facilities in Black Horse Yard, a large number of coaching inns had also established themselves here. The builder William Baker was a resident of Hanway Street at the time he laid the first stone in Baker Street in 1755.

Horwood’s Map (Figure 3), 1799, shows larger individual plots on the south side of the street, with a void between them and Oxford Street. The Star Brewery has been established along Oxford Street, which consists of a number of small-scale shops. The Tottenham Pub, No. 6 Oxford Street, has occupied the same site since at least 1826 and was originally named ‘the Flying Horse’; the street number was originally No. 2, but this was changed in 1882. Both Roque’s and Horwood’s maps show a line of six plots along Tottenham Court road, separated from Oxford Street by a small alleyway named Bozier’s Court.

1 Beresford Chancellor, E London’s Old Latin Quarter; Being an Account of Tottenham Court Road and its Immediate Surroundings London, 1930 p. 214
However these were demolished in the late 19th century, when the present frontage was established.

Figure 3: Horwood’s Plan of the Cities of London & Westminster, 1799
(Copyright, Westminster City Archives)

3.10 The last fifty years of the 18th century continued the trend of intense development throughout the Conservation Area. In the 19th century Rathbone Place was redeveloped to consist of small-scale, semi-industrial and warehouse buildings; in 1817, forty shops were recorded to exist here. Narrow as Hanway Street was, by the 19th century it had become a busy thoroughfare that formed the direct route from the west to Bloomsbury; and in 1841 it was widened by six foot^2^.

3.11 The Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road frontages were comprehensively rebuilt between 1850 and 1920, and very little survives from the earlier phases of development. The rebuilding was to accommodate the boom in commerce, retail and entertainment of that period. The plots along the south side of Hanway Street were also demolished, to make way for the expanding developments along Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road.

3.12 The large red brick corner building, built by Saville & Martin in 1892, is architecturally linked to the Tottenham Pub (originally named The Flying Horse) at No. 6. The Flying Horse used to serve theatre goers from the nearby Oxford

^2^ A stone let into the wall along the Hanway Street front of No. 46 Oxford Street is inscribed: ‘This part of the Street was widened 6ft in the year 1841 at the joint expense of Lieu. Co. Rowles and E. H. Baldock, the ground having been given for that purpose by E. H. Baldock’
Music Hall, one of the first music halls in London. The Oxford Music Hall, no. 14-16 Oxford Street, was built on the site of the old Boar and Castle in 1861, with a lesser front along the Tottenham Court Road. After a series of fires it was rebuilt in 1892 and became the Tottenham Street Theatre in 1917. The building was demolished in 1929 and the site filled with the vast Lyons Oxford Corner House c. 1930, which could accommodate up to 2,500 diners. This vast building now houses the Virgin Megastore.

3.13 These main thoroughfares of Oxford Street and the Tottenham Court Road have continued to flourish as retail centres, although commercial and entertainment activities have dwindled.

Figure 4: Hanway Street in 1950, looking northward from Oxford Street (Copyright, Westminster City Archives)

3.14 During the 1950s, Hanway Street was still a popular thoroughfare but it started to experience a decline towards the end of the century. Today, the street houses an eclectic mix of shops, Spanish bars, and a language school, but has a rundown character with many of the buildings in need of renovation.

3.15 In Rathbone Place, many of the 19th century buildings still exist, interjected with post-war infill buildings; only No. 11 remains from the earliest phase of development in 1718-20. Other than the Black Horse pub and the Eagle Bar and Diner, the buildings provide office and retail space for commercial activities, although many are currently unoccupied.
4 CHARACTER OF THE CONSERVATION AREA

GENERAL

4.1 As a whole this is a lively area, with a prevailing urban character and mixed townscape. The Conservation Area can, however, be subdivided into three character areas: the frontages of Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road; the south end of Rathbone Place; and west and south Hanway Street.

4.2 Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road form part of major shopping and traffic arteries, which are two of London’s busiest roads. The characteristic atmosphere in these streets is vibrant, constantly full of the bustle of tourists, shoppers and commuters. Behind the main thoroughfares the atmosphere changes and the scale of buildings drops. Rathbone Place is a quieter retail and commercial thoroughfare, of a different scale and character to Oxford Street, and with a formal layout, yet diverse townscape. Hanway Street is a section of hinterland tucked behind Oxford Street, this part of the Conservation Area has an intimate character and charm, created by the narrow, curving streetscape and piecemeal way in which it has developed. In addition, Hanway Street offers a sudden respite from the hurried pace of Oxford Street.

Figure: 5
A section of Oxford Street

Figure 6: Rathbone Place

Figure 7: Hanway Street
HIERARCHY OF STREETS & OPEN SPACES

4.3 The historic street layout and the relationship of built form to open space define the overall framework of an area. Within this framework, the fine grain of the townscape, including sizes of plots and building lines are important in establishing the pattern and density of development. This has a significant impact on the character of an area, dictating the scale of development and level of enclosure or openness.

4.4 For the purposes of the conservation area audits, the Council has defined three categories of routes or spaces according to a combined analysis of their scale, level of enclosure and the function they perform within the area. These are: primary routes and spaces; secondary routes and spaces; intimate routes and spaces. Figure 8 shows the hierarchy of routes and spaces within the Conservation Area.

4.5 The Hanway Street Conservation Area is bounded to the south and east by the broad, busy thoroughfares of Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road. Both are primary routes. The route along Oxford Street originated as a Roman Highway that extended out of London to the west, commonly known as the Tyburn Road; this became one of the principle routes in and out of the City. It wasn’t until the Earl of Oxford purchased many of the surrounding fields that the road became the Oxford Road, and later Oxford Street. Today, Oxford Street remains as one of London’s busiest thoroughfares for pedestrians and traffic (see Negative Features below). The Tottenham Court Road remained a countrified highway until the mid 18th century, when architectural development prompted it to evolve into the important artery it is today. The Oxford Street/Tottenham Court Road junction is considered to be a ‘key node’ of the central London road network.

4.6 Rathbone Place forms the southern continuation of Charlotte Street, with the smaller thoroughfare of Upper Rathbone Place bearing away to the north-west. It is classified as a secondary route, which has a consistent but less congested flow of traffic. Despite being extensively redeveloped during the 19th century, the street pattern along Rathbone Place conforms with the 18th century layout – forming an important course north west from Oxford Street, parallel with Tottenham Court Road.

4.7 Classified as an intimate route, Hanway Street is a narrow arced thoroughfare linking the arteries of Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road. Although a written record of Hanway Street doesn’t exist until 1723, this is an ancient lane and the route probably existed here as early as 1600. The route has retained the historic curving street layout and is just wide enough for one car, with narrow pavements on either side. Northwards, the street turns into Hanway Place, Fitzrovia, which continues the pattern of small-scale buildings laid along narrow thoroughfares. This whole ‘backland’ development is a remarkable survival of this part of London and an area of considerable townscape interest.

Dominant street patterns should be respected and where historic patterns remain these should be protected and reflected in any proposed schemes. Policies DES1 A 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and DES 12 should be consulted.
Figure 8: Hierarchy of Streets in the Hanway Street Conservation Area
ARCHITECTURE

Overview

4.8 As outlined above, the Hanway Street Conservation Area can be divided into three distinctive parts, each with their own character and scale. In terms of its architecture, the area comprises an eclectic mix of styles, including Georgian, Victorian, Edwardian as well as some post war and modern in-fill buildings, which reflects the piecemeal nature of development and lack of formal planning within the area. The map at Figure 9 shows approximate buildings ages and types within the conservation area. The particular building types characteristic of each area are then described in turn below.

Figure 9

Oxford Street & Tottenham Court Road

4.9 Oxford Street has a varied streetscape, with buildings ranging in height from three to five storeys, all with shopfronts at street level. The defining character of this part of the conservation area is, however, established by large-scale late Victorian and Edwardian commercial buildings. These are punctuated by post war and modern infill resulting from the bomb damage of World War Two, as well as the remnants of earlier phases of development. The architecture therefore reflects the areas growth, and the expansion of retail shopping and popular entertainment that these streets became synonymous with at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century. The larger structures were purpose built commercial properties, and the lesser ones originated as residential buildings and were converted to commercial uses.
4.9 Along these frontages, which run from Perry’s Place to the eastern end of Hanway Street, the facades are constructed in a variety of materials and are embellished with a range of motifs to give visual interest and a distinctive character to their public side. At ground level, the buildings have modern and sometimes unsympathetic shopfronts, many of which bear little relation to the architecture of the building above (see negative features below). Although diverse in appearance, the mix of buildings creates an attractive frontage to these important shopping streets, which has retained some high quality examples of Edwardian commercial architecture.

Figure 10: A section of the Oxford Street frontage, showing the variety of architectural styles and building ages

4.10 From the corner with Hanway Street, the first two buildings along the Tottenham Court Road frontage are nos. 4 & 5, which are both mid 1990s commercial premises. No. 2-3 Tottenham Court Road is the lesser front of the Virgin Megastore (No. 14-16 Oxford Street), detailed below.

4.11 No. 1 Tottenham Court Road is a tall red brick building consisting of two bays and four storeys, with an additional storey within its elaborately shaped gable. Dated c. 1880, the third floor windows have coaded segmental arches, supported on brick pilasters, and with cast iron balconies. The gable has a central oriel window and is capped by a cast iron structure with a brass cupola.
4.12 No. 4 Oxford Street is the first building, on the corner with Tottenham Court Road, a large red brick and portland stone block in the ‘Free Flemish’ revival style, by Saville & Martin, 1892. Four storeys plus attic mansard, this building has stilted segmental headed windows with timber shashes. The Tottenham Pub at No. 6, is Grade II listed and is architecturally linked to No. 4, identifiable by a shaped gable to the upper floors and a steeply pitched slate roof. To the centre are recessed canted bay windows, and an altered plate-glass pubfront at ground level. The building has retained most of its original timber sash windows to the upper storeys, with different glazing bar patterns to the fanlights, set in Portland stone surrounds with decorative key stones.

4.13 The comparatively small No. 8 Oxford Street (Figure 13) dates from c. 1860, in yellow stock brick and with stucco detailing, possibly designed by Alfred Waterhouse (1830-1905)\(^3\). The building consists of three storeys, with triple round arched windows on each floor and a small attic with a central gabled dormer. No. 10 Oxford Street is in Portland stone with two bays to the first two storeys, beneath a dentil cornice. The top storey consists of three bays capped with decorative festoons. The street line jumps down to the small stucco-fronted No. 13, probably converted from domestic use.

