



# Heritage Impact Assessment

---

Flat 3, 40 Montagu  
Square, London

March 2021 | Project Ref 6604

HCUK Group is a multi-disciplinary environmental practice offering expert advice in archaeology, heritage, landscape, arboriculture, and planning. It began life in 2010 as Heritage Collective LLP, before becoming Heritage Collective UK Limited in 2014. In the coming years diversification saw the addition of Archaeology Collective, Landscape Collective and Planning Collective, before all strands came together to be branded under a single umbrella: HCUK Group, based on the acronym for the original company. A home working company since the beginning, we are pleased to employ a talented workforce of consultants and support staff, who are on hand to advise our clients.



Project Number: 6604  
 File Origin: <https://heritagecollectiveuk.sharepoint.com/sites/Projects/Shared Documents/Projects 6501-7000/6601-6700/06604 - Flat 3, 40 Montagu Square, London/HC/Reports/2021.03.02 Montagu Square HIA.docx>

Author with date	Reviewer code, with date
JE 02.03.2021	



## Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Relevant Planning Policy Framework .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Statement of Significance.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. Heritage Impact Assessment.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5. Conclusions .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## Appendices

**App. 1 Scale of Harm table (Heritage Collective, 2019)**

## Figures

- Fig. 1 General view of 40 Montagu Square**
- Fig. 2 Main staircase**
- Fig. 3 Existing roof lantern**
- Fig. 4 Existing roof lantern**
- Fig. 5 Roof lantern, interior**
- Fig. 6 Interior of the hipped roof**
- Fig. 7 Roof structure, 41 Montagu Square**
- Fig. 8 Roof lantern, 39 Montagu Square**
- Fig. 9 Upper staircase – third to fourth floor**
- Fig. 10 Upper staircase – third to fourth floor**
- Fig. 11 Landing, third floor**
- Fig. 12 Fireplace, main front room, third floor**

- Fig. 13** Fireplace, small front room, third floor
- Fig. 14** Wooden fireplace, back room (kitchen) third floor
- Fig. 15** Main dividing wall, third floor, seen from kitchen
- Fig. 16** Wall between large and small front rooms, third floor
- Fig. 17** Victorian nails used for fixing lath
- Fig. 18** Typical floor construction
- Fig. 19** Floor construction – kitchen
- Fig. 20** Kitchen skirting and floor

# 1. Introduction

**1.1** This Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared by Dr Jonathan Edis, Director of HCUK Group, on behalf of Mr and Mrs O. Merican. It relates to Flat 3, 40 Montagu Square, London, which is a grade II listed building (Figure 1) within Portman Estate Conservation Area.

**1.2** Applications for planning permission and listed building consent for the remodelling and refurbishment of the third and fourth floor flat were submitted by Mr and Mrs Merican to the City of Westminster in October 2020 (20/06617/FULL and 20/06618/LBC) and were withdrawn in December that year, following emailed comments from the Council's Design and Conservation Officer, Mr Toby Cuthbertson, as follows:

*"I'm dealing with your planning and listed building consent applications at 40 Montagu Square.*

*I've been through the pack, and I'm afraid that a number of the works proposed are not consistent with our adopted listed building and conservation policies.*

*The replacement of the front sash windows may be acceptable, providing that the new double glazed units are as slender as possible in profile, and that they are individually puttied in to structural glazing bars (i.e. that the glazing bars are not planted on.)*

*The replacement of the rear windows would only be consented if it could be demonstrated that they too are non-original; we would not normally permit the loss of historic windows. Again, only very slim units puttied into structural glazing bars would be acceptable.*

*In both cases only the sashes should be replaced – the sash boxes and frames should be retained.*

*In terms of the proposed works to the roof lantern, the date of the roof should be established before we can consent to the loss of fabric, including roof timbers. The hipped roof appears to be historic – the same roof form is repeated on almost all of the Montagu Square buildings which have the same two-storey bay as no. 40. If the roof is indeed original then the loss of roof*