\(^3\) Pevsner & Bradley, 1994
4.14 At No. 14-16 (Virgin Megastore) is a vast block, with a lesser front that reaches round to Tottenham Court Road (nos. 2-3). Originally one of Lyons’ Corner House restaurants, dated 1926-8 by F.J. Wills, the building has a classical white-faience front and giant broken-pediment aedicule.

4.15 No. 18 is also white faced, built in a ‘modern’ style c. 1955 with single metal casement windows on each of the five storeys. No. 20-22 is similarly minimalist, although in black reconstituted marble with a full height glazed bay over its four storeys. Again the building height drops with No. 24, which has two bays on three storeys. This stucco fronted, early 19th century building was probably converted from a Georgian residence, and is jammed between its modern neighbours. Nos. 26-32 designed by Fitzroy Robinson & Hubert H. Bull 1954-5, is a vast plot of curtain glazing.
4.16 Offering another completely different architectural style along Oxford Street is the Grade II listed No. 34-36 (Figure 15). Designed by Metcalf and Grieg, 1912, this tall commercial premises is in Portland stone and has six storeys rising to a shaped gable attic. In an Arts and Crafts style, there is a broad single bay front separated by a dentilled cornice with foliated and masked corbels beneath. The roofline again drops down to the relatively small and plain survival at No. 38, before rising again at Nos. 40-42. This Portland stone building is dated 1923, although the black marble entrance with Doric columns dates from 1930.

Figure 15:
The Grade II 34-36 Oxford Street, designed by Metcalf & Grieg in an Arts and Crafts style

4.17 Nos. 44 & 46 Oxford Street are both mid 20th century modern infill buildings of three storeys. No 44 has curtain wall glazing, while 46 has metal casement windows. No. 48 is a red brick corner building with a steep pitched roof above three storeys. C. 1900, and with an entrance in Hanway Street, the central bay is canted on the first and second floors and has portland stone pediments and dentilled entablature.

Figure 16:
No. 48 Oxford Street
4.18 On the opposite side of Hanway Street, No. 50 is a three storey building, which has a bland mid 20th century front, however the set-back mansard roof suggests that this may conceal the remains of a small Georgian house. Its neighbour at no. 52 is a painted brick commercial premises with an angled corner front built in 1864. Three storeys high, with a bottle balustrade concealing a mansard roof, set on composite pilasters and segmental headed windows on the first floor. A stone let into the wall is a replacement tablet that would have been on the 18th century plot, identifying ‘Rathbone’s Place in Oxford St, 1718’

4.19 The Grade II listed ‘Evelyn House’ at No. 54-62 is a commercial building designed by H Percy Adams and Charles Holden (Figure 17). This building dates from 1909 and adopts a stripped classical style, typical in scale and detail to many of the Edwardian buildings on this stretch of Oxford Street. Five storeys plus attic in Portland stone, the building occupies the large corner site that reaches into southern Rathbone Place. It has semi circular windows at mezzanine level and cast iron balconies to the second floor windows, all framed by giant strip pilasters. Nos. 64-66 Oxford Street was built in 1906, by Purchase, the Portland stone premises occupies five storeys with a gable attic storey concealing a mansard roof. An entablature above the first floor supports the projecting central bay. No. 68, the final building along this frontage, is a mid-to-late 20th century, simply detailed with a pale stone finish.

Figure 17:
The Grade II ‘Evelyn House’ occupies the vast plot that runs from Rathbone Place round to Perry’s Place
Rathbone Place

4.20 Architecture in Rathbone Place also reflects its differing phases of development, in various styles but with semi-industrial buildings predominating. Most examples date from the turn-of-the-century to modern 1980s blocks, with shopfronts at ground level and office or storage accommodation above. Most are of four to five storeys, some with additional attic storey. Some of the older buildings retain a more domestic character, where the original timber-framed sash windows still exist and some windows, for example those in no. 14, are defined by round or segmental brick arches and a keystone. Buildings as a whole occupy relatively small plot widths and the architecture in the street retains a vertical emphasis.

4.21 Standing out from its neighbours is No. 11, which is listed Grade II (Figure 18). This four storey building, in yellow stock brick, is a converted Georgian townhouse from 1720, the only survival from the earliest phase of development in Rathbone Place. The front elevation and shopfront, however, are mid 19th century replacements of the originals.

Figure 18:
No. 11 Rathbone Place – the only surviving building from the earliest phase of development

4.22 No. 9 is a slender Edwardian redbrick warehouse with a shaped gable in the attic storey and stone coading. Also in red brick and of a similar period, No. 15 has a gable end, coade stone detailing and a moulded clay frieze beneath the fourth storey.

4.23 Of the 20th century warehouse buildings, Nos. 12-13 dates from the 1950s and is in an ‘art deco’ style, with a portland stone front and large recessed curtain glazed window. No. 7-8 looks incongruous compared to its neighbours, with a concrete and glazed face. Five storeys with a staggered 2-
storey roof extension, flanked by a red brick stairwell, this building is bulky and interrupts the otherwise consistent roof level.

Hanway Street

4.24 The architecture along the narrow lane of Hanway Street has a dual personality. The west and north sides have Georgian origins although have largely been enlarged and re-fronted during the mid 19th century. They largely consist of small-scale buildings, of three and four storeys, with narrow street frontages. Most are brick or stucco fronted, with commercial premises at ground level.

4.25 To the north, including the northern side of Hanway Street, is Camden’s Bloomsbury Conservation Area, which forms an extension in character and scale, continuing the narrow streets lined with three to five storied brick and stucco buildings. In contrast, the buildings along the south side contain the larger blocks, which occupy wider plots, many associated with Oxford Street’s large commercial structures. These loom over the narrow pavement and date from the early 20th century. They are described in more detail below.

Figure 19:
The northern side of Hanway Street that falls within the London Borough of Camden
4.26 The first building to the north is No. 1 Hanway Place, which is of three storeys in yellow stock brick with a wooden shopfront, canted to follow the street layout. This example reflects the architectural characteristics of the buildings that continue into Camden’s Bloomsbury Conservation Area. Next door, no. 34 Hanway Street is in red brick with stucco window surrounds decorated with segmental arches and a partially rusticated shopfront at ground level.

4.27 The elevations of Nos. 36, 42-44 have canted ends, to allow the buildings to follow the curved line of the street, which adds to the unusual and intimate character. No. 36 has a stucco-fronted elevation, over three storeys. The first floor windows are tall with wooden casements and capped with segmental arches. There is a re-fronted shopfront with a wooden pilastered surround.

4.28 Another mid 19th century building is at No. 38, set over three storeys with attic level mansard roof and three bays of recessed sash windows. The windows have square or arched brick-headed surrounds and there is a shallow parapet wall above the third storey. No. 40 has retained the proportions of a Georgian domestic building, with a shorter elevation and a simple stucco façade.
4.29 Nos. 42-44 is a stucco-fronted building, with a parapet wall concealing the mansard roof. It has the original timber framed sash windows to the upper storeys; the first floor windows have a stone surrounds and lintels. The public house and adjoining shop at ground floor level have retained the original Corinthian capitals but has an unsympathetic front (see Negative Features below).

4.30 The buildings along the southern side of Hanway Street are of a different character, occupying wider plots, with a more horizontal emphasis and a more robust, semi-industrial character. The first two-storey red brick building has arched windows and wide arch entranceways to the ground floor. These arches were probably goods entrances to service the large retail stores along Oxford Street. Next is a three storey building, with a stucco front subdivided by projecting, rusticated piers and red granite pilasters supporting a dentil cornice at ground floor level. An elaborate festoon adorns the doorway, and pediments top the first floor windows, and the upper storey windows have been blocked in. The classical proportions and detailing of this building suggests that it was used as a front façade rather than just a goods warehouse.

4.31 The next plot towards the Tottenham Court Road is a reflection of the first with wide arches at ground floor level and constructed in red brick. This probably links physically to the first behind the central rusticated building. The final building is rear elevation to the vast 14-16 Oxford Street, in brown brick with heavy proportions and steel windows. This was constructed during the 1920s when the building functioned as a cinema.
4.32 The first building on the west side of Hanway Street is an older section to No. 50 Oxford Street, two storeys with classical pediment and casing around the windows.

Any proposal should take into account the character of its context. Policies, DES1 A 3 and 4 and DES4 should be consulted on the Principles of Development and DES5 A and B should be consulted on alterations and extensions. Relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance documents are noted throughout the document.

Roof Profiles and Extensions

4.33 Roof profiles are fundamental to the architectural character of any building and, as such, contribute to the character and appearance of conservation areas. Alterations at roof level including extensions, terraces and plant can have a negative impact on this.

4.34 Owing to its redevelopment in various phases, the Conservation Area displays a mixture of building heights and a variety of roof profiles. This blend of scale and form adds to the character of the area.

4.35 The Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road buildings have an eclectic mix of pitched, butterfly, ‘M’ and mansard roofs, although some are not visible from street level. Many buildings have already had roof extensions, some set back, and it is unlikely that further upward extension of such buildings would be acceptable. Also, in instances where a building has not had a roof extension, but the roof form has a distinctive character or creates a
completed architectural composition (Figures 23 & 24), any upward extension is unlikely to be acceptable.

**Figure 23:**
Distinctive roof line at No. 1 Tottenham Court Road

**Figure 24:**
No. 10 Oxford Street

**Figure 25:**
No.14-16 Oxford Street

4.36 The roofline along Rathbone Place is more regular, although there is still no consistency in roof construction. In general, pitched and mansard roofs predominate, usually with attic dormers.

4.37 The majority of visible roofs along Hanway Street appear to be mansards with dormer windows. Others, for example no. 40, appear to have flat roofs. Although the roofline varies along this side of the street, roof extensions here are unlikely to be acceptable, as any changes at roof level would potentially alter the existing townscape character. The buildings along southern Hanway Street have a mix of pitched, mansard and flat roofs, although they are hard to identify from ground level. These blocks already loom over the smaller terraces along Camden’s side of the street; extensions may pose amenity issues for the neighbours opposite.

**Figure 26** identifies where roof extensions are unlikely to be acceptable within the Conservation Area. This survey was undertaken from street level only and a full analysis would be undertaken as part of any application received.
4.38 Clutter such as antennae and satellite dishes can also have a significant and detrimental impact on the character of the area, affecting both short and long distance views and careful consideration should be given to the siting of such equipment to minimise its visual impact. They should be located away from the front façade of buildings and the roof, chimneys or other locations where they are highly visible.

Policy DES6 highlights instances where roof extensions and other roof structures are unlikely to be acceptable without proper justification.

Advice is given the Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance ‘Roofs. A Guide to Alterations and Extensions on Domestic Buildings (1995)’.
Figure 26: Properties with existing roof extensions, or where roof extensions are unlikely to be acceptable
UNLISTED BUILDINGS OF MERIT

4.39  Unlisted buildings can also contribute to the character and quality of the local area. They may make a valuable contribution to the townscape, and can be of architectural interest in their own right or have local historic and cultural associations, for example with a famous resident or event. Within the Conservation Area Audits these are identified and defined as ‘unlisted buildings of merit’.

4.40  There are a number of buildings or groups of buildings that are not listed but are considered to be of merit:

Hanway Street
Nos. 34, 36, 38, 42-44, 47-55

Hanway Place
No. 1

Rathbone Place
Nos. 6, the Black Horse Public House, 9, 12-13, 15

Oxford Street
Nos. 4, 8, 10, 12, 14-16, 24, 26-32, 40-42, 48, 52, 62, 64-66

Tottenham Court Road
No. 1, (no. 2-3 considered to be of merit as the lesser front of no. 14-6 Oxford Street)

Figure 27 identifies those buildings considered to be of merit and any landmark buildings within the Conservation Area. By definition these properties are considered to be of particular value to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and their demolition or unsympathetic alteration will be resisted.

Policy DES9 2 states that permission will not normally be given for proposals which involve the demolition or partial demolition of buildings which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that the existing building cannot be repaired or adapted so as to extend its useful life and that the proposed development will preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. This requirement may be balanced against the City Council’s other policy objectives.

Landmark buildings

4.41  Landmark buildings are those which, due to their height, location and detailed design stand out from their background. They contribute significantly to the character and townscape of the area being focal points or key elements in views.
4.42 The most prominent landmark building in the Conservation Area is No, 4 Oxford Street and the architecturally linked Tottenham Pub at No. 6 (Figure 28). The huge red brick and portland stone edifice is a prominent feature on the busy corner of Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road. In addition to its position, the scale, polychromy and classical detailing makes this block easily identifiable, since the adjacent buildings are considerably smaller and in contrasting architectural styles.

Figure 28:
No. 4 Oxford Street, the vast building with its horizontal emphasis and polychrome brickwork makes it a prominent feature at one of London's busiest junctions
Figure 27: Unlisted Buildings of Merit and Landmark Buildings within the Conservation Area
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STRATEGIC, METROPOLITAN AND LOCAL VIEWS

4.43 Policy DES15 in the Unitary Development Plan defines two categories of views which contribute to Westminster’s townscape and historic character: Metropolitan and Local Views.

4.44 Metropolitan Views include both views from Westminster to other parts of London and views from other parts of London into Westminster, such as views along and across the river Thames. They also include views within and across Westminster, particularly views of landmark buildings. There are no Metropolitan Views within the Hanway Street Conservation Area.

4.45 Local Views are by definition more localised and can be of natural features, skylines, smaller landmarks and structures as well as attractive groups of buildings and views into parks, open spaces, streets and squares. Some notable Local Views do exist within this Conservation Area, these are mapped on Figure 33. Full consideration must be given to the impact of any development proposals on important Local Views, both within the Conservation Area and into and out of it.

4.46 From the western edge of the Conservation Area along Oxford Street, the views west and east have local significance. Looking up and down from this point gives the context of Oxford Street as one of the busiest arteries in London. Also viewed from this point, just outside the Conservation Area, is Centre Point - the 35 storey, Grade II listed tower, which is an important London landmark. The views northwards up Tottenham Court Road and westwards down Oxford Street, from St Giles Circus, also have local value.

4.47 Hanway Street viewed from Oxford Street is also classed as a notable local view, in which the narrow arced curve of Hanway Street draws away from the busy thoroughfare of Oxford Street. This view is of local importance as it is an introduction into the narrow streetscape that exists beyond into Fitzrovia.

Figure 29: Looking east up Oxford Street

Figure 30: The view into Hanway Street from Oxford Street
4.48 From Rathbone Place, two important local views can be seen (Figures 31 & 32). Northwards, the road looks towards the Charlotte Street West Conservation Area, with a line of 19th century shopfronts and pubfronts. Beyond these, the skyline is dominated by the BT Tower, which stands 619 metres high and is an important London landmark. Looking South from Rathbone Place, there is also a valuable view across Oxford Street into Soho Square, the leafy characteristics of which provide a contrast to the busy artery before it.

**Figure 31:**
The view of Charlotte Street West and the BT Tower beyond, from Rathbone Place

**Figure 32:**
The green space of Soho Square, seen beyond Oxford Street from Rathbone Place

4.49 In addition the Strategic Views from Parliament Hill to the Palace of Westminster cuts across the western half of the Hanway Street Conservation Area (see Directory at back of this document).

In the Unitary Development Plan DES15 seeks to protect metropolitan and local views.
LOCAL TOWNSCAPE DETAIL

4.50 The detail of the local townscape contributes to the sense of local distinctiveness and may be unique to a particular conservation area. This includes boundary treatments, street furniture, trees and hard landscaping. Individually and collectively such elements contribute to the overall quality of Westminster streetscape as well as enhancing individual areas of character within the City.

4.51 Within Hanway Street there are relatively few noteworthy examples of railings and boundary walls or public art. However, where interesting examples of local townscape detail do exist the City Council considers that these should be retained and properly maintained. Well-designed additions to the streetscape such as public art may also be encouraged where appropriate.

4.52 This is a very urban area, and there is little in the way of soft landscaping; only one tree, situated outside No. 68 Oxford Street. Whilst this positively impacts on the quality of the area, the congested and narrow streets mean there is unlikely to be any scope for further tree planting, away from the Oxford Street frontage.

Street Furniture

4.53 Westminster has an outstanding variety of interesting and historic street furniture, much of it listed. The most interesting examples of street furniture within the Conservation area are the variety of bollards that exist, notably those along Hanway Street. Given that this Conservation Area borders the London Borough of Camden and is on the periphery of the Parish of St Marylebone, a number of boundary indicators have been retained. The appropriate maintenance and protection of such features is important, as a physical record of London’s development and history.

Figure 34:
Hanway Street c. 1950, showing the old boundary bollards for St Marylebone painted black and white
Historic floorscapes within the Conservation Area have all been lost and modern replacements do little to complement the surrounding townscape and built fabric, as identified in the Negative Features section below.

Policy DES7 C & F intends to protect these historic and characteristic features of the street scene. For guidance on best practice relating to street furniture and public realm works, the Westminster Way is the Council’s emerging Public Realm Manual for the City.

Shopfronts & Public Houses

Shopfronts, including well-designed contemporary ones, can be of great importance in contributing to the character and appearance of both individual buildings and the Conservation Area as a whole as well as being of historic and architectural interest in their own right.
4.56 The Tottenham Public House (Figure 38), No. 6 Oxford Street is a Grade II Listed building, which has been altered to have a recessed timber front, behind cast iron railings. The front is framed by red marble pilasters and decorative console brackets, supporting a dentil cornice.

4.57 In Rathbone Place, The Black Horse at No. 6 (Figure 39) has an early 20th century front, with a passageway leading to Black Horse Yard to the left. The fascia is capped by a cast iron sill guard and two large lanterns hang from the pilasters between the first floor windows.

Figure 38: The Tottenham, No. 6 Oxford Street
Figure 39: The Black Horse, No. 6 Rathbone Place

4.58 Also on Rathbone Place, The Grade II No. 11 has a mid 19th century shopfront with a large display window that curves round to the recessed doorway to the right. The fascia is supported by wooden pilasters and solid console brackets (Figure 40). No. 1 Hanway Place has a modern reinstatement of a mid 19th century wooden shopfront. The display window is canted with the building and solid console brackets support the fascia (Figure 41).
4.59 The City Council seeks to retain original shopfronts wherever possible and new signage should use materials and detail sympathetic to the building and Conservation Area.

The relevant City Council policy concerning historic shopfronts and the design of new ones is DES5 C. Reference should be made to the design guide 'Shopfronts, Blinds and Signs: A Guide to their Design' (1990) and 'Advertisement Design Guidelines (1992).

CHARACTERISTIC LAND USES

4.60 Land uses also contribute significantly to the character and appearance of a conservation area. These will not only have a direct influence on the building typology or make-up of an area but also on the nature, atmosphere and use of the public spaces and streets. Particular uses may be of historic or national importance and will have dictated the evolution of an area.

4.61 Along Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road, there is a continuous retail frontage at street level, with a mixture of office, financial and education services on upper floors. Here are large high street stores, interspersed with chain coffee shops, restaurants and smaller temporary shops. The upper floors tend to be occupied by small firms and a number of language schools.

4.62 The characteristic land uses in Rathbone Place are generally semi-industrial and small scale specialised retail, this in contrast to the large scale commercial units on Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road. Although outside the Conservation Area boundaries, the Royal Mail Sorting Office dominates the west side of the street and contributes to its industrial character. There are also a number of cafes and bars but on the eastern side, the properties are most commonly in office use and there are a number of media related companies here – these reflective of the creative industries that have tended to accumulate in the vicinity in recent decades.
4.63 The premises in Hanway Street also have a mix of small retail and entertainment establishments at street level, and the upper floors are generally occupied by small firms and educational establishments. There are a number of bars and nightclubs here, many with a Spanish theme.

4.64 Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road have very heavy pedestrian and vehicular traffic flows 24 hours a day. In contrast, Hanway Street is a narrow route, with vehicular traffic mainly confined to servicing. Rathbone place has some vehicular traffic emerging onto Oxford Street and is well used throughout the day and night by taxis, and pedestrians, attracted to the bars and restaurants.

Future Policies Affecting Land Use

4.65 If proposals for Crossrail are implemented in the future, it will have a substantial impact on the local townscape and an associated impact on the Hanway Street Conservation Area. The preservation of Oxford Street’s 19th century character under the Hanway Street Conservation Area will become essential as the immediate vicinity undergoes a substantial transformation. Further information on proposals can be found in the Draft Planning Brief for Crossrail, available on the City Council's website.

4.66 The Tottenham Court Road has been identified as an ‘Area for Intensification’ in the Mayor of London’s London Plan; which estimates up to 2,000 new jobs and 200 new homes in the period up to 2016. Currently, no boundary has been set for the Area for Intensification, though it is likely to affect Westminster and possibly the Hanway Street Conservation Area.