*timbers to allow for an enlarged roof lantern would not be acceptable. The fabric of the lanterns itself does not appear to be of special interest - there would be no objection to the replacement of the existing lantern with one of the same volume.*

*The opening up of the third floor to form a single open plan space is unacceptable in terms of the impact on the historic plan form.*

*The loss of historic chimney breasts is also contentious, and not ordinarily consented.*

*The internal wall insulation is another area which is often problematic. It has an awkward affect [sic] on the depth of the window reveals, and may involve the loss of historic cornice which is not something we would ordinarily allow. The impact of internal wall insulation on the transport of moisture through the walls, while not in itself forming a reason for refusal, is something which should be very carefully considered.*

*In my view, there is a considerable amount of work to do to make the application acceptable in listed building terms. I would suggest a withdrawal and resubmission of a revised scheme omitting the contentious elements and including further information on the internal wall insulation, rear windows and roof fabric."*

### 1.3

I was approached by Beacham Architects, who were acting on behalf of Mr and Mrs Merican, between the date of Mr Cuthbertson's email and the withdrawal of the applications. In fact, it was partly on my advice that the applications were withdrawn. I was then appointed to advise Mr and Mrs Merican, and I visited the building with Mr Mike Beacham on 8 January 2021. In discussion with Mr and Mrs Merican, we then revised the application so as to be more in line with policy, taking out those elements that appeared to be the most challenging (e.g. the removal of chimney breasts, replacement windows etc). The present Heritage Impact Assessment accompanies the Design and Access Statement by Beacham Architects, and the rest of the application documents in support of the proposals, which seek a sensitive level of modernisation in order to make the flat suitable for 21<sup>st</sup> century living.

## 1.4

I have been advising on the alteration, extension, reuse and repair of listed and historic buildings for more than thirty years - for a decade as a local authority conservation officer, for another decade as Director and Head of Historic Buildings at CgMs Limited (now part of RPS), and, for the last eleven years, as a founder-Director of HCUK Group. I am a full Member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) and of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (MCIfA).



## 2. Relevant Planning Policy Framework

- 2.1** The decision maker is required by sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building and its setting when exercising planning functions. The decision maker must give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the significance of the listed building, and there is a strong presumption against the grant of permission for development that would harm its heritage significance.<sup>1</sup>
- 2.2** There is a broadly similar duty arising from section 72(1) of the Act in respect of planning decisions relating to development within conservation areas.
- 2.3** For the purposes of this statement, preservation equates to an absence of harm.<sup>2</sup> Harm is defined in paragraph 84 of Historic England’s Conservation Principles as change which erodes the significance of a heritage asset.<sup>3</sup>
- 2.4** The significance of a heritage asset is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as being made up of four main constituents: architectural interest, historical interest, archaeological interest and artistic interest. The assessments of heritage significance and impact are normally made with primary reference to the four main elements of significance identified in the NPPF. The setting of a heritage asset can contribute to its significance.
- 2.5** The NPPF requires the impact on the significance of the designated heritage asset to be considered in terms of either “substantial harm” or “less than substantial harm” as described within paragraphs 195 and 196 of that document. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) makes it clear that substantial harm is a high test, and case law describes substantial harm in terms of an effect that would vitiate or drain away much of the significance of a heritage asset.<sup>4</sup> The Scale of Harm is tabulated at Appendix 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Limited v East Northamptonshire District Council and others [2014] EWCA Civ 137. This principle has recently been confirmed, albeit in a lower court, in R (Wyeth-Price) v Guildford Borough Council.

<sup>2</sup> South Lakeland v SSE [1992] 2 AC 141.

<sup>3</sup> Conservation Principles, 2008, paragraph 84.

<sup>4</sup> Bedford Borough Council v SSCLG and Nuon UK Limited [2013] EWHC 4344 (Admin).