The City Council will consider the contribution of existing and proposed uses to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. DES9 D is the relevant UDP policy.
5 NEGATIVE FEATURES / POSSIBLE ENHANCEMENT

5.1 Negative features are those elements, which detract from the special character of an area and present an opportunity for change and enhancement. It may be that simple maintenance works could remedy the situation or in some cases there may be the opportunity to redevelop a particular site.

Wires, Flues, Pipework and Plant

5.2 Minor additions to buildings such as wires, pipework and flues, can cumulatively have a negative impact on the character of an area (Figure 42). Poorly sited examples can not only impact on a building’s façade but collectively, along with larger features such as flues and air conditioning units, they can dominate the architecture and contribute to visual clutter. For example, the large flue that protrudes from the top of No. 8 Oxford Street is extremely unsightly and prominent (Figure 43).

![Figure 42: No. 38 Hanway Street, here relatively small additions have built up to create visual clutter and blight the overall charm of the street](image)

![Figure 43: Little effort has been made to minimise the impact this ventilation flue has on the buildings it is attached to or on the local street scene](image)

Security Features

5.3 Security features, including the mounting of equipment such as alarm boxes, shutters and CCTV cameras on the façades of buildings can obscure detailing and detract from the architectural integrity of a building and character of the street. The negative impact of security features can often be minimised through sensitive design and siting to integrate them with the existing building.
5.4 Roller shutters with projecting box housing, and boarded up entrances, have a deadening effect on the street scene (Figure 44). Along a narrow street such as Hanway Street, for example at No. 55, their impact is particularly marked. At the back of the Virgin Megastore is a large blank metal casing, which protrudes into this narrow street and contributes to the current ‘back alley’ atmosphere (Figure 45). The Conservation Area also has numerous burglar alarms, many of which are no longer in use and their metal casements have corroded and are damaging the building surface, for example at No. 46 Oxford Street.

![Figure 44: Projecting shutter casements and boarded up entrances have a deadening effect and are ideal for graffiti](image1)

![Figure 45: The large metal casing at the rear of Virgin Megastore is damaging the character of Hanway Street](image2)

5.5 The removal of negative accretions will considerably enhance the streetscape and the area’s overall character. Although these features may now be exempt from enforcement action, having been introduced some time ago, more careful consideration needs to be given to the siting and design of security measures in the future.

**Maintenance and Paintwork**

5.6 The care and maintenance of individual properties can have a significant impact on the character of the area as a whole.

5.7 In Hanway Street especially, the poor upkeep of some of the buildings has a harmful effect on its character, contributing to the run-down feeling.

5.8 While most of the buildings along Rathbone Place and Oxford Street are fairly well maintained, the paintwork on Nos. 46 & 38 Oxford Street is in a poor state of repair. In some cases original brickwork and or stone details have
been painted and the boarded up arches and air vents provide an ideal canvas for graffiti.

**Aerials, Telecommunications Equipment and Associated Roof Plant**

5.9 Roof clutter from the inappropriate siting of aerials, telecommunications equipment and associated roof plant, is often visually obtrusive from street level and can have a significant and detrimental impact on the character of an area, affecting both short and long distance views. Careful consideration should be given to the siting of such equipment to minimise its visual impact. All such equipment should be located away from the front façade of buildings and from chimneys or other locations where it may be visible.

5.10 Television aerials, for example at 50 & 52 Oxford Street have been crudely sited on chimneys and are clearly visible from street level. At 14 Rathbone Place, an aerial is perched on a guard rail at the front of the building, with the wires draping down the façade. Similarly, at No. 20-22 Oxford Street a large satellite dish has been positioned to the front and is quite prominent from the street.

5.11 With such equipment comes the associated wiring and this is often positioned without consideration. Often wires are draped down the front of the building whilst redundant wires are not removed.

**Shops and Shopfronts**

5.12 In general, shopfronts should relate to the proportions and detail of the building in which they are set, as well as to the adjoining townscape. In order to retain an area’s historic character, it is important that contemporary shopfront design is of the highest quality and sympathetic to its surroundings.

5.13 Along the Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road frontages, the shopfronts tend to be generic of the chain stores that occupy them. Whilst these are typical of any high street, they do nothing to reflect the character or architecture of the buildings above. Furthermore, there has been an increase in the number of short-term shops along Oxford Street, selling discount clothing, mobile phone accessories or souvenirs. These tend to have temporary signage of poor quality, as well as banners and displays that intrude onto the pavement. These are often unsightly and add to the physical confusion and are having a negative impact on the character of the Conservation Area.

5.14 Other shops in the area are of poor quality in terms of their design and materials, with oversized plastic fascias and aluminium framing that bears no relation to the historic buildings above and does not observe any continuity along the street. Examples include 40, 42 & 44 Hanway Street.

5.15 A number of the shopfronts in Rathbone Place are currently vacant and, while unoccupied, they can quickly fall into a state of disrepair. The vacant shops would benefit from appropriate reuse.
Traffic and Congestion

5.16 The amount of traffic, both people and vehicular, is a difficult issue within the Conservation Area. Pavements and crossings along Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road are very heavily congested with pedestrian traffic, and the problem is particularly acute at the eastern corner where Oxford Street meets Tottenham Court Road. The area may be particularly challenging for people with mobility and sensory disabilities.

5.17 The road junction of Oxford Street, Tottenham Court Road, New Oxford Street and Charring Cross Road, is busy with traffic 24 hours a day, there is also a high rate of accidents in this area. The London Borough of Camden is responsible for maintenance of the junction, and at the time of writing had obtained funding from TfL for an accident remedial scheme.

Signage

5.18 There are a large number of language schools, shops and small businesses in the Hanway Street Conservation Area, creating a large amount of signage. This has cumulatively had a significant impact on the street scene. Projecting box signs and internally illuminated signs are particularly intrusive. They not only impose on the view from Oxford Street, they also mask the architectural detail of some buildings. Signage at first floor level is particularly incongruous and is rarely acceptable (Figures 46 & 47).

![Figure 46: The poor quality signage here is detracting from the architectural interest of this entrance](image1)

![Figure 47: The illuminated box signage is bulky and poorly designed and is overbearing on the street scene](image2)

Street Furniture & Street Surfacing

5.19 Inappropriately sited and poorly designed street furniture can become both physically and visually obtrusive. At present there is an excess of unnecessary street clutter throughout the Conservation Area, such as bollards, bins and signage, which is detracting from the area’s special interest. The introduction of parking controls and one way systems, along Tottenham Court...
Road and Oxford Street has increased the visual clutter associated with signage; these also create physical barriers that hinder pedestrian traffic flows. Unsightly street furniture should be kept to a minimum, and the removal of surplus objects, such as disused signposts along Oxford Street, should be encouraged.

**Figure 48:**
The Tottenham Court Road Pavement has three bins, phone box and an electrical equipment cabinet sited within 10 metres, in an already crowded area.

5.20 No historic street surfacing remains in this Conservation Area which has a range of surfaces including asphalt, mass produced concrete flagstones and concrete blocks, in a range of colours, textures and sizes. The asphalt surfacing Hanway Street for example has been reinstated in a number of places and the intimate character of this narrow street would benefit from a unified surface treatment.

**POLICY AND FURTHER GUIDANCE**
The City Council will take appropriate steps to ensure the preservation and enhancement of its conservation areas. Schemes for the improvement and enhancement of conservation areas will be encouraged and initiated where possible. Any proposal will be judged against policies DES1 and DES9.
6 Management Proposals

6.1 It is expected that the effective management of Hanway Street Conservation Area can, for the most part, be met through an effective policy framework and the positive use of existing development control and enforcement powers. The analysis of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area within this audit therefore identifies those elements the Council will seek to protect, as well as negative features which may present opportunities for change or enhancement. Each section is linked to relevant policy guidance, which provides the framework for the future management of the area. Other statutory designations and existing controls in place to manage the Conservation Area are listed in the Directory, which follows this section. In addition, the following table provides a list of proposals, related specifically to those features identified as ‘negative’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Feature Identified</th>
<th>Future Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>• All future proposals for development within and adjacent to the conservation area should include an analysis of the impact of proposals on the character and appearance or setting of the area, which makes reference to the findings of the audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Windows and Doors</td>
<td>• Raise awareness of original design detail by increasing circulation and availability of the conservation audits and design guides to local property owners and developers. Publish audit on Council website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Original Architectural Detail</td>
<td>• Photographic survey of Conservation Area to be undertaken and enforcement action pursued, where possible, on unauthorised works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops and Shopfronts and Signage</td>
<td>• Many of the poor quality shopfronts have been in place for more than four years, and are therefore exempt from enforcement action. Where this is the case, improvements will be sought through the development control process as and when planning applications are received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Full list of unauthorised signage identified as part of the audit process to be referred to enforcement team for action where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Original shopfronts, surrounds and architectural detailing identified as of merit in the audit to be retained as part of future redevelopment schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wires, Flues, Pipework &amp; Security Features</td>
<td>• Removal of redundant wires, flues, pipework and alarms to be sought as part of any new development or refurbishment proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepare new SPG on Plant &amp; Air-conditioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enforcement action to be taken to secure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
removal of unauthorised equipment where possible.

| Roof alterations, Aerials, Telecommunications Equipment and Associated Roof Plant | • All applications for roof extensions to be determined with reference to the roof extensions map in the audit.  
• Removal of unnecessary and redundant equipment to be sought as part of development or refurbishment proposals. |
| --- | --- |
| Maintenance and Paintwork | • Increase circulation and availability of audit and design guides as well as English Heritage Publications to ensure property owners are aware of best conservation practice and the importance of timely maintenance of historic properties.  
• In the most serious cases, consideration to be given to the use of Listed Building Repairs or Section 215 notices.  
• Encourage the regular removal of graffiti. Refer to graffiti and fly-posting unit. |
| Street Furniture & Street Surfacing | • De-cluttering initiative to be undertaken to secure removal of redundant street furniture and signage.  
• Original landscaping details and street furniture identified in the Audit to be retained as part of landscaping schemes.  
• Improvements to street surfacing, using unified materials to be encouraged as part of future street improvement schemes.  
• Encourage improvements to street lighting, with a more consistent treatment and sympathetic design |
| Traffic and Congestion | • Future proposals to make reference to London Borough of Camden’s adopted planning framework for the Tottenham Court Road Station and St Giles area (July 2004) and Westminster City Council’s Planning Brief for Tottenham Court Road Western and Eastern Ticket Halls (2005). |
DIRECTORY

Designation and Extension Reports
Listed Buildings and other Designations
Further Reading and Information
Contacts List
Audit Designation and Statement of Decision
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 The City Council has designated thirty-seven conservation areas covering approximately two-thirds of the built-up area of the City since 1967. Four additional areas have been identified as worthy of protection and enhancement under conservation area designation. They are at:

(i) Rathbone Place/Hanway Street/Tottenham Court Road/Oxford Street, W1. (See Map No. 1 attached).
and this report seeks the Committee's approval in principle to their designation and authority to proceed with the consultation necessary prior to final and formal designation.

The findings of these consultations will be reported back to Committee for final designation.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

2.1 That proposed areas at

(i) **Rathbone Place/Hanway Street/Tottenham Court Road/Oxford Street, W1** as shown on Map No. 1.

(ii) Medway Street/Horseferry Road, SW1 as shown on Map No. 2.

(iii) Maida Vale Conservation Area Extension, W9 as shown on Map No. 3.

(iv) 'The Royal Parks' (comprising: Hyde Park, Buckingham Palace, Kensington Gardens, Green Park, Apsley House, Hyde Park Corner Roundabout) as shown on Map No. 4.

be approved in principle for designation as conservation areas and that consultations be undertaken with the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission. The Directorate of Heritage - Royal Estates (where appropriate). The Victorian Society, The Georgian Society, local amenity groups and other such consultees as the Committee directs before the final boundaries as defined are formally agreed.
2.2 That the results of the consultations be assessed and reported back to Committee to approve the areas as conservation areas as subsequently defined.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 (i) Rathbone Place/Hanway Street/Tottenham Court Road/Oxford Street, W1.

This area comprises three elements all of which are recommended for inclusion in a single conservation area. They are:

a) The south end of Rathbone Place.
b) Hanway Street.
c) The frontages of Tottenham Court Road and Oxford Street adjoining Rathbone Place and Hanway Street.

a) The south end of Rathbone Place (Nos. 1-18 and Nos. 52-56 inclusive)
This is a lively area mixed in uses and architectural styles with good quality turn-of-the-century buildings predominating; but No. 11 Rathbone Place, which is listed Grade II, is essentially a c.1720 house with many of its original internal features though a front elevation is a mid-nineteenth century replacement of the original.

b) Hanway Street
The London Borough of Camden invited the City Council to consider the area bounded by Hanway Street/Tottenham Court Road/Oxford Street for conservation area designation to complement Camden’s own conservation area proposals centred on Hanway Place to the north and which includes the north side of Hanway Street.
The small secluded area of the London Borough of Camden comprises narrow streets which are lined with three four storied brick and stucco buildings with comparatively narrow frontages and ground floor shops in Hanway Street.

The west and south sides of Hanway Street, which have a similar scale, lie within Westminster and form an extension in character and scale of the area to the north. This whole 'backland' development is a remarkable survival of this part of London and Nos. 33-44 Hanway Street, in particular, are of considerable townscape interest.

Although run down at present, the area would benefit from a conservation-based approach of selective infill and refurbishment maintaining the existing street pattern and scale.

c) Tottenham Court Road and Oxford Street Frontages
These comprise 19th and 20th century commercial buildings and are of a different scale and character to the area they abut to the north. Nos. 1-3 (odd) Tottenham Court Road and Nos. 2-16 (evens incl.) Oxford Street have good quality facades including the frontages of a former Lyons Corner House.

No. 6 Oxford Street, 'The Tottenham' public house, which is listed Grade II, has been described by the architectural journalist and author Mark Girouard as having: 'One of the best surviving public house interiors in the country'. Nos. 34 and 36 by Metcalfe and Grieg and Nos. 56-62 by Adams and Holden are both also listed Grade II, being high quality pre 1914 commercial buildings.
SUMMARY

Consultations on the proposed Conservation Areas of Medway Street/Horseferry Road, Hanway Street, Royal Parks and the Maida Vale Extension are now complete, following Committee approval on the 19 September 1989. This report presents the responses from consultees, and seeks approval for the Conservation Area designation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the areas at:

i Maida Vale Conservation Area Extension, W9 as shown on map one.

ii Rathbone Place/Hanway Street/Tottenham Court Road/Oxford Street, W1 as shown on map two.
iii Medway Street/Horseferry Road, SW1 as shown on map three.

iv The Royal Parks (comprising: Hyde Park, Buckingham Palace, Kensington Gardens, Green Park, Apsley House and Hyde Park Corner Roundabout) as shown on maps four and five be designated respectively as:

i The Maida Vale Conservation Area (Extension)

ii The Hanway Street Conservation Area

iii The Medway Street Conservation Area

iv The Royal Parks Conservation Area

under the provisions of Section 277 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971 and that the Director of Planning and Transportation be authorised to give notice of designation in the London Gazette and at least one local newspaper circulating in the areas, to the Secretary of State for the Environment, English Heritage and (in the case of the Royal Parks Conservation Area) the adjoining Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and (in the case of the Hanway Street Conservation Area) the adjoining Borough of Camden, and to take other steps as may be prudent and necessary to implement the designations.

3. BACKGROUND

Members will recall the reasoning and descriptions of the proposed Conservation Areas as described in the report to committee on the 19 September 1989. At that Committee meeting, authority was given for consultations to commence on the four proposed Conservation Areas.

4. RESULTS OF CONSULTATIONS

4.1 A schedule of those persons who were consulted is attached. A letter was sent on the 3 November 1989 to each address. Responses were requested within 28 days (i.e by the 1
December 1989) and during this period the following responses were received:

i. Medway Street
   Four responses were received

ii. Hanway Street
    Two responses were received

iii. Royal Parks
    Seven responses were received

iv. Maida Vale
    One response was received

4.5 The following responses were received in respect of the Hanway Street Conservation Area.

i. The London Borough of Camden’s Planning, Transport and Employment (South Area) Sub-Committee on the 7th December welcomed the designation of the Hanway Street Conservation Area.

ii. The Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association “very much welcomed” the proposed designation of the Hanway Street Conservation Area

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers

1. Report of Planning and Development Committee 19 September 1989
2. Correspondence from Consultees on the proposed Conservation Areas at:
i. Maida Vale Conservation Area extension, W9

ii. Rathbone Place/Hanway Street/Tottenham Court Road/Oxford Street, W1

iii. Medway Street/Horseferry Road, SW1

iv. The Royal Parks (comprising: Hyde Park, Buckingham Palace, Kensington Gardens, Green Park, Apsley House and Hyde Park Corner roundabout.)
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### Wards Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West End Marylebone High Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Policy Context

The Civic Renewal Initiative has a target to adopt 8 Conservation Area Audits as Supplementary Planning Guidance by the end of 2005/06 in order to implement the programme to prepare audits for the City’s 54 conservation areas.

### Financial Summary

There are no financial implications arising from this report. The printing of the document will be met from existing budget.

## Summary

1.1 National guidance and advice places the responsibility on the City Council to produce detailed appraisals of each of its 54 conservation areas, and to consider the designation of further ones. Following a public consultation exercise, including a public meeting, this report seeks the adoption of the Conservation Area Audit for Hanway Street Conservation Area as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That the Cabinet Member for Planning and Customer Service resolves to adopt the Hanway Street Conservation Area Audit (attached in Appendix 5) as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

## Background Information

3.1 On 22 October 1998, Sub-Committee agreed a priority list of conservation areas to be audited as part of the City Council’s comprehensive review of its then
51 Conservation Areas (there are now 54). This review is a statutory duty and an updated timetable is being progressed.

3.2 Given the complexity and scale of the City’s conservation areas this process has been broken into three stages involving the production of mini-guides (general information leaflets), directories and audits. The audits represent the third and final stage of the preparation of appraisals of all of the Borough’s 54 Conservation Areas.

3.3 The draft Conservation Area Audit for Hanway Street was adopted for consultation on 14 November 2005. A public consultation exercise was then undertaken. A summary of correspondence received and the Council’s response is outlined below. The Audit has been amended further to consultation responses received.

4 Detail

Consultation

4.1 Public consultation consisted of both written consultation and a public meeting, which considered three audits: for East Marylebone, Hanway Street and Cleveland Street. The preparation of the audit was initially publicised with an exhibition at the central area forum in June, prior to its production. A letter of 13 October 2005 then invited local groups and residents, national bodies, ward Councillors and other local organisations to attend a public meeting to introduce and discuss the audit. In addition, public notices advertising the meeting were placed in local newspapers and site notices advertising the meeting throughout the Conservation Area.

4.2 The public meeting was held on 14 November 2005. It was chaired by Councillor Alastair Moss and there were seven attendees, including local residents and planning consultants. A list of attendees is attached at Appendix 2 and full details of the discussion at the public meeting can be found in the minutes at Appendix 4.

Main Comments Received

4.3 The feedback at the public meeting was, on the whole, positive with the production of the audits receiving general support.

4.4 Two written responses were received with regards to Hanway Street and these are listed in the background papers section. English Heritage wrote in support of all the audits, indicating they welcome the council’s continuing commitment to review its conservation areas and to develop positive policies for their protection and enhancement. They considered the draft area audit to be well written, and a useful basis for development control purposes and also for future townscape improvements.

4.5 The Richard Colman Consultancy, on behalf of Land Securities, provided a report detailing comments with regards to the audit. They make various detailed comments and suggestions with regards to changes to wording, some of
which have been adopted and these are summarised in the table at the end of the report.

4.6 The main issue discussed in the report, however, relates to the way in which unlisted buildings of merit have been identified in the audit. They conclude that the guidance in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15) is not sufficiently carefully reflected in the audit document. Two sentences in particular have been picked out from PPG15 and highlighted. Firstly the sentence: “it is the quality and interest of the area, rather than individual buildings, which should be the prime consideration in identifying conservation areas.” This leads the report author to the conclusion that: “individual buildings within the conservation area cannot be considered to make a contribution based on their individual qualities and that, in this case, this would apply to the Georgian properties on Tottenham Court Road.” (NB it is assumed that this is referring to Georgian properties on Hanway Street/ Oxford Street)

4.7 The report further quotes from Paragraph 4.4 (of PPG15) which they indicate “states that the definition of an area’s special interest should derive from an assessment of the elements which contribute to it….where the conservation area audit does identify the defining character, it then goes on to state that other older buildings, that do not have that character or appearance, do in fact make a contribution to it.”