**2.6** Paragraphs 195 and 196 of the NPPF refer to two different balancing exercises in which harm to significance, if any, is to be balanced with public benefit. Paragraph 18a-020-20190723 of National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) online makes it clear that some heritage-specific benefits can be public benefits. Paragraph 18a-018-20190723 of the same NPPG makes it clear that it is important to be explicit about the category of harm (that is, whether paragraph 195 or 196 of the NPPF applies, if at all), and the extent of harm, when dealing with decisions affecting designated heritage assets, as follows:

*Within each category of harm (which category applies should be explicitly identified), the extent of the harm may vary and should be clearly articulated.*

**2.7** Paragraphs 193 and 194 of the NPPF state that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering applications that affect its significance, irrespective of how substantial or otherwise that harm might be.

**2.8** Local heritage policy has been taken into account in the preparation of this assessment, including the Council's audit of Portman Estate Conservation Area dated March 2003.

## 3. Statement of Significance

### Introduction

- 3.1** This chapter of the assessment identifies the heritage significance of the listed building in the terms indicated in the NPPF – that is, architectural interest, historical interest, archaeological interest and artistic interest.

### Portman Estate Conservation Area

- 3.2** The general character of Portman Estate Conservation Area is summarised at the beginning of Part 3 of the Council’s audit of the conservation area dated March 2003:

*"A large part of the Portman Estate retains its late eighteenth century texture and residential character. This provides a homogenous character stemming from the survival of substantial parts of the original grid layout of streets and squares and the Georgian terraces lining them. Manchester Square to the east remains largely unaltered (except on the north west side) and contains some of the oldest houses in the area. A strong hierarchy remains to the fabric and open spaces, varying from the many examples of mews to the grand terraces of Bryanston Square and Montagu Square.*

*The important legacy of this historic development is the prevailing character of the conservation area derived from the harmonious rhythm generated by coherent blocks of historic terraced buildings. These terraces have consistent characteristics of scale, plot sub-division, elevational treatment, solid and void patterns and use of materials in a hierarchical relationship to the carefully planned, historic grid of streets and squares. However, subtle variations including later alterations, exist which add richness to some groups of properties within the uniform order of terraces.*

*Towards the end of the 19th century and early 20th century a grander scale was introduced to parts of the conservation area with the development of mansion blocks and civic buildings focusing around Marylebone Road. Large scale commercial development since the First World War, has been concentrated along*

*the principal routes of Oxford Street, Baker Street, George Street, Blandford Street and around Portman Square, where only three of the original grand houses survive on the north side. In addition to the development of some large new blocks the latter part of the twentieth century has seen the introduction of some office use into the Georgian terraces, resulting in a mixed residential/commercial character to the area.*

*It is necessary to look at specific components of the built fabric of the conservation area in order to gain a full understanding of the character and appearance of the area. This will range from an analysis of views of metropolitan or local importance to the identification of local townscape qualities such as notable shopfronts. Individually and collectively these factors will define the unique character of an area and should be considered fully in the determination of any application."*

### 3.3

The development of Bryanston Square and Montagu Square is described in the Council's audit as follows:

*"A circus or double crescent was planned on the axis of Great Cumberland Place but only the east side was completed (in 1789). In 1811 the axis was continued north with the setting out of Bryanston Square and Montague [sic] Square alongside. The properties fronting them were designed by J Parkinson for the Portman Estate. A large pond and a cluster of small cottages known as Apple Village were formerly located near the site. This long vista north is terminated by the portico and tower of St. Mary's Wyndham Place, begun in 1823. To the south, the axis is closed by Marble Arch, built by John Nash as the entrance to Buckingham Palace and moved to its present site in 1851."*

### 3.4

The development is said to have been complete by 1820-1821. Many commentators refer to its appearance as though the terraces are uniform, but they were clearly built in phases, with blocks of houses of slightly differing heights and widths. There have also been a number of refurbishments and alterations since the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, including mansard roofs and roof lanterns, bays being carried to the upper storeys of some frontages, and replacement windows. Some buildings in Bryanston Square and Montagu Square appear to have suffered considerable bomb damage during the Second World War, resulting in whole or partial reconstruction.

## Historic Development of 40 Montagu Square

**3.5** 40 Montagu Square was listed grade II on 1 December 1987 when it was officially described as follows:

*"Terraced town house. c.1810-11 (with some mid C.19 alteration), by J.T. Parkinson as part of his Montagu-Bryanston Square development. Stock brick with stucco ground floor; concealed slate roof. 5 storeys and basement. 3 windows wide. Semicircular arched doorway to left with panelled door in moulded jambs and fanlight. 2-window segmental bow to ground floor above which rises mid C.19, stucco, 2-storeyed canted bay finished off with cornice and blocking course; otherwise recessed sashes, under flat gauged brick arches to upper floors. Plat band finishing off ground floor stuccowork. Crowning stucco cornice and blocking course. Continuous, cast iron, geometric patterned balcony to 1st floor. Cast iron area railings with urn finials."*

**3.6** Internal inspection of the building indicates that the lower part of the main staircase is typical of the period c.1850-c.1870 (Figure 2), and that the upper part of the same staircase dates approximately to the Edwardian period (Figures 9 to 11). The extension of the "mid C.19" segmental bow on the frontage is consistent in date with the staircase. It is difficult to see how the entire staircase (and the cornices etc in the stair well) could have been replaced throughout the whole building without totally remodelling the internal floors and the room layouts, so it is likely that the building was comprehensively altered during the mid-Victorian period, with further change to the upper floors about half a century later.

**3.7** 37 to 39 Montagu Square, which stand to the right of number 40, are also listed grade II and are said to be the work of J.T. Parkinson c.1810-1811. Similarly, 41 Montagu Square, which stands to the left of number 40, is also said to be of the same date, and by the same architect. While it is possible that some elements of these buildings may date from the time of the Montagu Square and Bryanston Square redevelopments, they have probably been substantially reworked on several occasions since that time. The third floor plans of 40 and 41 Montagu Square have strong similarities, and the broadly late Victorian or Edwardian style of the staircase

(Figures 9 to 11) and fireplaces (Figure 13)<sup>5</sup> in number 40 suggests that the layout dates from the late 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

## Architectural interest

**3.8** It is the townscape of the Montagu Square and Bryanston Square developments that is of primary architectural importance. The layout of the long squares, with their central gardens, is an essentially Classical theme that attempts to create an impression of order and regularity. Each individual building makes a contribution, often differing slightly from its neighbours in detail, but it is the composition of the whole that takes precedence. The interior of 40 Montagu Square, which has a mid-late 19<sup>th</sup> century character and appearance, is in some respects of special interest, notably the main staircase with its elaborate cast iron balusters (Figure 2). The floor plan is also of some interest, but it is not the primary architectural contribution of the listed building. To appreciate that, one has to see 40 Montagu Square in the context of its neighbours, and the relationship with the spaces in the road and central garden to the front.

## Historic interest

**3.9** There are two broad strands to the historic interest of the listed building, one of which is illustrative, in the sense that it is a good example of a terraced house with a square on the Portman Estate, displaying characteristics that help form a connection with 19<sup>th</sup> century middle class society. The other strand is associative, with the estate itself, and with the London architect James Thompson Parkinson (1780-1859), not to be confused with another nearly contemporary architect called Joseph Parkinson (1783-1855).<sup>6</sup> J.T. Parkinson is thought to have been the architect of Mabledon House near Tonbridge in Kent, c.1805, for James Burton. He became architect and surveyor to the Portman Estate, and was responsible for the Classically-inspired layout, form and character of Montagu Square and Bryanston Square.

---

<sup>5</sup> In number 40, the fireplace in the small third floor room at the front is late Victorian or Edwardian, and the fireplace in the larger room is probably Victorian (See Figures 13 and 12 respectively). They may not, of course, be original to the building, but they are, nevertheless, in character. The timber surround to the fireplace at the back is relatively modern (Figure 14).

<sup>6</sup> <https://blogs.ucl.ac.uk/survey-of-london/2020/08/21/parkinson/> accessed 15 February 2021.

## Archaeological interest

- 3.10** The fabric of the listed building is of significance, but it is not of archaeological interest in the normal use of that term.