4.8 The report author is therefore suggesting that in assessing special interest a singular ‘defining’ character should be identified and that only buildings which have this character can make a contribution to the area. In Hanway Street they consider “the character of the … Conservation Area consists of a handful of large-scale Edwardian buildings which are well spaced.’ As such they feel “it is incumbent on the local authority to list only those buildings which contribute to the defining character or appearance.”

4.9 This analysis leads to various suggested changes to wording (listed in the table at appendix 3), to emphasise the importance of large-scale Edwardian buildings, and in particular to a suggestion to group the south side of Hanway Street with Oxford Street/ Tottenham Court Road in one character area.

4.10 In response to this, firstly with regards to the way in which an assessment of unlisted buildings of merit is carried out, reference should be made to the rest of paragraph 4.4 of PPG15 which states clearly of conservation area appraisal that “the assessment should always make clear those unlisted buildings of merit which make a positive contribution to the special interest of the area.” It goes on to refer to the more detailed guidance in English Heritage’s Conservation Area Practice, which sets out how local authorities should go about identifying special interest and, more particularly, includes a checklist of questions to be used to identify Unlisted Buildings of Merit. This has been recently superseded by a further English Heritage Guidance Note on Conservation Area Appraisals, which includes the same checklist. This includes various questions to ask when looking at a building, perhaps the most relevant being “does it individually or as part of a group serve as a reminder of the gradual development of the settlement in which it stands or an earlier phase of growth?”
4.11 In assessing the character of this particular area, it is accepted that the character of Oxford Street itself relates primarily, but not exclusively to larger scale Edwardian and late Victorian buildings. However, this particular conservation area is centred on Hanway Street. The interest of this small corner lies in the gradual and sometimes piecemeal way it developed. It did not form part of one of the larger planned developments of the Great estates to the west. Hanway Street itself is an ancient route and much of its interest stems from its curving form, as visible from early maps. Behind Oxford Street the smaller routes retain a Georgian scale to many of the buildings and smaller plot widths, whilst the pre-existing road-form of Hanway Street gives a particularly distinctive character. Only the small Berners estate centred on Rathbone Street formed part of a planned development. Both Georgian and late Victorian/Edwardian eras as well, particularly in the case of Oxford Street, as the later 20th century, which have formed the character of the conservation area. The mixture of building types, heights and ages and the step down in heights between Oxford Street and Hanway Street is an important part of the area’s character.

4.12 To describe its special interest as ‘Edwardian’ is therefore to privilege one era, which only forms a relatively small part of the character of the area. In defining character the audit identifies the mixed character of this area as of importance. The area can be broadly subdivided into three and, of these three areas, the stretch of buildings along Oxford Street/ Tottenham Court Road can be characterised by the larger scale of its buildings and predominance of Edwardian architecture. However, this does not mean that the older buildings interspersed between these are unimportant, as these are part of the historic development and interest of the area. This is also only one third of the conservation area.

4.13 As a result of analysis, various specific changes to the audit are suggested. This includes the removal of certain unlisted buildings of merit: those at 12, 24 and 38 Oxford Street (smaller, Georgian scale buildings), no 22 Oxford Street (a mid twentieth century building) and a block at 47-55 Hanway Street. Number 38, whilst retaining its Georgian scale has undergone substantial and detrimental alteration and has therefore been removed from the unlisted buildings of merit map as suggested. However, numbers 12 and 24 are attractive buildings and good examples of the small scale Georgian properties which would previously have lined Oxford Street. These have therefore been retained as unlisted buildings of merit. It is, however, agreed that number 22 is not a particularly significant building of its type and makes a limited contribution to the character and appearance of the area, so this has also been removed from the list. However, the early 20th century red brick blocks on south Hanway Street are of some interest and give a particularly distinctive character to this part of the conservation area. These have therefore been retained as unlisted buildings of merit:

4.14 Further comments in the report relate to the unlisted buildings of merit map and suggest that “a clearer legend for the plan needs to be established which recognises the relevant facades providing identifiable contributions, whilst identifying the value of only those interiors which are historically intact”. However, unlisted buildings in conservation area are protected only for their townscape value. Conservation area legislation does not protect historic interiors and this is not therefore a relevant consideration. It would not be appropriate to identify
parts of buildings as it is the contribution of a building to the overall townscape which is most important.

4.15 Also with reference to the map, the report states that “the map of the Hanway Street Conservation Area identifies all unlisted buildings in yellow, and listed buildings with a hatched pattern, however, with the assumption that listed buildings in fact also contribute to the character of the conservation area, for clarity they should also be coloured in yellow to portray this.” Listed Buildings are by definition buildings of national importance protected for their individual qualities and there is much greater control over their repair and alteration. This is different to an unlisted building of merit in a conservation area which is, generally, of local importance and identified for its townscape value. It would be misleading to have these shown in the same way.

4.16 Other comments relate to changing specific words, mostly to emphasise the importance of the Edwardian character of the townscape. In the light of these it is considered that in places the wording of the audit may not be clear enough with regards to character. We have therefore strengthened the wording to emphasise more clearly the important characteristics of this unique area: the way its historical development has created a unique interaction of buildings and spaces, with larger scale buildings to the front, smaller plot widths to the rear reflecting the Georgian/ Victorian phases of development and the distinctive curving street pattern. A map of building ages has been inserted at Figure 9a.

4.17 Presentation of the final document including page numbers and quality of photos will be reviewed prior to printing and a new front cover prepared. The directory, as with all the audits, forms an appendix to the final document.

5 Financial Implications

5.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report at this stage. Expenditure costs will be met from existing revenue budgets.

6 Impact on Health and Well-being

6.1 The conservation area audits make no recommendations with effects on health and well-being.

7 Legal Implications

7.1 Under Section 69 (1)(a) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 every local authority “shall from time to time determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance”. Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 ‘Planning and the Historic Environment’ interprets this responsibility by advising local authorities to periodically review existing conservation areas and their boundaries.
8 Consultation

8.1 A programme of public consultation was undertaken as detailed above involving English Heritage, national amenity societies, local resident groups and ward Councillors.

9 Human Rights Act 1998

9.1 The Human Rights Act came into force in England on 2 October 2000. It gives teeth to the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which was ratified by the UK in 1951 and has been in force since 1953. The Act confers the direct protection of English law in relation to Convention rights. For the purposes of the role of a local planning authority the relevant provisions are: Article 2 - right to life, Article 6 – right to a fair hearing, Article 8 - right to respect for private and family life, Article 14 – prohibition of discrimination and Article 1 of the First Protocol - protection of property.

10 Conclusion

10.1 It is considered that the attached audit provide a sound basis for the future stewardship of the Hanway Street Conservation Area, meeting the statutory requirements placed on the Council. The findings have been amended in the light of comments received. It is therefore recommended that the audit now be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance to ensure the continued preservation and enhancement of this Conservation Area.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUERIES ABOUT THIS REPORT OR WISH TO INSPECT ANY OF THE BACKGROUND PAPERS, PLEASE CONTACT JANE HAMILTON ON 020 7641 8019; EMAIL ADDRESS jhamilton@westminster.gov.uk; FAX NUMBER 020 7641 2338

BACKGROUND PAPERS

1 Hanway Street Mini-guides.
2 Hanway Street Conservation Area Directory
3 Letters from English Heritage and Submission by Land Securities
4 English Heritage Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals
APPENDIX 1: LIST OF WRITTEN CONSULTEES
Neil Thompson, Great Portland Estates
Paul Houston, Westminster Property Owners Association
David Wilson, Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association
Heather Acton, The Marylebone Association
Jeremy Evershed, Montagu Evans
Steven Quinn
Dick Muskett, The Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association
Louise Campbell, Estates and Facilities, University of Westminster
Land Securities
All Saints Church
Keith Hearn, CB Richard Ellis
Welsh Baptist Church
Tim Hunter-Whitehouse, Headteacher, All Souls School
Sally Humphreys, Director, New West End Company
Howard De Walden Estates Ltd
Soho Housing Association
James Thoratt, Estate Manager, Marylebone Estate Office
Ben Weaver
St Charles Borromeo RC Church
John Millard, Marylebone Association
Langham Estate Management
Sandra Edwards, Director, Fitzrovia Trust
Mr Neufield, Charlotte Street Association
Peter Burroughs, UCLH Trust, Capital Investment Directorate
Mr John Dyke, Savills
Cllr Mark Page
Cllr Harvey Marshall
Cllr Micheal Vearcombe
Cllr Glenys Roberts
Cllr John Cox
Cllr Ian Wilder
English Heritage
Georgian Group
Victorian Society
The Twentieth Century Society
Trees and Landscape Team
West End Team
Head of City Planning (policy)
WCC Corporate Property
Martin Low, Transportation
APPENDIX 2: ATTENDEES AT PUBLIC MEETING

Judith A Crave – Local Resident
Jon Tarlton – Local Resident
Stephen Pooley – Local Resident
R Cameron – Local Resident
D Jacobs – Local Resident
Ben Weaver – Local Resident
David Reid – Montagu Evans

Council
Councillor Alastair Moss
Councillor Harvey Marshall
Robert Ayton
Jane Hamilton
John Wilman
Toby Cuthbertson
Hannah Smith
### APPENDIX 3: Table of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Responses</th>
<th>Council Response / Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Richard Coleman Consultancy on behalf of Land Securities</td>
<td>It is advisable to group the south face of Hanway Street together with Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road as this group varies a unified defining character and appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The audit recognises the differences in the architecture of the buildings to the east and south side of Hanway Street. However, as a whole, Hanway Street has a smaller scale and character very different to that of Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road and it is important to note the step down in heights between the two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omit word important at paragraph 2.2, as there is nothing to suggest the south side of Hanway street is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence changed as wording may have been confusing. Important here refers not just the south side of Hanway Street, but to Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road. Para reworded to clarify this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para 3.15 add words… which is listed….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is stated in the next section, architecture, rather than the history section. No need for repetition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both unlisted buildings and listed buildings to be highlighted in yellow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change not agreed. Listed Buildings and Unlisted buildings of merit are completely different. See main report for detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para 4.1 add ‘and appearance’ This needs to be remembered when describing which character and appearance is distinctive and therefore, which buildings contribute to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The start of this sentence has been amended as it is not clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para 4.1 Add ‘ and the south face of Hanway street’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change made. Do not agree south Hanway street should be in a section with Oxford Street. whilst the buildings on south Hanway Street do relate functionally to those on Oxford Street, in terms of servicing, this section is about character and it does not make sense to include Hanway street in the same sentence which describes the character of oxford street and Tottenham court road as major shopping and traffic arteries, which Hanway street clearly isn’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para 4.2 add ‘Hanway street acts as a service street to the major retail elements on these two streets’ and various associated changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As per previous comments, change not agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change heading to add and South Hanway Street to the heading to read Tottenham court road and south Hanway Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amended throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recurrent error with regards to no of storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Added ‘and the remnants of earlier development as suggested. No other amendments made as description is adequate. Word cohesive has been omitted as it is agreed that the buildings are not cohesive. Word attractive has been substituted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para 5.2-5.3 Various semantic changes to emphasise the importance of large scale buildings proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para 5.4 add clarification of numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Painting of stonework is not encouraged. This will be added to the negative features section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para 5.6 add ‘all the stonework details of the pub have been painted.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This interior is not relevant for an unlisted building in a conservation area, as it is not protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph 5.8: add the interior has been rebuilt leaving only the two facades of heritage value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Para 5.12 Add sentence 'It is an interesting interwar verging on modernist interpretation of the defining character buildings in the conservation area.