## Artistic interest

- 3.11** There is a degree of artistic interest in the innate architecture of the building, for example in the iron balustrade of the staircase (Figure 2).

## Summary of significance

- 3.12** 40 Montagu Square is significant as part of a Classically-inspired development of squares by the London architect James Thompson Parkinson (1780-1859), acting as architect and surveyor to the Portman Estate in the period c.1810 to c.1821. Its special architectural interest lies in the relationship between the long terraces either side of a central garden, creating an orderly, logical arrangement of town houses. In detail, the various groups of buildings are of slightly different heights and widths, indicating that they were not constructed in a single phase. They have also been altered externally, and some have had to be rebuilt following bomb damage. Nevertheless, the buildings that line the square are a very important and relatively well preserved component of the townscape of this part of London, making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of Portman Square Conservation Area. The interior of 40 Montagu Square appears to have been reconfigured in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, probably in the 1850s or 1860s, and again in the Edwardian period or early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Generally speaking, the interior is not as important as the exterior, but there are aspects of the internal layout that are of some interest, and that should be preserved where possible and practical.

## 4. Heritage Impact Assessment

### Introduction

**4.1** This chapter of the assessment describes the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the designated heritage assets, with reference to architectural interest, historical interest, archaeological interest and artistic interest.

**4.2** In summary, the main proposed changes involve (1) the replacement and upgrading of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century roof lantern to provide more light, (2) improved insulation at fourth floor, and (3) modification of the layout at third floor, including an alteration to the handrail of the late Victorian or Edwardian landing area. On the third floor it is proposed to remove parts of the partitions between the front and back rooms (Figure 15), and between the two front rooms (Figure 16). It is clear that some neighbouring houses have already been changed in this respect. For example, 38 Montagu Square, which has a broadly similar floor plan to number 40, was in 2015 the subject of listed building consent for alterations more intrusive than those proposed in the present application. The delegated report relating to that application (15/07680/FULL) stated that:

*"The property dates from circa 1810 however, the roof is a modern, flat, replacement of the original pitched roof, and the interior of the upper floors has been modernized in the past. As a result of this modernisation little other than the plan form of the building at these levels is of special interest, although it is assumed that structural timbers/partitions and the floors are original and therefore of historic interest."* (With original punctuation).

**4.3** For reasons explained in Chapter 3, it is unlikely that the partitions and layouts date to c.1810, and it is more probable that they were the result of comprehensive refurbishments in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. This can be deduced from the general character of the interior (cornices, main staircase, layout etc) and details of the fabric, such as the machine-made Victorian-style nails that were used to fix the laths to the studs that formed the structure of the internal partitions (Figure 17). At any rate, the present application seeks to open up and modernise the layout, while at the same time leaving enough visual evidence for people to "read" its earlier form.



- 4.4** There will be no significant alterations to windows, thereby obviating a point of concern raised in the now withdrawn application. Windows will be overhauled (i.e. ensuring they open and close properly and safely) and fitted with invisible brushes at the meeting rails to improve insulation.

## Alterations at roof level

- 4.5** The principal change at roof level is the removal of the existing lantern, which appears to date to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, perhaps around 1920 (Figures 3 to 5). It is made of timber, with wired glass on the pyramidal roof, and reeded glass on the cheeks and the casements. The interior is boarded, and it has cut through an earlier hipped roof which, from the appearance of the joists and boarding is itself likely to be a late 19<sup>th</sup> century or early 20<sup>th</sup> century alteration (Figure 6). There is nothing of special interest in the fabric of the existing rooflight, and its removal will not harm the significance of the listed building.
- 4.6** A new and enlarged rooflight is proposed. This will cut out more of the hipped roof, but the fabric of that structure is very unlikely to be original. The new rooflight will not be visible from ground level. In design terms it should be compared favourably with the lantern at 39 Montagu Square that was approved in 2008 (08/07584/LBC) (Figure 8). Other broadly similar lanterns have been approved, including 2 Montagu Square (14/0557 and 16/03489). When observed from roof level, the whole area abounds with incremental alterations and changes, most of which are hidden from public view and have no effect on the special interest of the townscape – including the structure on the roof of the neighbouring listed building, 41 Montagu Square (Figure 7).
- 4.7** The proposed change will allow much safer access to the roof for maintenance purposes, and into the roofspace for storage. The present access, which involves temporarily placing a ladder over the landing and above the stairwell, is dangerous. It is also insecure from the point of view of intruders, whereas the replacement will offer better protection from crime.