Add the section on south side of Hanway Street to this part of the audit.

Delete para 5.26

Para 5.28 Change: “This blend of scale and form adds to the character of the area” to “the more stark contrast in height, however, weaken the cohesiveness of the defining buildings”

Change “those buildings which have already had roof extensions, including those set back, would not be acceptable for further alteration” adding the words “unless they enhanced the roofline”. Suggested twice.

Unlisted Buildings of Merit. Suggested addition of the phrase “both listed and unlisted buildings of merit can contribute

Deletion of various buildings marked as unlisted buildings of merit

Add nos 2 and 3 Tottenham Court Road to list as unlisted buildings of merit and 1 Hanway Place

Insert word be

Landmark buildings: suggest rewording the text so no 6 comes before no 4.

Sentence to be added explaining significance, as follows: This building dates from 1909 and adopts a stripped classical style typical in scale and detail to many of the Edwardian buildings on this stretch of Oxford Street.

The section on Hanway Street addresses this point as it describes Hanway street as having a split personality. Change not made.

Suggestion not explained.

Not changed. This completely changes this meaning and suggests the defining scale of the buildings in the conservation area relates to the Edwardian buildings on Oxford street, which only from a very small part of the built form of the conservation area, as detailed in the main report.

Wording as proposed not adopted but changed wording to be more clear. ‘further alteration’ to read ‘upward extension. Further upward extension of buildings which already have roof extensions is unlikely to be acceptable. Changed ‘would not be acceptable to ‘is unlikely to be acceptable’

This paragraph is specifically about unlisted buildings of merit. This is a separate category and different legislation applies, therefore change not made.

Not changed, as detailed in the main report.

Added

Inserted

No change made. 4-6 is essentially one building and the whole has been identified as a landmark.
APPENDIX 4: MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

EAST MARYLEBONE/CLEVELAND STREET/HANWAY STREET CONSERVATION AREA AUDITS
PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING

MINUTES OF MEETING

When: 7:00 p.m. Monday 14 November 2005
Where: Aston Webb Room, RIBA, 66 Portland Place WC1

In Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westminster City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judith A Crave (JC) – Local resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Tarlton (JT) – Local resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Pooley (SP) – Local resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Reid (DR) – Montagu Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Cameron (RC) – Local resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Jacobs (DJ) – Local resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Weaver (BW) – Local resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Corr (BC) – Local resident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAM opened the meeting at 7:00pm and welcomed those present, and invited attendees to introduce themselves and to sign in.

The purpose of the meeting and the reasons for covering three Conservation Area Audits together were explained before outlining the presentation format and inviting questions at the end of each topic. The Council’s statutory duties to undertake Conservation Area Audits and the guidance received from English Heritage was given before CAM explained the three stage appraisal process for each Conservation Area: mini guides; directory; and audits. Details of the range and extent of Westminster’s 54 Conservation Areas were also given.

CAM then handed over to JH for a PowerPoint presentation, which primarily explained the following:

- What constitutes a Conservation Area (CA)
- The general audit contents, the format of which is taken from English Heritage guidance.
- The value in receiving public comments on the audits and the ultimate aim to have the draft audits adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

The presentation then summarised the following topics:

1 Historic Development of the Conservation Areas

- Development of the Great Estates: the western side of East Marylebone CA was developed by the Portland Harley Estate; and the eastern side, along
with a portion of Hanway Street CA, as part of the Berners Estate. Cleveland Street was developed as part of the Southampton Estate to the north. Hanway Street itself was outside the remit of any great Estate.

- Historic Maps (Roque’s, 1746 & Horwood, 1793) illustrate the development of the rapid three areas, which began as rural suburbs
- 2nd phase of development evolved during the Victorian/Edwardian period, when Oxford Street was established as a commercial centre; shopfronts were inserted into the Georgian houses; terraces were replaced by mansion blocks and corner public houses
- later, 20th century developments consisted of post-war infill and speculative office developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Conservation Area Boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries of each Conservation Area were defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for designation of Hanway Street &amp; Cleveland Street, to complement Camden’s Bloomsbury Conservation Area, explained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH then invites any comments relating to the CA boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- BW: Queried the exclusion of Berners Street, given its historic significance as part of the Berners Estate
- JH: Highlighted the extent of post-war development, the character of which does not correspond with the rest of East Marylebone
- BW: Asked if the Middlesex Hospital site was protected
- JH: Explained it is protected as falls within the Conservation Area boundary; some of the buildings are Listed; parts of the site is protected through the Planning Brief that imposes restrictions on future development proposals
- BW: Asked why the Planning Brief does not give consideration to the Hospital’s 20th Century developments
- JH: Explained that although the later buildings have a significant presence, only the best parts were identified, the excluded elements were not considered to be of particular merit
- BW: Is the area excised from the East Marylebone Conservation Area still considered to be in East Marylebone?
- JH: Yes, but these portions do not receive the same protections as Conservation Areas

JH hands over to RA for the remainder of the presentation

3 Character of the Conservation Area

RA briefly described the character of each area:

- Hanway Street as a small-scale route set behind large commercial front of Oxford Street and the semi-industrial Rathbone Place. East Marylebone has the commercial front of Oxford Street and an eclectic mix further north Cleveland Street’s Georgian terrace, a rare survival in Westminster.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Architecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA then explained the Architecture section, and identified the various building types that exist within the three Conservation Areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale, narrow buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial buildings, department stores and semi-industrial warehouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansion blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Houses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the various buildings, RA explained that it is their architectural detail and applied decoration that makes them special, for example: decorative friezes; polychromatic detailing; glazed tile fronts; decorative lettering

- RH invites any questions on the architecture of the Conservation Areas

### 5 Roof Profiles & Extensions

RA shows slide of Westminster Council’s policy relating to roof extensions and explains that the maps within each CA Audit correspond to the Council’s policy as set out in the Unitary Development Plan. Examples of the range of roof profiles that would not be acceptable for extension were shown, including: roofs that form individual features; roofs with existing extensions; roofs that form part of a historic group.

- CAM reiterated that the roof extensions maps within the audits refers directly to the Unitary Development Plan
- RA: Agrees. Also highlights that a lot of buildings already have roof extensions and further extensions would not be likely on these, hence the roof extensions maps appear rather negative
- RA goes on to explain that any new development in a Conservation Area requires Conservation Area Consent as well as Planning Permission, and in all instances new buildings would have to make a better contribution to the local environment than the existing. Any new building in a Conservation Area should preserve/enhance the area.
- CAM explains that this principle applies to any new alterations that might affect a Conservation Area.

### 6 Townscape Detail

RA gives a number of examples of townscape detail including: railings; a historic bollard; blue plaque; coal hole cover; the public lavatory on Foley Street.

BC queried the inclusion of the public lavatory as the cover is new (c. 1990) and something she considers useless and unsightly.* amended in final EM audit
CAM asked whether because something is new does that make it less significant
BC raised the point that townscape detail should not be identified as making a significant contribution if it performs no useful function. The toilet in particular has no use, attracts rats, and is inferior workmanship
JH explained that something can still be an important if it is an attractive townscape feature, regardless of its age or function
BC asked whose opinion it was that the toilet is an attractive feature
CAM highlighted the distinction between planning and conservation issues from management issues, which are not part of the audits in particular
- RA proposed Conservation Officers will try to understand more about the toilet, its age and function

### 7 Negative Features

RA identified the various types of negative features that have a cumulatively detrimental impact on Conservation Areas, including:

- shopfronts on Oxford street
- overbearing developments such as the Courtauld building on Cleveland
Street
• security measures like roller shutters on Hanway Street
• street clutter for example on Tottenham Court Road
• unsightly flues and pipework like those attached to the rear of the Cleveland Street terrace.

8 Written Comments
RA clarified that any comments relating to the draft audits are gratefully received and should be submitted to the Council by 14 December 2005, either in writing on via e-mail

9 Management Proposals
JH emphasised the inclusion of a new element to CA audits, dealing with Management Proposals and how things can be improved. This section forms part of a drive towards more joined-up thinking within the Council

CAM reiterated the Council’s commitment to a more joined-up process, where critical appraisals lead to management proposals which would lead to enforcement or policy action and said this is perhaps the most important part of the audit documents.

Invitation for any comments relating to management proposals

- BC referred to the ground floor windows of the TJ Boulting building on the corner of Candover/Riding House Street, which are currently boarded up. She asked whether the original leaded light windows would be reinstated.
- RA said if the originals had been removed, the Council could tackle the issue with enforcement powers.
- JW explained that he knows of the issue and believes Westminster is currently working with English Heritage to seek the reinstatement of the originals.
- BW said he was very impressed with the East Marylebone CA audit and how comprehensive a document it is. He felt the negative features element was a particularly pro-active policy, but expressed a concern with the lack of knowledge and understanding, particularly on the part of shop owners, relating to the cumulative impact shopfronts and signs can have. He asked what can be done to raise general public awareness into the issues. *Added action to management proposals in the EM audit
- JH explained the audit documents and specific guidance is available on the Council website as well as through OneStop services.
- RA also emphasised the importance of raising particular issues or problems with the planning enforcement team.
- BW highlighted the fact that some residents are not aware and that there is a reluctance to ‘snitch’ on others within the local community.
- JW explained that the majority of Enforcement cases are the result of members of the public checking and querying and the Enforcement team are happy to check.
- BC asked about nos. 73-77 Great Titchfield Street, where the original shopfronts were ripped out and unsympathetically replaced, and pointed out it would be better to reinstate shops according to their original proportions.
- JW explained that as development applications are received, improvements...
in design terms are sought and Officers take a holistic view and will always look at the surroundings.
CAM suggested Westminster’s Communications department try to improve ways of letting people know about the importance of living in a Conservation Area, especially small businesses *Added action to management proposals in EM related to ‘raising awareness’
- **BW** pointed out that it is the residents that feel most passionate about their environment, but there could be a higher level of awareness and reiterated the reluctance amongst many residents to complain to the Council
- **JC** commented how the problem with negative features such as vandalism on shopfronts, rubbish dumping etc can quickly spread and blight an area
- **JW** stated that it is right for residents to be concerned about their local environment and they shouldn’t feel uncomfortable about altering the Council as prevention is far better trying to resolve damage through the enforcement route once it has been done.
- **BW** stated that there is a lot of ignorance surrounding Conservation Areas
- **CHM** explained that Westminster’s has the busiest planning enforcement team in the country, who are very efficient and quick to respond to concerns and complaints. However, the Enforcement Team prefer to be altered to potential problems prior to something being lost, most of which is through ignorance.
- **BC** asked about the Crown & Sceptre public house, which has large unsightly air conditioning units to their rear and had an application for awnings that may have reduced the need for air conditioning turned down.
- **JW** explained that in this instance, the air conditioning units are unauthorised and the awnings would not have been an appropriate feature on a historical pub front
- **CAM** Thanked all attendees, stating the usefulness of having such a specific discussion and comprehensive feedback on the audit documents. He pointed out the Audit Team’s contact details and repeated the deadline for written comments.

**Councillor Moss closed the meeting at 8.10 pm**

Additional comments after the meeting was closed:

Suggestion p. 59 Fig 86 – public toilet, should not be described as a ‘Survivor’ since the top canopy is c. 1990 and not particularly high quality

p. 73 Fig. 113 – negative shopfront is on Candover, not Foley Street
STATEMENT OF DECISION

SUBJECT:  Hanway Street Conservation Area Audit – Adoption as Supplementary Planning Guidance

Notice is hereby given that Councillor Robert Davis, the Cabinet Member for Planning & Customer Service, has made the following decision on the above mentioned subject for the reason set out below.

Summary of Decisions

Resolved to adopt the Hanway Street Conservation Area Audit, as attached at appendix 5 to the report, as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Reason for Decision:

It is considered that the audit provides a sound basis for the future stewardship of the Hanway Street Conservation Area, meeting the statutory requirements placed on the Council. The findings have been amended in the light of comments received and the audit’s adoption as Supplementary Planning Guidance will ensure the continued preservation and enhancement of this Conservation Area.

C T Wilson
Director of Legal and Administrative Services
Westminster City Hall
64 Victoria Street
LONDON
SW1E 6QP
Publication Date: 23 March 2006
Decision Ref: no. CMfP&CS/18 /2006
LISTED BUILDINGS

The following buildings within Hanway Street Conservation Area are listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Tottenham Public House</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oxford Street W1</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34-36</td>
<td>Oxford Street W1</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn House</td>
<td>54-62</td>
<td>Oxford Street W1</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rathbone Place W1</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TQ 2981 SE
CITY OF WESTMINSTER
OXFORD STREET W1

58/201
No 6 (The Tottenham Public House)

II

Public House. 1892. Designed by Saville and Martin. Red brick with Portland stone. Dressings and banding; slate, steeply pitched roof. 4 storeys plus 2 storeys to gable. 3 main bays. Free Flemish revival style. Altered plate glass shop front to ground floor, with entrance to right and stone cornice above, supported upon pink granite corner pilasters. First and second floor linked by 2 storey niches to outer bays, with rounded heads, canted bay window to centre with front aligned with plane of wall; stilted segmental arches to first floor, round headed lights, to stone tracery in square headed windows to second floor; central gable feature breaking through into third floor. Third and fourth floors, each with 3 stilted segmental headed windows. Shaped gable to fourth and fifth floors; round headed window to fifth floor. Timber sashes. Fine public house interior to ground floor with pilastered panelling, frieze, moulded cornice, and heavily moulded ceiling with painted roundel; back painted mirrors by Jones and Firmin, encaustic tiles by Millington, Wisdom and Co, and painted panels of the four seasons by Felix de Jong and Co. One of the best surviving public house interiors in the country.

M Girouards, Victorian Pubs.

TQ 2981 SE

CITY OF WESTMINSTER
OXFORD STREET W1

58/2
Nos 34 and 36

II

Commercial premises. 1912 by Metcalfe and Grieg. Portland stone faced, slate roof. Arts and Crafts office cum shop elevation with strong vertical emphasis in the manner of Treadwell and Martin. 6 storeys rising to a shaped gable attic. Broad single bay front. Ground floor and 1st floor/ mezzanine have mid C20 altered shop front and upper display window, framed by a full width label moulded semi-elliptical arch, the display window mullioned and transomed. A dentilled cornice with foliated and masked corbels separates the upper floors from the arch and from it to the parapet rise shafts dividing
the front into 3 parts with central through-storey canted oriel with stone mullioned and transomed lights, carved on raised corbels that break into the flat arch of 3-light 2nd floor window; small 2-light windows flanking oriel. The parapet, with projecting capping and moulding crowning the shafts, sweeps up to the shafted gable containing a 3-light lunette and finished off with open segmental pediment.


Terrace house, c.1718-20, refronted early to mid C19. Stock brick, slate roof. 4 storeys. 3 windows wide. Mid G19 shop front with display window curved in to right with angled shop door, creating open lobby to set back house door, the right hand wall retaining original fielded panelling and segmental arched niche of the passage hall. Upper floors have stucco panelled architraves to sashes /those on first floor with pediments on consoles. Cornice and blocking course. Interior retains numerous original features on a standard 2 room deep plan ..«.th closet wing, including the rest of passage-hall panelling continued from now exterior lobby with another segmental arched niche and one remaining fluted Corinthian pilaster to hall opening onto staircase which is in a fully panelled compartment with cut carved bracket strings, 3 twisted balusters per tread and fluted column newels, simpler turned balusters to 2nd flight, 1st floor landing with panelled window seat and shutters. 1st floor rooms all retain fielded panelling and dado rails, box cornices to rear rooms with angle chimney pieces, 2nd floor rooms with plainer sunk panelling and box cornices; original door furniture etc.
Adjacent Conservation Areas and Council Boundaries

Hanway Street adjoins the Soho Conservation Area along Oxford Street. To the north and east it adjoins the Bloomsbury Conservation Area (London Borough of Camden).
Strategic Views through Hanway Street Conservation Area

The parliament hill to the Palace of Westminster strategic view cuts across the western half of the Hanway Street Conservation Area.
Regulation 7 Directions

The whole area is affected by the requirement that any advertisement for the sale or letting of land (including estate agents’ boards advertising shops, houses, flats or offices) must be given consent by the City Council as local planning authority. Displaying an advertisement without first obtaining consent is a criminal offence.
PUBLICATIONS AND FURTHER INFORMATION

Unitary Development Plan
Planning policies are explained in the adopted City of Westminster Unitary Development Plan, 1997 and the draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2nd deposit version, pre-inquiry version and modifications agreed May, September and December 2004). This can also be accessed electronically at: http://www.westminster.gov.uk/planningandlicensing/udp/index.cfm

Crossrail
A Draft Planning Brief for Crossrail: Tottenham Court Road Station (Eastern Ticket Hall) is available Consultation Papers on the Planning page of Westminster City Council website: www.westminster.gov.uk

Design Guides and Publications
Other Westminster City Council publications, produced by the Department of Planning and City Development are listed below. These are available from One Stop Services (see addresses under ‘contact details’) or can be viewed on the Westminster City Council Website: www.westminster.gov.uk

1. Hanway Street Conservation Area No. 39 – General Information Leaflet
2. Conservation Areas: A Guide to Property Owners
3. Development and Demolition in Conservation Areas
5. The Listing of Historic Buildings: A Guide for Owners and Occupiers
7. Design Matters in Westminster – Supplementary Planning Guidance on Creating Good City Architecture
8. Designing out Crime in Westminster
12. Lighting up the City: A Good Practice Guide for the Illumination of Buildings and Monuments
13. Façade Cleaning – The Removal of Soiling and Paint from Brick and Stone Facades
14. Refuse Storage in New Developments
15. Stucco: A Guide to its Care and Maintenance
16. Shopfronts, Blinds and Signs
17. Blinds: Guidelines for their selection and fitting
18. Advertisement Design Guidelines
20. Plant and Air Conditioning Equipment – Guidance Notes on Applications for Planning Permission
22. A Guide to Providing Access for All
23. Railings on Domestic Buildings in Westminster
24. Public Art in Westminster
25. Trees and Other Planting on Development Sites
26. A Brief Guide to Planning Enforcement
Further Reading


Local History

For information on all aspects of local history contact:

**City of Westminster Archive Centre**  
10 St. Ann’s Street  
London  
SW1P 2XR

General Enquiries Tel: 020 7641 5180
Westminster City Council Contacts List

General Planning Information
To find out if a property is listed or in a conservation area, or is affected by a Regulation 7 or Article 4 Direction; to obtain copies of design guidance or planning application forms; or to report a breach of planning control, contact: Planning Records (Customer Service Centre) Tel: 020 7641 2513 or Fax: 020 7641 2515 E-mail: PlanningInformation@westminster.gov.uk

Planning Advice
For advice about planning permission, conservation area, listed building or advertisement consent; design and restoration advice; restrictions in Article 4 Direction Areas; or lawful development certificates, contact: Central Area Team Tel: 020 7641 2681 or Fax: 020 7641 2339

Or write to:
Development Planning Services
Department of Planning and City Development
Westminster City Council
City Hall, 64 Victoria Street
London SW1E 6QP

To view or purchase Westminster City Council’s Unitary Development Plan and any Council documents relating to planning and design matters, visit: One Stop Services
62 Victoria Street, SW1
Opening times: 08:30 – 19:00 Mondays to Fridays, 09:00-13:00 Saturdays

Further Information
For contacts regarding other frequently used services, refer to the Council’s booklet: A-Z Guide, Your Guide to Council Services, available from One Stop Services; Libraries and Council Information Points; or Tel: 020 7641 8088 Fax: 020 7641 2958.

City of Westminster General Inquiries Tel: 020 7641 6000
The City Council also makes available many documents in Braille, on tape and in large print. If you require any of the information contained in these documents in one of these alternative formats please contact: (020) 7641 8088.