## Alterations at fourth floor level

- 4.8** The proposed alterations at fourth floor level are very minor in nature, involving the removal of cupboards in the master bedroom and the landing area, and short

lengths of partition in the two ensuites. It is proposed to move the door between the master bedroom and the master ensuite, which will not affect the special interest of the building.

- 4.9** Insulation will be applied to the sloping rear wall at this level. The original intention had been to strip all the lath and plaster from this wall, and to insulate the roof slope and renew with plasterboard. The proposal had been modified so that the lath and plaster will be left in place, with the insulation applied over the top. This will retain more fabric, and it will only have a small effect on the depth of the window reveal, such as to have no effect on the special interest of the building.

## Alterations at third floor level

- 4.10** Two new openings will be formed in the internal partitions at third floor level. One will open the partition between the front and back rooms, currently a living room and kitchen respectively. Another will open up the partition between the front living room and the smaller, narrower room at the front. In both cases it has been decided to leave nibs and downstands so that the existing (probably mid-19<sup>th</sup> century) layout can still be “read” at all times. Cornices and existing timber beams in the ceiling will be retained. Furthermore, retractable timber shutters will be provided where the two partitions are to be opened up. This will allow the appreciation of either (1) a contemporary open-plan arrangement when the shutters are opened, or (2) a more traditional three-room arrangement when the shutters are closed.

- 4.11** Glazed doors will be provided between the landing and the two main rooms<sup>7</sup> at third floor level, so as to bring natural light down from the lantern into the central part of the house. This will replicate the existing plan as closely as possible, while significantly improving the amenity of the flat.

- 4.12** In order to accommodate easy and safe access to the roof lantern and better access to the main rooms, it will be necessary to widen the landing at third floor level. It is proposed to adjust the existing timber staircase (Figure 11), which appears to be of late Victorian or broadly Edwardian date. The handrails and balusters can be

---

<sup>7</sup> Or single room, when the timber shutters are open.

reused and reconfigured, removing what is at present a rather odd-looking kink in the handrail.

## Other alterations

- 4.13** It is proposed to insulate and re-lay the floor, which will involve carefully taking up the floorboards and replacing them (Figures 18-20). It is intended that the height of the floor surface will remain unchanged.
- 4.14** Radiators will be provided, and gas fires will be overhauled within the existing fire surrounds (Figures 12 to 14).

## Effect on the conservation area

- 4.15** The proposed development will have no effect on the character or appearance of Portman Square Conservation Area, or on any aspect of its architectural or historic significance.

## Effect on the listed building

- 4.16** The external envelope of the building will be unaffected, and in this regard its contribution to the character and appearance of Portman Square Conservation Area will remain exactly the same as it is now.
- 4.17** The proposed internal alterations are relatively minor, and they affect fabric that probably dates from a significant refurbishment in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. The main internal change will be the opening up of two partitions at third floor level, but the provision of timber shutters will allow the original layout to continue to be appreciated when desired. The proposed new roof lantern will replace a poor quality early 20<sup>th</sup> century structure (Figures 3 to 5) with minimal effect on a roof that is itself very unlikely to be original to the building (Figure 6). It will not be visible from ground level and it will have no effect on the character or appearance of 40 Montagu Square.

## Summary of effects

**4.18** The proposed changes will not affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, which lies primarily in its external contribution to the character and appearance of Portman Square Conservation Area. The building will be no less significant after the completion of the works, if permitted, than it is now. Therefore, there will be no erosion of significance, and no harm to significance. Paragraphs 195 and 196 of the NPPF will not be engaged. There will be no harm to place into the planning balance. No local planning policies will be conflicted. There will be preservation for the purposes of the Council's duty under sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act.

## 5. Conclusions

**5.1** 40 Montagu Square is significant as part of a Classically-inspired development of squares by the London architect James Thompson Parkinson (1780-1859), acting as architect and surveyor to the Portman Estate in the period c.1810 to c.1821. Its special architectural interest lies in the relationship between the long terraces either side of a central garden, creating an orderly, logical arrangement of town houses. In detail, the various groups of buildings are of slightly different heights and widths, indicating that they were not constructed in a single phase. They have also been altered externally, and some have had to be rebuilt following bomb damage. Nevertheless, the buildings that line the square are a very important and relatively well preserved component of the townscape of this part of London, making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of Portman Square Conservation Area. The interior of 40 Montagu Square appears to have been reconfigured in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, probably in the 1850s or 1860s, and again around the time of the Edwardian period. Generally speaking, the interior is not as important as the exterior, but there are aspects of the internal layout that are of some interest, and that should be preserved where possible and practical.

**5.2** The external envelope of the building will be unaffected, and in this regard its contribution to the character and appearance of Portman Square Conservation Area will remain exactly the same as it is now.

**5.3** The proposed internal alterations are relatively minor, and they affect fabric that probably dates from a significant refurbishment in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. The main internal change will be the opening up of two partitions at third floor level, but the provision of timber shutters will allow the original layout to continue to be appreciated when desired. The proposed new roof lantern will replace a poor quality early 20<sup>th</sup> century structure with minimal effect on a roof that is itself very unlikely to be original to the building. It will not be visible from ground level and it will have no effect on the character or appearance of 40 Montagu Square.

# Appendix 1

## *Scale of Harm (HCUK, 2019)*

<b>Scale of Harm</b>	
Total Loss	Total removal of the significance of the designated heritage asset.
Substantial Harm	Serious harm that would drain away or vitiate the significance of the designated heritage asset
Less than Substantial Harm	High level harm that could be serious, but not so serious as to vitiate or drain away the significance of the designated heritage asset.
	Medium level harm, not necessarily serious to the significance of the designated heritage asset, but enough to be described as significant, noticeable, or material.
	Low level harm that does not seriously affect the significance of the designated heritage asset.

HCUK Group, 2019



Figure 1 - General view of 40 Montagu Square (marked by the red line) in the context of the neighbouring terrace. Note that there is no absolute conformity in terms of building heights, storey heights, balcony heights, or the widths of the various blocks in this terrace.



Figure 2 - The main staircase of c.1850 to c.1870.





Figure 3 - The existing roof lantern, of early 20<sup>th</sup> century construction.



Figure 4 - The existing roof lantern, of early 20<sup>th</sup> century construction.



Figure 5 - The interior of the existing roof lantern.



Figure 6 - The interior of the hipped roof, of late 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> century date.



Figure 7 - Modern roof structure looking down on 41 Montagu Square.



Figure 8 - Modern roof lantern (c.2008), 39 Montagu Square.



Figure 9 - The upper staircase, of broadly late Victorian or Edwardian date, between the third and fourth floors in 40 Montagu Square.



Figure 10 - The upper staircase, of broadly late Victorian or Edwardian date, between the third and fourth floors in 40 Montagu Square.





Figure 11 - The landing of the upper staircase, of broadly late Victorian or Edwardian date, third floor, in 40 Montagu Square.



Figure 12 - Fireplace in main room, third floor, 40 Montagu Square



Figure 13 - Fireplace in smaller front room, 40 Montagu Square.



Figure 14 - Modern fire surround, rear part of third floor, 40 Montagu Square



Figure 15 - Dividing wall between the third floor front and back rooms, seen from the back room (kitchen) looking towards the front.



Figure 16 - Dividing wall between the large and small front room, third floor.



Figure 17 - Victorian-era machine made nails used to apply laths, third floor.



Figure 18 – Typical floor construction.





Figure 19 – Typical floor construction, kitchen.



Figure 20 – Kitchen floor and skirting.